

From	Date	Comments	Action	Status	NPAC Proposed Response	Action
Parishioner	14/07/2017	In accordance with the recent notification, I should be obliged if you could provide me with a hard copy of the amended draft Plan at your earliest convenience. In anticipation, thanks and kind regards.	Send	Closed	Hard copy provided.	No action.
Stewart Patience (Anglian Water)	19/07/2017	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Swinford Draft Neighbourhood Plan (regulation 14) consultation. The following comments are submitted on behalf of Anglian Water. I would be grateful if you confirm you have received this response. It would appear that Swinford Parish is located outside our area of responsibility. Therefore we have no comments relating to the Draft Plan. Should you have any queries to this response please let me know.	Note	Closed	Acknowledged receipt of email.	Remove from future communications list.
Caroline Pick (CPRE Leicestershire)	22/07/2017	CPRE Leicestershire would like to congratulate Swinford PC on a very clear and thorough NP.	Note	Closed	Acknowledged receipt of email.	No action.
Sean Mahoney (Natural England)	01/08/2017	Thank you for the Regulation 14 Consultation on the Swinford Draft Neighbourhood Plan. Natural England has already commented on a previous draft of the Swinford Neighbourhood Plan (as attached). We have no further comments to make at this stage.	Note	Closed	Acknowledged receipt of email.	No action.
Sean Mahoney (Natural England)	01/08/17 (Originally submitted 21/03/17)	Thank you for consulting Natural England on the Swinford Neighbourhood Plan. Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.	Note	Closed	Acknowledged receipt of email.	No action.
Sean Mahoney (Natural England)	01/08/17 (Originally submitted 21/03/17)	Natural England does not consider that the plan will have any likely significant effects on any internationally or nationally designated nature conservation sites and welcomes the broad thrust of the plan and some of the specific policy proposals. It is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and set within the context of Harborough District Council's existing Core Strategy and emerging Local Plan. We particularly welcome POLICY ENV4: BIODIVERSITY which aims to ensure that development proposals will safeguard significant local habitats and species, especially those protected by relevant English and European legislation, and to create new habitats for wildlife.	Note	Closed	Acknowledged receipt of email.	No action.
Sean Mahoney (Natural England)	01/08/17 (Originally submitted 21/03/17)	We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us. For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter only please contact me on 02080261940. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.	Note	Closed	Acknowledged receipt of email.	No action.

Parishioner	08/08/2017	With reference to the letter from the SNPC may we thank the committee for the opportunity to comment on the draft neighbourhood plan. We have considered this and in particular the fact that you state that our comments will "influence our final draft". As our membership consists of largely Swinford parishioners we think it would be better left to individual members to make their own comments. Therefore SODS will not comment on the draft plan.	Note	Closed	Acknowledged receipt of email.	No action.
Adrian Chadha (Highways England)	10/08/2017	Highways England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the final draft of the Swinford Neighbourhood Plan which covers the period 2017-2031. It is noted that this constitutes the final consultation stage before the plan is submitted to Harborough District Council.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Adrian Chadha (Highways England)	10/08/2017	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. In relation to the Swinford Neighbourhood Plan, M1/A14 junction is located towards the south of the Neighbourhood Plan area. However direct access to the SRN is via M6 J1, A14 J1 and the M1 J20, which are situated approximately 4 miles to west, 7 miles to the east, and 4 miles to the north of the Neighbourhood Plan Area respectively.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Adrian Chadha (Highways England)	10/08/2017	Highways England understands that a Neighbourhood Plan is required to be in conformity with relevant national and Borough-wide planning policies (more specifically the Harborough Local Plan).	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Adrian Chadha (Highways England)	10/08/2017	Highways England understands that the housing target for Swinford has been revised. In the pre-submission consultation document 48 dwellings were proposed to come forward by 2031, this has subsequently been reduced to 35 dwellings in the current consultation document. Highways England considers that this scale of growth will have no impact upon the operation of the SRN.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Adrian Chadha (Highways England)	10/08/2017	Reference is made to the 'Highways Agency' in the consultation letter and it should be noted that from April 2015, the Highways Agency became a government-owned company, under the new name "Highways England" and should be referred to as such going forward.	Note	Closed	Noted.	Update Highways Agency to Highways England on future communications.
Adrian Chadha (Highways England)	10/08/2017	Highways England also notes that the letter is addressed to Aoife O'Toole who is no longer employed by Highways England. Any further communication with Highways England should be directed to Adrian Chadha and Scarlett Griffiths.	Note	Closed	Noted.	Update contact names on future communications.
Adrian Chadha (Highways England)	10/08/2017	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	11/08/2017	Having scanned the spreadsheet I can't find anything that seems to relate to my comments and queries, further scanned copy attached of original sent 30.03.17.	Reply	Closed	Apologised that the comments were omitted from the previous consultation. They were submitted to the previous Clerk on 30/03/17. The previous Clerk left the post on 31/03/17.	Include comments in current consultation, see below.
Parishioner	11/08/17 (Originally submitted 30/03/17)	Please find below my comments and queries, relating to the Pre-submission version of the Swinford Neighbourhood Plan, viz.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Parishioner	11/08/17 (Originally submitted 30/03/17)	(A) Firstly, I am not happy about the way the document(s) were presented, i.e. the method of publicity via an un-dated newsletter. Due to the potential importance of this document to the parishioners of Swinford, this should have either been the first item on the newsletter drawing attention to its importance, not on the second page after dog fouling and other matters, or, a separate message altogether. Furthermore, the terminology in the newsletter (statutory stakeholders) is misleading and suggests something other than the actual wording used in the NP Regulations, Part 5, Clause 14(a) which is perfectly clear - "for the attention of people who live etc.". I didn't actually know what the reference to stator stakeholders meant, and I have spoken to others who thought it didn't mean them! Furthermore, any publicity should include details, again as per the NP Reg's, Clause 14(a) (iv), rather than a passing reference to the PC website which everyone is not familiar with or necessarily has access to. This means that it is possible that the PC haven't complied with Reg 14.	Note	Closed	Noted. All required information was on the website. Regulation 14 rules were followed.	No action.
Parishioner	11/08/17 (Originally submitted 30/03/17)	(B) The Pre-submission Draft is one of 19 separate documents on the PC website, the others are presumed to be in support of the Draft. My question is simple - is it the PC's intention that these are included in the final draft, if so, how, appendices? When I looked at those documents, I started with the first on the list entitled Swinford Land Registry data 2011, which is in fact a series of excel worksheets, some of which appear to have no relevance to the matter at hand, other than causing confusion. However, one caught my eye, the one entitled "Street by Prop Type", although again confusingly when opened is headed "Count of Price paid 1995 to 2015 - Swinford". Please advise the purpose of including this worksheet which in its present form is riddled with errors and could cause the PC to be called to account in due course.	Note	Closed	All supporting documents will be available on the website.	No action.

Parishioner	11/08/17 (Originally submitted 30/03/17)	(C) Draft NP Pre-submission Version - questionable comments etc. as follows: p.4 - increasing number of planning applications - where is the evidence? p.14 - demand for housing is strong - where is the evidence? p.14 - public transport is limited - THERE IS NONE AT ALL! p.18 - Vision Statement is totally ignored by Site 4 recommendation - see later p.19 - Last paragraph makes only a passing reference to what are very important concerns to the parishioners as evidenced by the questionnaire responses p.28 - Housing Provision and p.29 clearly show parishioners are against large scale developments p.29 - refers to 48 properties - where is the evidence in support of this figure? p.30 - it is quite clear that Site 3 is significantly bigger than Site 4; however the surveys give Site 3 area as 2.05HA, Site 4 as 2.43HA. On further investigation both site areas are incorrect and conclusions drawn must therefore be wrong. p.31 - despite the wording of the 3rd paragraph, The Consultants have simply ignored any references to Sites 5a and 5b, therefore the Surveys are incomplete. Generally, How does the final version of the NP intend to fully address parishioners concerns about, for example, lack of shops, public transport which don't have any prominence in the Draft?	Review	Closed	It is not necessary to back up each statement in the NP with evidence of community backing. Most of these comments relate to the version of the Plan for Round One of the Regulation 14 Consultation and as such have now been reviewed.	No action.
Parishioner	11/08/17 (Originally submitted 30/03/17)	(D) Housing Sustainability Surveys - Site 4 - land described as redundant is incorrect, omits any mention of a large property on the North side of the site, refers to heavily sloping site which would bring with it construction issues such as retaining walls, under-build to house foundations etc., and the trees which are on the Lutterworth Road side of the site form no barrier or screen due to the large spacing of these trees. The site is fully visible from the road, as above, Sites 5a and b remain unconsidered.	Review	Closed	Assessments have been revisited. Site 4 has been revised and sites 5a and 5b are now on website.	No action.
Parishioner	11/08/17 (Originally submitted 30/03/17)	(E) Please provide a realistic cost of preparing the Neighbourhood Plan to completion, to include all costs paid or still to be paid to external Consultants, this latter figure to be identified separately.	Review	Closed	This is a Parish Council matter, queries of this nature should be addressed to the Parish Council, not NPAC.	No action.
Parishioner	11/08/17 (Originally submitted 30/03/17)	Bearing in mind the efforts put into providing replies to questionnaires by the parishioners, it is disappointing to say the least that key issues have either been ignored or given scant attention, anecdotally the impression is quite clear that the views of Consultants have taken precedence and this is not acceptable to the Parish the views of which the PC are supposed to listen to and represent.	Review	Closed	This is a personal view that is not supported.	No action.

Edy O'Connor (Swinford C of E Primary School)	13/08/2017	Having studied the draft neighbourhood plan for Swinford and having considered the possible implications of the key proposals outlined therein, I cannot foresee any adverse effects on the school if this plan is approved.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Edy O'Connor (Swinford C of E Primary School)	13/08/2017	Naturally we would want to see any section 106 (or similar) funds put to best use. Whilst we accept that we may not need to expand our facilities if we can steadily reduce the number of admissions from out of catchment to free up space for an increase in children living in catchment, it will be difficult to achieve the optimum balance in the medium term. Therefore we would hope to be able to apply for a share of any available funding to ensure that we don't need to reduce the quality of our service during periods of transition.	Note	Closed	A S106 Policy is included in the plan, this will allow for consideration of measures to alleviate issues arising from new housing and the school.	No action.
Edy O'Connor (Swinford C of E Primary School)	13/08/2017	Finally, I think the limits to development boundary map needs improving as there is currently no key to clarify the intention for the shaded areas and the school building, car park and lower playground have all been divided when surely they should be classified in the same way.	Review	Closed	Agreed, update map.	Updated 'Limits to Development' map required.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	I have read the draft Plan and set out below my comments. There is much to comment the Plan but there are also factual inaccuracies, some policies and statements are not backed by hard evidence, there are potential conflicts between policies and much subjective comment. I hope the NPAC can consider my comments in a constructive manner.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	A. Presentational issues (A1 to A10 below):	N/A	Closed	N/A	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	A1. Any document that is subject to comment or scrutiny by others should have para. Nos. as well as pages Nos. for easy reference.	Review	Closed	Noted. This is a matter of style and preference.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	A2. The document should have a version No. and date of publication to distinguish it from other versions.	Review	Closed	Noted. This is a matter of style and preference.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	A3. There is no bibliography, or list of supporting documents included in my hard copy (although I did find some of them on the PC Website). The fact that these are only on the Website and not available to consultees as a whole could possibly invalidate the Reg. 14 consultation.	Review	Closed	This is not an essential requirement. The full range of supporting information will be available on the PC website for ease of reference. There is no risk to the process being invalidated as a result of hard copies not being available as indicated.	No action.

Parishioner	15/08/2017	A4. There are references in the documents to Appendices but these are not attached. In addition, there are numerous statements and subjective opinions that are not backed up by factual evidence or research.	Review	Closed	Appendices are available on request and are available on the website. The reference to a lack of factual evidence or research is not backed up by examples so it is impossible to comment.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	A5. The document would appear to have not been proof-read as there are numerous grammatical errors, the classics being the use of the term "less" on pp79 when it should be "fewer".	Review	Closed	Noted. The document will be amended prior to submission.	Proof read plan.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	A6. Also there is a lack of accurate up to date plans which make it impossible to comment properly on the policies they relate to. I would have thought the consultant, Your Locale, would have insisted on accurate plans in a pre-submission document that will be subject to legal scrutiny.	Review	Closed	Uncertain what is meant by 'up to date plans', does this refer to the Limits to Development map? Some HDC plans are prior to the recent LP draft but are still the latest available.	Check plans are the latest versions available.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	A7. As this is the second time that a Reg. 14 consultation has taken place I would have expected the document to be complete, and up to date prior to its submission. The lack of crucial plans to accompany the housing and L of D policies and other errors are such that a third Reg. 14 consultation is surely necessary when these issues have been resolved. These continued fundamental problems are sapping the credibility of the NP and confidence in the ability of the NPAC who have now spent something over 2 years on an NP that is still not complete or credible.	Review	Closed	All documents will be available for the submission to HDC once all comments have been responded to and the NP amended as necessary.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	A8. I do not know who, or how the NP has been edited but the sequence of policies appears to be muddled. For instance, it is unclear if the housing allocations have been judged against the environmental policies in the NP or if the environmental policies have been fitted around the housing allocations.	Review	Closed	Each policy stands in its own right, the housing and environmental sites were assessed against their own criteria.	No action.

Parishioner	15/08/2017	A9. The NPAC have also alienated much of the village by it's attitude. When 61 parishioners signed a letter expressing concern at the inaccuracy of the housing allocation the immediate response from the NPAC Chair was to criticise a parishioner on social media and demand to know who initiated the letter. The NPAC subsequently sent two letters to the petitioners which, amongst other things claimed the petition was based on out of date information (2015) when it was based on information received from HDC 2 weeks prior. Both letters were defensive, factually inaccurate, (as is some of the NP), and did not attempt to recognise that villagers had a legitimate right to raise concerns. Subsequently the village was faced with a "take it or leave it" presentation of revised housing sites rather than a rational total allocation (the fact that known windfall sites could be included was not even mentioned) and the public were not consulted or given a choice of sites. This seems to ignore what I thought was the fundamental purpose of a NP, which is to give a say to the village in where and how development should take place.	Review	Closed	Much of this point is personal opinion. Parishioners have had numerous opportunities to say where housing takes place including a questionnaire, two open days, two rounds of Regulation 14 consultation, a housing presentation and numerous Parish Council meetings.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	A10. I suggest the NPAC read the North Kilworth NP which is factual, logical, to the point, seems to represent the views of the village, and was produced under the same local planning framework, with the same Consultant, and the same Parish Clerk.	Review	Closed	Each NP has its own aspects and is based on different features related to the specific locality.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	1. Background and Content (1.1 below):	N/A	Closed	N/A	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	1.1. Pp. 6 - 2nd para. Judging from the housing allocations and locations this is not so. On the basis of the consultations the village wanted a minimum of development because of a lack of facilities.	Review	Closed	The NP cannot allocate fewer houses than is required by HDC, this is made clear throughout the document. Allocating the absolute minimum leaves the parish open to speculative development once housing need increases. The production of a NP clearly gives the local community greater influence over many issues in addition.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	2. Planning Context (2.1 to 2.4 below):	N/A	Closed	N/A	No action.

Parishioner	15/08/2017	2.1. Pp 1, "NP's are required to contribute to Sustainable development" I do not see how this is so when the housing allocations are in open countryside and the village is totally reliant on cars for transport as there is no public bus service and no local food shop. Any new development is entirely reliant on the car for journeys to work, shopping and access to most other services.	Review	Closed	The NPPF requires development to be in the most sustainable locations. This means close to village facilities as is achieved by the NP in allocating housing adjacent to the built-up area. HDC consider Swinford to be a sustainable location for residential development, so the query is best addressed to them. The NP cannot refuse housing development on the basis of the Parish not being sustainable.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	2.2. Pp 11, 2nd para. A social role with "accessible local services" They are clearly not, most being in Lutterworth 3-4 miles away.	Review	Closed	This section is describing what the social role is in achieving sustainable development. The NP supports the services that do exist in Swinford – pub, school, village hall etc. – even if most other services are in Lutterworth. The paragraph does not say that ALL local services are in Swinford.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	2.3. Pp 11, 4th para. How can the NP be moving to a low carbon economy when it is entirely reliant on the car for transport?	Review	Closed	The NP supports the move to a low-carbon economy by including policies on, for example, promoting footpaths and sustainable development.	No action.

Parishioner	15/08/2017	2.4. Pp 11, 5th para. "special open spaces are protected" The development of the Mourant paddock is in conflict with it's special significance to the Conservation Area as defined in the original C.A. Designation report. The NPAC and the PC made no effort to protect this important site.	Review	Closed	The granting of planning permission for the Mourant paddock was a decision by the LPA. The paddock was proposed as a local green space by NPAC early on but this was overridden by the planning application / decision before the NP was ready for submission.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	3. Swinford Village (3.1 to 3.5 below):	N/A	Closed	N/A	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	3.1. PP 13/14. The history is interesting but does not inform or have any direct relevance to policies. The document could be much shorter and more relevant if explanation that is not directly relevant to policies is excluded. This point also relates to much of the dialogue later in the document.	Review	Closed	This is a matter of style and personal preference. The information contained here is of interest and will help an Examiner gain an understanding of the history of the Parish. One and a half A4 pages of narrative does not seem excessive.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	3.2. The profile confirms that the village is over reliant on the car for transport and the house type profile is distorted in favour of larger, more expensive and lower density properties.	Review	Closed	Noted. This is why the NP supports the provision of smaller dwellings.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	3.3. PP 15, 2nd para. The high level of under-occupancy is partly due to the lack of smaller accommodation which mitigates against down-sizing.	Review	Closed	Again - this is why smaller properties and bungalows are supported in the NP.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	3.4. PP 15, 3rd para. I think the fit between demand and supply of small housing is probably a bigger issue than affordable housing but does not appear to be addressed in the housing policies.	Review	Closed	Policy H5 specifically addresses the need for smaller housing.	No action.

Parishioner	15/08/2017	3.5. Pp 15, 5th-6th paras. The statements about public transport are disingenuous. There is no public transport in the village and this is fundamental to the suitability of Swinford for so-called "sustainable development".	Review	Closed	Again - HDC identifies Swinford as a suitable location for new housing. Reference to 'so-called sustainable development' is not a matter for the NP to address.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	6. Process (6.1 below): (Note - no sections 4 & 5 on letter)	N/A	Closed	N/A	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	6.1. The process is described but there is no summary of the responses or the views of the villagers, how these responses have been assimilated into policies, or the fact that it was the villagers that discovered the housing allocation was flawed and that 71 requested that the housing allocations be revisited.	Review	Closed	The Consultation responses are contained in the Consultation Statement that will accompany the submission of the NP to HDC, along with a Statement of Basic Conditions that will describe in detail how the NP meets the strategic requirements.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	6. Vision (6.1 below): (Note - '6' used for 6 & 7 on letter)	N/A	Closed	N/A	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	6.1. Pp 20, 1st and 3rd paras. Reference is made to reflecting the views of the community and addressing its needs, but nowhere in this section or the policies are the majority views of the village actually identified or used as an evidence base.	Review	Closed	Reference will be made in the Consultation Statement about how views of the public have been captured and taken into account.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	Note - there is no 6.2. in this section, letter jumps to 6.3 6.3. Objectives section. The sentiments expressed here are not borne out by the policies or actions to date. For instance, the NPAC failed to comment on "The Berries" application despite it being a serious encroachment into open countryside, (it scores badly in the Site Assessment) or comment adequately on the Mourant paddock application despite it being identified, with other open spaces as being important in the Conservation Area. The NPAC and PC had every justification to comment robustly on both these proposals as they fundamentally impinge upon, or contravene draft NP policies. Unfortunately it has now taken nearly 2 1/2 years to get to this revised draft plan stage.	Review	Closed	This is a matter of opinion. As previously stated NPAC were not invited to comment on The Berries proposal or the Mourant application. This was a matter for the PC and the LPA.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	8. Policies (8.1 to 8.17 below):	N/A	Closed	N/A	No action.

Parishioner	15/08/2017	8.1. PP 22, 1st para. Another reference to sustainable development and not making life "worse for future generations". I fail to understand why adding 35-45 houses to a village which has no shop or bus service to access other facilities and will inevitably add significantly to car travel on narrow inadequate country lanes can be claimed to be sustainable.	Review	Closed	This comment needs to be directed to HDC. The NP has no say on the minimum of new houses required, although it can and does make the delivery of those houses as sustainable as possible through its policies in support of community facilities and amenities etc.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	8.2. Limits of Development. This policy in the Core Strategy has served the village well in the past but with the approval of "The Berries" applications seems to have been abandoned. The section seems to have been lifted from another document as Swinford is not likely to merge with another "hamlet".	Review	Closed	The reference to Hamlets is in the section describing HDC's original Limits to Development, and then goes on to propose updating them for Swinford through the NP. The existing Limits to Development are considered out of date as the District does not have a 5-year land supply, and are proposed for removal in the draft Local Plan, hence the need for the inclusion in the NP. The Planning approval on the Berries was made by HDC so it is not relevant to refer to this in the comments relating to the NP.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	8.3. Pp 23, 3rd para. I cannot see any correlation between limits of development and supporting existing village services.	Review	Closed	Locating development close to existing services, within the Limits to Development, helps to support them.	No action.

Parishioner	15/08/2017	8.4. Pp23, 4th para. Methodology. I cannot find a policy that states that L of D may be relaxed in the future.	Review	Closed	This is because this is referring to the previous Limits to Development prepared by HDC, Limits to Development have been relaxed in the updated NP version. There is no intention to relax Limits to Development further therefore there is no policy.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	8.5. Pp 23/24. Updated limits of development. Unfortunately the boundary of the proposed limits of development is the current one (see date on plan - 2011) so all proposed allocations are contrary to this policy.	Review	Closed	Noted. It seems that the existing Limits to Development, not the revised Limits to Development are in the pre-submission version.	Provide updated Limits to Development map.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	8.6. The revised site assessments (site 8 for example) do not have as a criterion their relationship to L of D but this site is described as being outside the revised L of D. Without an accurate plan how can consultees make a judgement?	Review	Closed	Agree, need a revised Limits to Development map.	Provide updated Limits to Development map.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	8.7. The boundary of the L of D has clearly not been thought through or included in the draft NP.	Review	Closed	Same as the point above.	Provide updated Limits to Development map.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	8.8. Incidentally the plan on pp 24 clearly shows the open land that was (but no longer appears to be) significant to the CA designation.	Review	Closed	These are HDC designations that have been updated through the NP.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	8.9. Pp 25. Housing Policy. I have previously made the point that the built environment (building design) is entirely different from housing policy (the number and type of housing). The section is muddled and the policy H1 is about Building Design, which ought to apply to all buildings and not just housing.	Review	Closed	The design policy DOES also apply to community facilities and amenities, and there is a requirement in policy CF1 to meet the design criteria in policy H1 - so the issue is covered. This is consistent with the NP for Hungarton that has passed examination.	No action.

Parishioner	15/08/2017	8.10. It would be more logical to group Building Design together with Conservation Area and Listed Building policies.	Review	Closed	This is a personal view that is not supported.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	8.11. Pp27, 3rd and 6th paras. I can find no background evidence to support the statements about the communities views.	Review	Closed	Reference can be found in the various consultation exercises. It is not necessary to back up each statement in the NP with evidence of community backing ... surely wanting to protect the character of Swinford is an accepted aim?	Replace 'each' village with 'the' village.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	8.12. Pp 28. Policy H1 Paras 1 and 2. These are vague aspirations which are entirely subjective. Compare with North Kilworth policy NK9 which is a comprehensive design guide.	Review	Closed	NK incorporated an already approved design statement - without this it is entirely appropriate to introduce requirements such as contained in policy H1 which help to shape design feature to retain the village character.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	8.13. Pp 29. Policy H1, it is quite evident that Swinford has a higher car ownership than catered for by the standards in para 3. A good example is Simons Close where off-street parking is inadequate. The policy does not address this issue which can only get worse with more housing.	Review	Closed	This reflects the County Council's strategic parking policy. NP's cannot go against strategic policies unless they have exceptionally strong grounds which do not apply in Swinford. Any different policy requiring higher car parking standards would be likely to be rejected at examination.	No action.

Parishioner	15/08/2017	8.14. Pp 29. Village profile, 2nd para. There is plenty of anecdotal evidence that young people move out of the village because there is no suitable or affordable housing (by which I mean cheaper open market housing).	Review	Closed	Noted - this is a reason why smaller housing and affordable housing is supported in the NP.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	8.15. Pp 30. The housing profile confirms the lack of smaller homes and the MRH concludes that there is a need for smaller homes.	Review	Closed	Agreed - the NP supports the provision of smaller homes too.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	8.16. Pp 31, 1st para, last sentence. Policy H3 is inconsistent with the need for smaller houses as expressed in Policy H5 in that it requires densities to be "similar to adjacent dwellings".	Review	Closed	Smaller houses can still be provided within a mix and with provision for open space.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	8.17. Pp 31, 2nd para. Actually about one third of residents who responded to the consultation were opposed to any development.	Review	Closed	As previously stated - the option of there being no development cannot be reflected in the NP as this is not a viable option.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9. Policy H2 (9.1. to 9.48 below):	N/A	Closed	N/A	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.1. Pp 32. This requires a "minimum" of 35 dwellings but Policy H3 requires "around" a certain number on each site. Furthermore the use of the word "minimum" implies that there is no limit to the number of new dwellings.	Review	Closed	The housing requirement for Swinford as required by HDC is expressed by the District Council as a 'minimum'. Examinations of other NPs have confirmed that site allocations must be expressed in approximate terms to meet these minimum requirements. These are planning terms that may not be immediately familiar to the general public.	No action.

Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.2. Pp 33. This diagram and text confuses the issue as the original SHLAA sites have been overtaken by the consideration of additional sites.	Review	Closed	This is provided by way of background information to set the context.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.3. Pp 34. I am concerned that such a crude hand drawn plan is included and purports to identify in detail housing allocations that are probably the most important and contentious issues in the NP. One cannot make any rational comments on the relative merits, because the size, and boundaries of sites are unknown. For example, Site 8 is allocated 20-22 dwellings, over 4 times the number for Site 7 (4-5) but is only about 2 1/2 times the size. Site 6 is allocated 18-20 dwellings but is only double the size of Site 7 (4-5). I do not know how the sustainable site assessment could be undertaken on this basis.	Review	Closed	Agreed, provide better quality drawings.	Provide a better map to replace it with.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.4. Pp 34, 1st sentence. This is incorrect and misleading. "The Berries" SHLAA site (4-5) is clearly identified on pp 33 and the site for which PP was obtained (9 dwellings) is to the south and only includes a small portion of the SHLAA site which is now an infill site for about 4 dwellings. This error is all the more worrying as it would appear the NPAC is incapable of reading plans. The NPAC response to the letter submitted by 61 residents clearly states erroneously that "this is plainly incorrect. Account has been taken of "The Berries" site and the 9 houses ...".	Review	Closed	The NPAC have read this comment and find it offensive and inaccurate.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.5. The analysis lost credibility when it described the Lutterworth Road site as a grass racing track (or similar) when in reality it is a paddock. In addition the size was incorrect and this was not checked, hence the re-assessment of sites.	Review	Closed	Every assessment has been through a review process and amendments have been made. This is what happens when independent consultants provide initial comments based on what they see which parishioners can then comment on. The NPAC fails to see how this affects credibility, indeed we see the process of review and amendment as a good thing.	No action.

Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.6. The analysis of sites is entirely subjective. For instance, judgements are made on noise impact but no noise readings are referred to and do not appear to have taken place, sites 4,6,7 and 8 are all on relatively straight sections of road with good visibility but the scores for pedestrian and vehicular access vary. The impact of access requirements on trees (Jubilee Trees on Lutterworth Road) have not been scored. Since when has the walking distance to a PH been a significant determinant of the suitability of any housing site? What are the walking distances that determine a red, amber or green score?	Review	Closed	It is acknowledged that site assessments can be subjective, but nonetheless provide an opportunity for transparent and independent comparison. The site assessment scoring has been made available. Interestingly, when responding to criticism from a developer following a site selection process in Great Easton, the Examiner concluded: <i>An objection has been received from a landowner's agent, promoting a site not allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan. As set out earlier, a Neighbourhood Plan is examined against the basic conditions. It does not comprise a "beauty parade" of sites. Whilst the landowner's agent considers its site to be better than those allocated, I note that, whilst by their very nature, site assessments can involve subjective views, the allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan have emerged through a process appropriate to neighbourhood planning which is fully reflective of the community's "direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and deliver the sustainable development they need" (Paragraph 183, the Framework). Together, the allocations provide for sustainable growth and have regard to the Framework's requirement to "boost significantly the supply of housing." There is no requirement for the Neighbourhood Plan to allocated an additional, or alternative site, in order for it to meet the basic conditions.</i>	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.7. Pp 35. There is no information as to how the numbers of dwellings on sites was arrived at. HDC uses 30 dph and if the NP is to deliver a large proportion of smaller dwellings to redress the imbalance in the housing stock one would logically expect a higher dph to have been used.	Review	Closed	30 dph is just a guide. In consultation the village has expressed a desire to maintain existing density as far as possible.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.8. Pp 35, 3rd para. I do not recall parishioners making any comments on density of development, this has not been evident in the consultations, no calculations of existing development densities have been undertaken, so how can new development be judged to be similar? There is a clear requirement for more smaller dwellings which would increase density and therefore reduce the overall land requirement. To maintain existing densities (probably significantly below 30 dph) will do nothing to resolve the imbalance in housing stock.	Review	Closed	The author is incorrect. Many parishioners made comments during consultation regarding maintaining existing density levels as far as poss. It is not Swinford's objective to resolve the national imbalance in housing stock, simply to do its part.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.9. Pp 35. The setting of targets below the capacity of a site (however that has been arrived at) will exacerbate the imbalance as it will merely reduce densities further. No justification or explanation is provided to substantiate this which is contrary to the stated need for smaller dwellings.	Review	Closed	As above.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.10. Pp 35. There is also a clearly stated preference by villagers for a number of smaller sites rather than a few large sites. There are only 3 sites allocated and two of these are around the 20 mark, not exactly the preference of villagers.	Review	Closed	This is better than a single site accommodating all development. Is the respondent advocating developing a small proportion of ALL available sites? This is not considered practical.	No action.

Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.11. No account has been taken of "The Berries" SHLAA site which is now an infill between the PP Site and farmhouse, or the proposed 5 houses at 1 Chapel Street. These are both identified sites for development and their inclusion in the allocation would reduce the total by 9-10 i.e., leaving 25-26 to be found. HDC has confirmed that such infill sites can be identified as Windfalls sites and can count towards Swinford's allocation. AN INFILL POLICY TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF THESE 2 SITES WOULD REDUCE THE NEED FOR GREENFIELD SITES.	Review	Closed	The Berries was taken into account by HDC when setting the target. Chapel St is a recent application and its impact will be considered.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.12. PP 36, Table. There is no explanation as to why an indicative no. of 48 dwellings is shown (the previous NP figure) and a min. preferred No. of 35. If the current requirement is 35 surely this is what the NP should allocate, not a lower density than a site can accommodate as the clear need is for more smaller dwellings (a higher density) not a lower No. (and a lower density). Why does the NP not just use HDC's 30 dph as a starting point?	Review	Closed	indicative number of dwellings' can come out – and the right hand column just say 'approximate number of dwellings'.	Amend.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.13. Pp 36, Policy H3. Each site is required to "maintain a similar density to adj....dwellings". No indication of this desired density is quoted, apart from which policy H5 requires smaller dwellings to more likely to be a higher density. It would appear that the implications of this policy have been thought through.	Review	Closed	30 dph is just a guide. In consultation the village has expressed a desire to maintain existing density as far as possible.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.14. Pp 36, Policy H3. If the infill sites are included in the Allocation then 2 other sites of 12-14 dwellings would meet the allocation. At HDC's normal density of 30 dph, these sites would only need to be 0.5 ha. And could be a combination of parts of two of three sites identified at Lutterworth Road, Kilworth Road or Rugby Road. It is a pity that the village has not been consulted on these options rather than being presented with a fait accompli.	Review	Closed	The community are being consulted through this Regulation 14 process.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.15. Pp 37, Policy H4. There is no explanation as to why windfall sites must be limited to 3 dwellings. Surely the No. is determined by what can reasonably be accommodated on a site in accordance with planning standards?	Review	Closed	The number of dwellings is determined by the size of the village and the desire to limit the impact of windfall development.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.16. Pp 38. The Housing Needs Report is not attached as an Appendix.	Review	Closed	The Housing Needs report will be available when the NP is submitted.	Ensure Housing Needs report is available.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.17. Pp 38. This page unnecessarily repeats the basic data set out in the Village Profile at pp 14-15 and pp 29-31.	Review	Closed	The page emphasises the information pertinent to the section in summary form.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.18. Pp 39, Policy H5. This is weak as it does not state that smaller dwellings are a priority and that larger dwellings that do not meet the needs of the village are not supported. If the policy cannot specify the type of housing that is needed then any attempt to redress the balance of housing types in Swinford is a waste of time.	Review	Closed	Disagree, the policy on housing mix covers the affordable housing policy and supports smaller dwellings.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.19. Pp 39. Personally I am not sure that HDC's standard of 40% of Affordable Housing is appropriate. What seems to be required is a larger proportion of smaller dwellings for sale at the lower end of the market. Perhaps the affordable element could be reduced and the need for smaller dwellings for sale strengthened (see 16 above).	Review	Closed	As stated throughout the NP, the policies have to be in general conformity with the Local Plan. It is not possible to specify a lower level of affordable housing without strong evidence as to why – and this doesn't exist.	No action.

Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.20. Pp 43, Policy H7. Given the importance of obtaining and using developer contributions for the benefit of the village this is weak. I am sure villagers would have plenty of specific ideas if they had been consulted at the publicity events. There are a number of projects that may find favour with villagers, if they had been given an opportunity to comment or make suggestions, such as the long term security of the Play Area, and its expansion to protect the open nature of the Glebe land, the long term availability of the Lutterworth Rd. sports field (the PC failed to follow through its decision to designate this an Asset of Community Value), the design and implementation of a scheme for the Cemetery extension, and continued restoration of the landscape of the existing Cemetery, bulb and tree planting on the village approaches and support for the Village Hall are just a few specific ideas that could be discussed. Unfortunately it looks as if its too late to develop this policy in conjunction with the community.	Review	Closed	The policy was added to the plan following the initial round of Reg 14 Consultation.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.21. Pp 42. It is not clear what this relates to apart from which it is a series of sentiments without any factual evidence or specific policies.	Review	Closed	Agreed.	Move 'The Natural Env' paragraph p.42 above the policies. (p44)
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.22. Pp 43 and part of 44 are historical narrative, not related to any specific policy and would be better precised in the village profile.	Review	Closed	This is a matter of style and personal preference.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.23. Pp 44, Local Green Spaces. Appendix 1 is not attached to the NP. The definition is unclear - does it relate to visual, recreational or wildlife features? The Cemetery (which is not recreation or wildlife because it is cultivated) is included but the churchyard which is visually far more prominent is not.	Review	Closed	The LGS Appendix is on the website. The inclusion of the churchyard is not necessary as the site is protected by its status as churchyard and as a Grade II Listed Building (see page 1 of the inventory).	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.24. Pp 46, Policy ENV1. The Cemetery is a burial ground and presumably included as it is a contemplative site as defined in HDC's LP, so why is the churchyard not included for the same reason?	Review	Closed	See above.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.25. Pp 46, Policy ENV 1. The Glebe is included in HDC's draft LP, (Appendix F, entry LGS/SWIN1) as a Local Green Space but there is no mention of the Village Green (a highway verge owned by LCC).	Review	Closed	The village green was proposed by HDC as an LGS in their draft Local Plan (see NP page 46). Check HDC Local Plan to make sure the village green is still included.	HDC have confirmed the LGS which is the village green and Glebe Land is still included under policy GI14 in the Local Plan. The naming and boundary may have been changed but both areas are still included, confirmed by screen shot of policy map from Matthew Bills at HDC.

Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.26. Pp 46, last para. The Environmental inventory is a list of sites with scores and some coloured blocks. There is no explanation of the criterion, how sites are scored, or what justifies inclusion in this policy. There is no Appendix or evidence to justify the statement that they are "highly valued by the community". I can find no appendix to the HDC LP that lists OSSR sites in the District of Swinford. The consultation documents referred to are not in the published LP of 2017.	Review	Closed	The inventory scoring key is on page 27 of the inventory on the website. The criteria used are taken from the national planning framework (see also NP page 46 for explanation of criteria). Check with Matthew Bills about OSSR sites in the Local Plan.	Remove last sentence of final paragraph on page 46.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.27. Pp 47. Policy ENV1 is different from Policy ENV1 on pp 46. There is no explanations of how OSSR's are different from LGS's. Why is just the Cemetery included in both policies?	Review	Closed	There is no policy on page 47 - this is a community action and clearly headed as such.	Include clearer definitions of LGS and OSSR in the narrative.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.28. Pp 47. I cannot find any reference in HDC's draft LP, or its appendices, of any of the sites in ENV1 being OSSR's. Have I missed something?	Review	Closed	This reference is to Local Plan consultation documents 2014-2016, as stated on page 46.	Check HDC draft Local Plan for OSSRs.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.29. Pp 48, Map 3. What is the relevance of this as it does not appear to relate to a policy. If it does where is the policy and would it not be more appropriate to add this information as an appendix to justify whatever policy?	Review	Closed	The map provides contextual information relating to consultation.	Make sure colours are clearer on the dots map. Include a statement about what these sites are and how they were identified.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.30. Pp 49, Policy ENV2. There is no evidence or background paper to support the claimed "local significance" and being "locally valued". Oddly those sites on the periphery of the built up area seem to be designated to protect the views of residents in Lilbourne Lane, N.W. part of Chapel Fields, Shawell Rd. and East of Stanford Rd. It is also interesting that the Lutterworth Rd. housing site is excluded but the Shawell Rd. housing site is included in the designation. Bearing in mind that all of these designated sites are likely to be outside the L of D (when they are eventually clarified). What is the point of this vague policy?	Review	Closed	Not clear what point is being made. The evidence is contained within the environmental inventory, as noted on page 48.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.31. Pp 51/52, Policies ENV3 and ENV4. It is misleading to suggest that the NP can protect all or any trees or hedgerows. Planning permission is required to remove certain hedgerows, and trees are only protected if in the CA or subject to a TPO. Having appointed a Tree Warden is it simpler to have one policy supporting the protection of important trees by making TPO's?	Review	Closed	The policy supports the retention of trees, woodland and hedges and requires replacement should destruction be unavoidable. This seems to be an appropriate aim and is contained in other NPs.	No action.

Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.32. Pp 53-56. This is all irrelevant to a NP as Ridge and Furrow is not rare, and is not as far as I know statutorily protected, (if it is where is the reference?). HDC's draft LP Appendix D does not include any R and F in the District. Apart from which none is subject to development.	Review	Closed	Legislation determines that it is appropriate to describe R&F as non-designated heritage assets and as such the policy seeks to protect them in relation to their significance as heritage assets. This policy wording has passed examination elsewhere so is a relevant policy for an NP. Development can include matters other than residential development, including for agricultural purposes. The Examiner of the NP for Wymondham and Edmondthorpe commented about R&F ' I agree that it is appropriate to protect these features from any development which requires planning permission and this is a legitimate aspiration for an NP'. it should be noted that the writer made this point in the previous consultation. Answer is the same; 'Proposed policy is that the community should value as an asset'.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.33. Pp 57, Built Environment. The Conservation Area is intended to protect the historic core of the village which includes all the Listed Buildings. It is a pity that the NP does not recognise this and include an appropriate policy, particularly to promote the local design vernacular (see North Kilworth's Design Policy).	Review	Closed	Policy H1 seeks to reinforce local distinctiveness and character, especially within the conservation area, so this point is adequately covered.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.34. Pp 58. Where is map X?	Review	Closed	Map X under construction.	Include Map X.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.35. Pp 59, Policy ENV6. There is no Appendix defining the criterion for the Locally Listed Buildings, and in any event alterations to the exterior or interior of these buildings is not subject to planning control. If the policy is supposed to protect the buildings from demolition or major harm as part of a redevelopment requiring pp then it should say so.	Review	Closed	Agreed.	Amend page 59 to include the criteria for Locally Listed Buildings.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.36. Pp 60, Policy ENV7. There is a famous planning adage "that one does not buy a view". There are no defined criterion for assessing these views, apart from which "The Berries" pp, and proposed allocations on Shawell Rd., and Rugby Rd. conflict with this policy. The public are being misled into thinking views can be protected when they cannot unless they involve nationally significant views.	Review	Closed	The comment made is contrary to 'Made' NPs which have protected locally important views. The Independent examination of Wymondham and Edmondthorpe concluded 'I consider that it is entirely a matter for the discretion of the local community to identify what it considers are important viewpoints to be protected'.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.37. Pp 61, Policy ENV8. Any development proposals are obliged to consider footpaths and formally apply for diversions or closures. The PC has never had a footpath monitoring regime in place. What are the enhancements that the PC will seek? In view of the statutory protection that footpaths and bridleways have this policy is unnecessary.	Review	Closed	Policies protecting footpaths are routine elements of NPs and help to reinforce the local importance of this issue.	The second and third bullet points of ENV8 can be made into a community action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.38. Pp 62. As this is supposed to be a Reg 14 consultation (immediately before the NP is submitted to HDC) it should be complete with current up to date maps.	Review	Closed	The NP has incorporated the most up to date map available.	No action.

Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.39. Pp 62, I) Sustainable Development. I do not recall this being an issue at any consultation event and there is no background evidence to substantiate the statement.	Review	Closed	We were advised that this should be included to link to HDC LP.	Change first sentence to 'In line with HDC's Local Plan it is the community of Swinford intends to play its part in the sustainable development of the District.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.40. Pp 63, Policy ENV9. This clearly states that any development that complies with this policy will be "viewed positively". Does this include development outside the proposed allocations and outside the proposed L of D (when we know what they are)?	Review	Closed	Planning applications will have to have regard for every NP policy.	Amend to include 'within the Limits to Development'.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.41. Pp 63-66, Policy ENV10. This section is unnecessary. Surely all that is required in the NP is a statement to the effect that development of the allocated sites and within the L of D are not at risk of flooding.	Review	Closed	Advised to include by Nik Green of LCC.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.42. Pp 67. What is the point of or context of including this map?	Review	Closed	This map needs to be seen in conjunction with the environmental inventory.	Move map to the inventory.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.43. Pp 68-70. Much of this description is subjective rather than factual. For example - on pp 68, how can the loss of a shop and bus service have "opened up a wider range of shopping alternatives"? What criterion have been used to decide the Village Hall is well used?	Review	Closed	This is contextual information which helps understand the policies about community facilities and their importance locally. It is not felt necessary or helpful to back every comment with supporting evidence where this is merely setting the scene.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.44. Pp 71-72. This could be condensed into a simple policy of supporting or designating Assets of Community Value although the PC's record of this is poor as after a year of failing to register the Sports Ground it gave up.	Review	Closed	The community action demonstrates the PCs determination to proceed with this, the promotion of new or improved community facilities is a separate matter altogether.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.45. Pp 73-74. Much of the transport proposals are vague aspirations not supported by facts or, importantly any evidence that finance might be available for implementation. The issue of congestion at school drop-off times was raised when the school was rebuilt and expanded but totally ignored by the Education Authority.	Review	Closed	The policy includes items highlighted by residents which are to be pursued through developer contributions. Finance would become available through the development that is proposed in the NP.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.46. Pp 75, Policy T2. Currently there is very little traffic through the village. Parked vehicles on High St. and Chapel St. slow traffic down. A one-way system would probably increase traffic speeds because drivers would be confident of not meeting oncoming traffic.	Review	Closed	This is a community action, not a policy. It will 'explore' options.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.47. Pp 75-81. Whilst employment issues are relevant the NP can hardly influence home working, the agricultural economy, or the continued existence of the few businesses in the village. Where are the rural buildings that have been referred to in Policy E3? To date all redundant farm buildings in the village have been redeveloped for housing - a far more profitable exercise.	Review	Closed	The policy relates to the whole parish not just the village. The policies in the NP demonstrate how they can influence the local economy.	No action.
Parishioner	15/08/2017	9.48. Pp 80, Policy E5. Where is the evidence that any of these types of development have occurred in the village or are likely?	Review	Closed	The proportion of people working from home in Swinford is double the District-wide average. The NP will last for 14 years and should consider eventualities over the whole period.	No action.

Robert Deanwood (National Grid)	17/08/2017	Swinford Neighbourhood Plan Consultation SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL GRID National Grid has appointed Amec Foster Wheeler to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the above Neighbourhood Plan consultation.	Review	Closed	N/A	No action.
Robert Deanwood (National Grid)	17/08/2017	About National Grid National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operate the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until it is finally delivered to our customer. National Grid own four of the UK's gas distribution networks and transport gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England, West Midlands and North London. To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.	Review	Closed	N/A	No action.
Robert Deanwood (National Grid)	17/08/2017	Specific Comments An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus. National Grid has identified the following high voltage overhead powerlines as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary: · ZL Route – 400kV from Enderby substation in Blaby to Platford Bridge substation in Daventry. National Grid has identified the following high pressure gas transmission pipeline as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary: · FM02 - Duddington to Churchover From the consultation information provided, the above gas transmission pipeline and overhead powerline do not interact with any of the proposed development sites.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Robert Deanwood (National Grid)	17/08/2017	Gas Distribution – Low / Medium Pressure Whilst there is no implications for National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus, there may however be Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) Gas Distribution pipes present within proposed development sites. If further information is required in relation to the Gas Distribution network please contact plantprotection@nationalgrid.com	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.

Robert Deanwood (National Grid)	17/08/2017	Key resources / contacts National Grid has provided information in relation to electricity and transmission assets via the following internet link: http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/ The first point of contact for all works within the vicinity of gas distribution assets is Plant Protection (plantprotection@nationalgrid.com). Information regarding the transmission and distribution network can be found at: www.energynetworks.org.uk Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database: Robert Deanwood, Consultant Town Planner, C127, Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK, Gables House, Kenilworth Road, Leamington Spa, Warwickshire, CV32 6JX / Spencer Jefferies, Development Liaison Officer, National Grid, box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com, National Grid House, Warwick Technology Park, Gallows Hill, Warwick, CV34 6DA.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Robert Deanwood (National Grid)	17/08/2017	I hope the above information is useful. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
David Jones (Armstrong Rigg)	17/08/2017	Could you please confirm the deadline for representations to the current regulation 14 consultation? I note that the Parish website says the 25th August, but the draft Neighbourhood Plan says 18th August. If you could please confirm if we need to submit by tomorrow it would be most appreciated.	Reply	Closed	Responded by email on 17/08/17 to confirm that the consultation runs until 25/08/17.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Dear Katherine, we wish to comment on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents. Some of our comments on the first Draft were dismissed as "just your opinion". Several of them were shown to be accurate (factual) when Site 4 was reassessed. We hope you will consider our comments, and fully answer our questions below.	Note	Closed	N/A	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	The Draft Plan (Comments on lines 134 to 145 below):	N/A	Closed	N/A	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	P24 the map is wrong, it shows the old LTD boundary.	Review	Closed	Noted.	Up to date Limits to Development map to be included.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	On the First Draft the new LTD boundary was placed to include Site 4 which the NPAC favour. It could actually be placed in several places once the final decision is made about which sites will be allocated. This point is relevant as Your Locale use the position of sites relative to the LTD to assess them.	Review	Closed	Noted.	Up to date Limits to Development map to be included.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	P29 Policy H1 states: "Development should be of a similar density to properties in the immediate surrounding area as far as possible"	Review	Closed	See line 139 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	P35 the Draft states: "a preferred estimate of dwellings per allocated site is shown below which maintains a density which is in keeping with the local environment. "	Review	Closed	See line 139 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	P36 Policy H3 states that Site 4 "should provide for around 17 dwellings on greenfield land to maintain a similar density to adjacent existing dwellings ".	Review	Closed	See line 139 below.	No action.

Parishioner	19/08/2017	The proposed development at site 4 clearly <u>does not</u> maintain a density which is in keeping with the local environment. The two dwellings adjacent to site 4 are of about 7.5 dph, the proposed development of site 4 is about 18 dph.	Review	Closed	The HDC standard is 30 dph. We have sought to reduce the density to something which is similar to the village density overall without being too prescriptive, which is why we are recommending a number of dwellings on the allocated sites which is less than illustrated by YourLocale. This is in keeping with feedback from parishioners. We do not believe that using a dph based on two neighbouring houses to be representative	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Could you please explain how 7.5 dph is similar to 18 dph? 240% difference we do not feel is similar, but that is just our opinion.	Review	Closed	See above. We note that the increase is 140%, not 240% as stated.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	P58 the Draft states: "The following Local Heritage Assets (identified on Map X) should be conserved and enhanced ".	Review	Closed	Proximity and character of Local Heritage Asset should be considered by the Local Planning Authority in granting Planning Consent.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	P59 the Draft states: "Development proposals will be expected to safeguard the settings of Statutorily and Locally Listed Buildings in the Plan Area, in line with national policy".	Review	Closed	Proximity and character of Local Heritage Asset should be considered by the Local Planning Authority in granting Planning Consent.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	P59 Policy ENV6 states: "Development proposals that affect an identified non-designated building or structure of local historical or architectural interest or its setting will be expected to conserve or enhance the character, integrity and setting of that building or structure. "	Review	Closed	Proximity and character of Local Heritage Asset should be considered by the Local Planning Authority in granting Planning Consent.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Lodge Cottage is a "Local Heritage Asset".	Review	Closed	Proximity and character of Local Heritage Asset should be considered by the Local Planning Authority in granting Planning Consent.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Could you please explain how building next door to Lodge Cottage with a 240% increase in housing density "enhances" it? We are mystified, and presume there is something we do not understand. The standard answer is that you can't please everyone, and some people will not be happy with the Plan; we feel patronised by our house being selected as a Local Heritage Asset, told it will be treated as above, and the policies stated by the Draft being ignored.	Review	Closed	We note that the increase is 140%, not 240% as stated. Proximity and character of Local Heritage Asset will be considered by the Local Planning Authority in granting Planning Consent.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site sustainability assessments (Comments on lines 147 to 208 below):	Review	Closed	See line 153 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	There are many inconsistencies in the assessments. They do not appear to have always been carried out on a scientific basis.	Review	Closed	See line 153 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	<u>"Safe vehicular access to and from the site?"</u>	Review	Closed	See line 153 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 4, "None at present but very straightforward to provide an access from Lutterworth Road with a suitably wide visibility splay to meet current highways safety standards."	Review	Closed	See line 153 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 8, "None at present although it should be possible to create a new opening with a suitably wide visibility splay to meet current highways safety standards in to the site, with the removal of a few trees."	Review	Closed	See line 153 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	There are three areas on Kilworth Road where access could be provided without tree removal. The trees on Lutterworth Road adjacent to site 4 are much denser than those on Kilworth Road, but no mention is made of tree removal.	Review	Closed	See line 153 below.	No action.

Parishioner	19/08/2017	Visit the sites: it would be more difficult to make access on the 4.8m wide Lutterworth Road, with dense trees, than it would on the wider 6.2m Kilworth Road with less dense trees.	Review	Closed	See line 153 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	The assessment is biased in favour of building on Lutterworth Road.	Review	Closed	There is no bias. Both have areas where access could be achieved, but this will be subject to normal planning review from the Highways Authority in both cases. The width of the road is only one consideration. We believe it appropriate that both sites have the same score.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	<i>"Ancient monuments or archaeological remains?"</i>	Review	Closed	See line 161 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Sites variously assessed as:	Review	Closed	See line 161 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 2, "It is possible that remains will be found in this location but none identified to date." Score amber. On this basis sites 4 and 5b should be amber not green.	Review	Closed	See line 161 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	"None identified."	Review	Closed	See line 161 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	"None identified within the site, will require further investigation."	Review	Closed	See line 161 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	"None identified from historical records."	Review	Closed	See line 161 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	It is possible that "Ancient monuments or archaeological remains" could be found anywhere, so the scoring of sites is at best unscientific/inconsistent and at worst biased. Why have historical records been checked on some sites but not others?	Review	Closed	See line 161 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	The assessment is biased against building on The Village Paddock or site 5b, and in favour of Lutterworth Road.	Review	Closed	There is no bias. All sites except for site 2 are agricultural land and are therefore scored green. Site 2 has potentially been used for other purposes and therefore may be worthy of investigation, hence a lower score.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	<i>"Distance to community facilities, specifically The Chequers public house."</i>	Review	Closed	See line 166 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 4, "Walking distance to the pub and other facilities is reasonable at about 220m."	Review	Closed	See line 166 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	FACT: The distance from the SE corner of the site is about 365m. Distance from NW corner 515m. Should score red not amber.	Review	Closed	See line 166 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	We would have thought that after the previous mensuration debacle, your consultants could at least get some simple distances correct.	Review	Closed	See line 166 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	The assessment is biased in favour of building on Lutterworth Road.	Review	Closed	We reject any insinuation of bias. We have however rechecked all the distances using 'Runkeeper', and assessed the distance from the pub door to the mid point on the road frontage to each site (we did not wish to trespass on the properties and therefore did not measure to the centre of each site - this makes no difference to the results). The results are as follows: Site 1 267m, Site 2 80m, Site 3 410m, Site 4 428m, Site 5a/5b/6 258m, Site 7 441m, Site 8 331m. All scores have been revised to reflect these measurements.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	<i>"Any known noise issues?"</i>	Review	Closed	See line 74 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 3, "Yes, the M1 motorway is within about 300m of the site boundary and this produces both atmospheric and very loud noise pollution that would need to be fully investigated and remediated."	Review	Closed	See line 174 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	FACT: the site is between about 436 and 700m from the M1.	Review	Closed	See line 174 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 5, "The A14 and the M1 are nearby and there is very significant traffic noise and atmospheric pollution that would require further investigation for the site to proceed."	Review	Closed	See line 174 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 4, is described as having the M1 "in the distance", but it is only 150m further away than the most distant part of site 3 and site 5b. No mention is made of atmospheric pollution for site 4, which is downwind of the M1 when prevailing winds blow.	Review	Closed	See line 174 below.	No action.

Parishioner	19/08/2017	Atmospheric pollution is variously described as being present, or being "very significant". Can you please explain how the different measurements of atmospheric pollution were obtained?	Review	Closed	See line 174 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Atmospheric pollution is mentioned in several assessments, could you please explain why atmospheric pollution is considered to be a noise issue?	Review	Closed	See line 174 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	The assessment is biased in favour of building on Lutterworth Road and against building on Rugby Road or Site 5b.	Review	Closed	Again, we reject any insinuation of bias. All the mentioned sites are scored red so how can this be described as bias?	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	"Listed Building or important built assets?"	Review	Closed	See line 182 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 8, "The site is within a direct sight line of the grounds of Stanford Hall and the heritage avenue, a grade 1 listed building located about 1.5km from the site boundary, so remediation required."	Review	Closed	See line 182 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	On Google Earth it may look as though there is a sight line, but this is very difficult to see on the ground, there are hundreds of tall mature trees between Stanford Hall and site 8. In addition, if the assessor is correct, the Hall already looks at the existing houses on the north side of Kilworth Road anyway.	Review	Closed	See line 182 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 7, "Swinford Lodge, a listed building is within a sight line of this location, so planting bunds will be required. Some distance away however".	Review	Closed	See line 182 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 5b, "None identified within or adjacent to the site."	Review	Closed	See line 182 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 4, Very simply assessed as: "None identified on the site." The site is also within a sight line of Swinford Lodge as per Site 7. The assessor has considered areas adjacent to Site 5b but not areas adjacent to Lutterworth Road.	Review	Closed	See line 182 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	A sight line from Swinford Lodge is considered important for site 7 and the assessor even describes how to mitigate it, but it is not mentioned at all for site 4.	Review	Closed	See line 182 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	The assessment is biased against building on Sites 5b, 7 and 8, and in favour of building on Lutterworth Road.	Review	Closed	Again, we reject any insinuation of bias. The comments on the assessments have been updated. Site 8 has the grounds of a Grade 1 listed building in clear view and mitigation will be required so amber is appropriate. Whilst sites 4 and 7 are in view of Grade 2 listed Swinford Lodge, we consider that the views from the Lodge are not significantly affected as they already overlook the houses in the village of Swinford. We appreciate this is a subjective matter.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	"Local Wildlife considerations?"	Review	Closed	See line 187 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 4, "Nesting birds and small mammals. A badger set (sic) is present within the site and will require professional investigation to re-site or mediate through careful design and siting of property."	Review	Closed	See line 187 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 5a, "Nesting birds, small mammals, badgers – a statutorily protected species."	Review	Closed	See line 187 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	The assessor mentions for site 5a that badgers are a statutorily protected species, but simply explains how to mediate badgers if building on site 4.	Review	Closed	See line 187 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	The assessment is biased against building on Site 5a, and if favour of building on Lutterworth Road.	Review	Closed	Again, we reject any insinuation of bias. Sites 6, 7 and 8 are now scored as amber due to having no statutorily protected species. The assessments are now consistent.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	"Any public rights of ways/bridle paths?"	Review	Closed	See line 194 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 5a, "Yes, two major footpaths run through the central area of the site and along one of the boundaries, leading to open Countryside to the South. A designated Leicestershire County Council Countryside walk. The unusual "shape" of the site will make it impossible to re-route these rights of way successfully."	Review	Closed	See line 194 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	The footpath through the middle of the site could very easily be re-routed in along the south boundary of Simon's Close and thence down the western boundary of the site.	Review	Closed	See line 194 below.	No action.

Parishioner	19/08/2017	Could you please explain why it is impossible to re-route this footpath?	Review	Closed	See line 194 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 3, "Yes, a footpath is within the Western boundary of the site set in open countryside but this could be easily accommodated in a sensitive design solution."	Review	Closed	See line 194 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	If you visit the site you will see that there is the western tree/hedge boundary, then a stream, then the footpath. Should be green not amber according to assessment framework.	Review	Closed	See line 194 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	The assessment is biased against building on Rugby Road site 3 and site 5a.	Review	Closed	Again, we reject any insinuation of bias. We stand by the comments on site 5a, although the word 'impossible' is under review. With regard to site 3 the path is adjacent to the site and potentially detrimental to PROW.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	<i>"Impact on the Conservation Area or its setting?"</i>	Review	Closed	See line 201 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 6, "Near the boundary of the current conservation area for Swinford and will therefore need to be designed sensitively to ensure it would not undermine the unique historical character of this location." Score amber.	Review	Closed	See line 201 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 5b "Near to the edge of the current conservation area for Swinford and would undermine the unique historical character of this main road location." Score amber.	Review	Closed	See line 201 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 4, "Outside of the current conservation area boundary so no impact." Score green.	Review	Closed	See line 201 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 4 is about the same distance from the conservation area as sites 5b and 6, but is described very differently.	Review	Closed	See line 201 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 4 should score amber not green	Review	Closed	See line 201 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	The assessment is heavily biased in favour of building on Lutterworth Road, and against building on site 5b."	Review	Closed	Again, we reject any insinuation of bias. However we agree that the scores could be more consistent. Accordingly as a result of other feedback we have designated Sites 5b, 6, 7 and 8 as green as they are all technically outside the Conservation Area (as is Site 4).	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	<i>"Gas, oil, pipelines and networks & electricity transmission network?"</i>	Review	Closed	See line 2013 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 4, "None identified." There is mains water running under the site. Should score amber not green.	Review	Closed	Sewerage and water is not considered for any site so the score is consistent across the population	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	<i>"Landscape Quality? Visual Impact Assessment (VIA)"</i>	Review	Closed	See line 208 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 7, "The site is currently grazing land with very high quality open panoramic views to three aspects. The site is on an important vehicular route in to the village so would extend the built form of the village in a Westerly direction, affecting the character and scale of the village in a negative manner. Although the M1 motorway is visible from (sic) the site the location is of pristine and unmodified quality." Score red.	Review	Closed	See line 208 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Site 4, "The site is generally unmodified and with high quality open vistas to three aspects. Overall of a high quality, although the situation of the M1 detracts from the Countryside feel." Score amber.	Review	Closed	See line 208 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	The sites are very close to one another, with very similar views. Site 4 is also on an important vehicular route in to the village, and visible from TWO routes, Shawell Rd and Lutterworth Rd, but these facts are not mentioned.	Review	Closed	See line 208 below.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	The assessment is biased in favour of building on Lutterworth Road.	Review	Closed	Again, we reject any insinuation of bias. Inevitably there is an element of subjectivity in this category. With regard to Site 7 its location, elevation and lack of existing buildings in the immediate vicinity make it more sensitive in our view. Site 4 does not extend the settlement pattern due to existing houses.	No action.

Parishioner	19/08/2017	Scores and Ranking of Sites (Comments on lines 210 to 217 below):	Review	Closed	See comments above.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	If the Sustainability Criteria are looked at with local knowledge and correct facts/assessment, Site 4 scores should change as follows:	Review	Closed	See comments above.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Ancient monuments or archaeological remains? If scored as per Site 2 Green to Amber	Review	Closed	See comments above.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Landscape Quality? Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) Possible Amber to Red Why? Because its description is the same as Site 7, but is on 2 vehicular routes into the village.	Review	Closed	See comments above.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Impact on the Conservation Area or its setting? Green to Amber Why? Because its description is the same as Site 7, but is on 2 vehicular routes into the village.	Review	Closed	See comments above.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Distance to community facilities, specifically The Chequers public house. Amber to Red Why? Because the measurement is wildly inaccurate, and the assessment framework classes it as red.	Review	Closed	See comments above.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	Gas, oil, pipelines and networks & electricity transmission network? Green to Amber Why? See assessment framework.	Review	Closed	See comments above.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	The score for Lutterworth Road therefore goes from Green 2 to Red 3 or Red 2.	Review	Closed	See comments above. We also note that in your response dated 31 March 2017 you stated that the score for Site 4 should be Green 3.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	At Red 2 Lutterworth Road ranks 5 th equal and should not be developed according to your own system.	Review	Closed	See comments above.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	In conclusion, we find the Draft Policy to include many inaccuracies and inconsistencies. There is a lack of rationality and scientific method in the Sustainability Assessments. We hope our response will be examined equitably, carefully and fully, and not dismissed as "matter of opinion".	Review	Closed	The point of a consultation process is to provide parishioners with the evidence and rationale for the conclusions reached in the draft NP, and ask for comments. We thank you for your feedback, and whilst we do not agree with all of your comments, there have been a number of amendments made to the Site Assessments as a result of your feedback and that of others. The impact of all these changes on the recommendations made in the draft NP will be assessed in due course.	No action.
Parishioner	19/08/2017	I am just clearing out a lot of old NP documents and came across as publication called "Keeping It Simple" by Tony Burton of Locality, a national advisory group on NP's. I suggest the PC and NPAC read this before they do any further amendments to the draft NP, as well as reading North Kilworth's plan which seems to follow this advice admirably.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Dear Mrs Clarke, RE: Swinford Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Formal Consultation. I can honestly state that I have never written a letter of complaint before in my life until now. I am simply astounded by the number of mistakes and inconsistencies that have been made by Mr. Doran from Your Locale when compiling Site Assessments for the Swinford Neighbourhood Plan. A hugely important, expensive plan compiled by a professional firm used as the basis for the long-term planning of the housing needs of Swinford. I would question as to whether Mr. Doran has visited the sites that he has cast his expert opinion over.	Review	Closed	The point of a consultation process is to provide parishioners with the evidence and rationale for the conclusions reached in the draft NP, and ask for comments. We thank you for your feedback, and whilst we do not agree with all of your comments, there have been a number of amendments made to the Site Assessments as a result of your feedback and that of others. All comments have been taken into consideration in the revised site assessments. Mr Doran has visited the sites.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	I am sorry that you felt that previous comments made by my advisor Armstrong Rigg Planning concerning Your Locale and its consultant Mr. Doran as "unhelpful" and "unprofessional" but when you have considered the evidence below I am sure that you will agree that work carried out by Your Locale and paid for by the Parish Council is simply not fit for publication and is simply not accurate. When errors have been corrected clearly the most sustainable sites have not been chosen for development.	Review	Closed	See above.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	To start with does Mr. Doran know what a public footpath is? It seems inconceivable that Mr. Doran can make THREE major errors on the location of Public rights of way/bridle paths alone in one small Parish:	Review	Closed	See specific comments below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 3 Rugby Road Glebe Land Published Report Errors 1 and 2	Review	Closed	See line 225 and line 227 below.	No action.

Parishioner	21/08/2017	“Yes, a footpath is within the Western boundary of the site set in open countryside but this could be easily accommodated in a sensitive design solution”	Review	Closed	See line 225 below.	
Parishioner	21/08/2017	RAG rating is “amber” which is incorrect as it should be scored green in accordance with Your Locales site assessment framework. More incredible is the fact that there is NO FOOTPATH/BRIDLE PATH IN THIS FIELD! There never has been.	Review	Closed	The path is adjacent to the site and potentially detrimental to PROW.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	“Dog walkers and joggers use the area” RAG Rating “Amber” Error 2	Review	Closed	See line 227 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Another error relating to this site. There are no rights for the public to use this site. This should have been scored Green.	Review	Closed	We believe that dog walkers use this site whether they have a right to or not - we note that there is no gate to prevent this at the existing site access.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 2 Village Paddock Published Report Error 3	Review	Closed	See line 230 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	“The right of way exists to the North of the site” RAG Rating “Amber”	Review	Closed	See line 230 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO RIGHT OF WAY THOUGH THIS SITE! The highly visible footpath markers most clearly point and direct walkers through Simons Close not the land assessed by Mr. Doran.	Review	Closed	The comment does not say that it is through the site - its says it is to the North of it. The comment is correct.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 8 Kilworth Road Report Draft 1 Error 4	Review	Closed	See line 233 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	“Yes, an important footpath traverses right across the middle of this site and it will not be possible to include a re-routing within a design solution” RAG Rating “Amber”	Review	Closed	See line 233 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	When this mistake was queried with the NPAC committee it was subsequently amended to “Yes, an important footpath traverses the field the western end of the site, but the site has been designed to leave this untouched” RAG Rating “Green”.	Review	Closed	That proves that NPAC is taking the consultation seriously and amending the assessments based on feedback.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 8 Kilworth Road Report Draft 1 Error 5	Review	Closed	See line 236 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	“A relatively undulating site” RAG Rating “Amber”	Review	Closed	See line 236 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	When this mistake was queried with the NPAC committee it was subsequently amended to: “A relatively flat site” RAG Rating “Green”	Review	Closed	That proves that NPAC is taking the consultation seriously and amending the assessments based on feedback.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 8 Kilworth Road Report Draft 1 Error 6	Review	Closed	See line 239 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	“A green field site set in the open countryside, currently used as a football pitch”	Review	Closed	See line 239 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	This has now been amended to “A Greenfield site set in the open Countryside” Whatever possessed Mr. Doran to describe a site as a football pitch when there are no goal posts anywhere in the field!	Review	Closed	That proves that NPAC is taking the consultation seriously and amending the assessments based on feedback	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 8 Kilworth Road Report Draft 1 Error 7	Review	Closed	See line 242 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	“Individual trees are found along the boundary of the site and there is a continuous run of ancient hedgerow along the Kilworth Road Boundary..... It is likely that some trees would need to be felled to provide access”	Review	Closed	See line 242 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	The continuous run of ancient hedgerow description has now been removed. This hedge has huge gaps in it and trees will not have to be removed to provide access! This error remains uncorrected. This hedgerow is the poorest specimen out of all the proposed sites in the Parish plan.	Review	Closed	The wording is now amended.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 8 Kilworth Road Report Draft 1 Error 8	Review	Closed	See line 245 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	“The site is within direct line of Stanford Hall, a grade 1 listed building located about 1.5km from the site boundary, so remediation required. “	Review	Closed	See line 245 below.	No action.

Parishioner	21/08/2017	You cannot see Stanford Hall or its grounds from the site. The assessment now refers to the "heritage avenue" which interesting according to Your Locales sustainability housing land assessment framework is not even a "Listed Building or Built Asset" as it's a natural avenue of trees. There is already a row of houses in place only 20 metres away so what effect would a further few houses have?	Review	Closed	The grounds of Grade 1 listed Stanford Hall are clearly visible from the site and this cannot be ignored. It is scored as amber because mitigation measures are possible.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 8 Kilworth Road Report Draft 1 Error 9	Review	Closed	See line 247 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Originally this site was assessed by Mr. Doran as having no noise issues. " None identified " RAG Rating " Amber ". After it was questioned by the Land Owner as to why this did not score "Green" suddenly the next draft reads " Elevated position and prevailing SW wind means that there is some noise from the M1 and A14 ". Whatever or who persuaded Mr. Doran to change his assessment?	Review	Closed	The wording of the assessment was changed following the consultation process and discussion between NPAC and the consultant. We note that all other sites are closer to the M1/A14 and are scored as red (except for Site 2 in the centre of the village which is sheltered by housing around it). This seems entirely reasonable and consistent.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 8 Kilworth Road Published Report Error 10	Review	Closed	See line 249 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	The site capacity is clearly wrong. 30 per cent more houses per acre of land have been allocated to this site than site number 4 (Lutterworth Road) and 20 per cent more houses have been allocated per acre of land than the Rugby Road (6) revised site. This is clearly a fundamental error by Mr. Doran as he states in the Safe vehicular access section to and from the site that " The Highways works will severely restrict the developable error of the plots. " So how is it physically possible to put more houses on a smaller site than the Rugby Road. Site 6 is allocated 18-20 units on 0.76 hectares and site 8 is allocated 20-22 units on a smaller site of 0.72 hectares and the developable area is severely restricted according to Mr. Doran.	Review	Closed	The number of houses on a site is not a simple calculation based on site size. A judgement is made taking into account, shape, depth, highways impact and other factors.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 4 Lutterworth Road First Published Report Error 11	Review	Closed	See line 251 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site Capacity. 2.34 HA this should have read 2.34 ACRES . The second published report has now recognised this error.	Review	Closed	That proves that NPAC is taking the consultation seriously and amending the assessments based on feedback. This was corrected.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 4 Lutterworth Road First Published Report Error 12	Review	Closed	See line 254 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Current use " Redundant site, used for stock car racing track " RAG rating " Green "	Review	Closed	See line 254 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	The latest published report now reads " Part of a large field in current agricultural grazing use that will require re- allocating. RAG Rating " Amber "	Review	Closed	That proves that NPAC is taking the consultation seriously and amending the assessments based on feedback. This was corrected.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 4 Lutterworth Road First Published Report Error 13	Review	Closed	See line 257 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Any known contamination issues? "None Found". RAG Rating "Green"	Review	Closed	See line 257 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	The second published report has now addressed this error and acknowledges that the site was once the village tip. RAG Rating "Amber"	Review	Closed	That proves that NPAC is taking the consultation seriously and amending the assessments based on feedback. This was corrected.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 4 Lutterworth Road Final Report Error 14	Review	Closed	See line 259 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Despite documented concerns being raised by a parishioner at the initial Statutory 14 Consultation Mr. Doran has still not seen the large Listed Building of Swinford lodge he still fails to mention the curtilage listed Lodge Cottage.	Review	Closed	Comments updated.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 6 Opposite 1-8 Rugby Road Published Report Error 15	Review	Closed	See line 262 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Gas, oil, pipelines and networks & electricity transmission network? "None on the site" RAG "Green"	Review	Closed	See line 262 below.	No action.

Parishioner	21/08/2017	One again would question as to whether Mr. Doran has visited this site that he has assessed. There are overhead electrical wires leading to a telegraph pole which then go under ground and traverse the site. There is also a mains sewer that runs through the Centre of the site. This RAG rating needs to be changed from "Green" to "Amber"	Review	Closed	It is impossible to know whether electrical wires traverse the site underground as you suggest without a formal survey, which is beyond the scope of the NP process. The electricity pole is sited on the edge of the site next to the existing PROW – this is not part of the planned site. A pathway to the new site could be sited without any impact on the pole, and therefore we do not consider this an issue. Sewerage has not been considered on any site so is not relevant.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 6 Opposite 1-8 Rugby Road Published Report Error 16	Review	Closed	See line 264 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	The site has been incorrectly scored as RAG "Green" for current existing informal/formal recreational facilities. This is not consistent with other sites (7 & 8) which also have footpaths on them. This needs to be amended to "Amber".	Review	Closed	This has been amended following the feedback from your consultant, Armstrong Rigg.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 2 Village Paddock Published Report Error 17	Review	Closed	See line 266 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	"The land is outside the new intended limit to Development (LTD) boundary, to be adopted in the settlement development policy of the neighbourhood plan and the draft Harborough Local Plan". RAG is "Red". Based on published assessment criteria site is within the village and must score positively. Change to "Green "	Review	Closed	This has been amended following the feedback from your consultant, Armstrong Rigg.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 2 Village Paddock Published Report Error 18	Review	Closed	See line 269 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	"BT broadband services are accessed on the edge of the site and may need to be re sited" RAG Rating " Amber."	Review	Closed	See line 269 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	There are no services on this site and site should be scored "Green."	Review	Closed	The comment does not say they are on the site - the service referred to is on the edge of the site and may need re-siting.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 2 Village Paddock Published Report Error 19	Review	Closed	See line 272 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	"The village play area for toddlers and teenagers is found adjacent to this site and would be severely overlooked if houses were built. The village paddock is widely seen as an important amenity site providing a central green vocal point in the village core." RAG Rating " Red."	Review	Closed	See line 272 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	This site does not have any formal recreational uses and should not be scored Red.	Review	Closed	This has been amended following the feedback from your consultant, Armstrong Rigg.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 4 Lutterworth Road and Site 7 Shawell Road Error 20	Review	Closed	See line 274 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Both sites are an equal distance away from the conservation boundary. Site 4 has been scored "Green" and site 7 has been scored "Amber". Why are both sites not scored the same?	Review	Closed	This has been amended following the feedback from your consultant, Armstrong Rigg.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 6 Opposite 1-8 Rugby Road Published Report Error 21	Review	Closed	See line 276 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	"The land is inside the new intended Limit to Development boundary, to be adopted in the settlement development policy of the Neighbourhood plan and the draft Local Plan from HDC "The map published on Page 24 of the Parish Plan does not include this site! A clear error.	Review	Closed	The map has been updated	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 7 Shawell Road Draft Report 1 Site Error 22	Review	Closed	See line 279 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	"Individual trees of quality are found along the boundary of the site" RAG rating Amber.	Review	Closed	See line 279 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	There was not a single tree along the boundary of the site! This error was raised and has now been amended by Mr. Doran.	Review	Closed	That proves that NPAC is taking the consultation seriously and amending the assessments based on feedback. This was corrected.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 7 Shawell Road Draft Report 1 Error 23	Review	Closed	See line 281 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Current recreational opportunities "tobogganing in winter". Tobogganing is not on the site and the published report has had this statement corrected.	Review	Closed	That proves that NPAC is taking the consultation seriously and amending the assessments based on feedback. This was corrected.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 7 Shawell Road Draft Report 1 Error 24	Review	Closed	See line 284 below.	No action.

Parishioner	21/08/2017	Gas, oil pipelines etc. "Large wind turbines dominate the skyline and are close to the rear boundary of the site, this will affect visually in a negative manner and potentially through noise RAG Rating "Amber"	Review	Closed	See line 284 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	No mention of turbines in assessment of site 4 which is located closer to the turbines! This assessment has subsequently been amended by Mr. Doran to "none identified" RAG Rating "green."	Review	Closed	That proves that NPAC is taking the consultation seriously and amending the assessments based on feedback. This was corrected.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 7 Shawell Road Draft Report 1 Error 25	Review	Closed	See line 287 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Any known drainage issues?" Yes, a land drain is found along the front boundary of the site so drainage will need to be further investigated with a professional survey" RAG Rating "Amber"	Review	Closed	See line 287 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	At this point one does have to seriously question whether Mr. Doran physically inspected this site? There is no land drain in question and when the matter was raised with the committee comments have now been amended to "No issues identified" RAG rating "green"	Review	Closed	That proves that NPAC is taking the consultation seriously and amending the assessments based on feedback. This was corrected. It was not unreasonable given the location to suggest a form of drain in the original inspection.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 7 Shawell Road Published Report Error 26	Review	Closed	See line 289 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Impact on the conservation area. This site is scored amber for impact on the conservation area despite being a very similar distance as site 4 Lutterworth Road which has been scored Green.	Review	Closed	This has been amended following the feedback from your consultant, Armstrong Rigg.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 7 Shawell Road Published Report Error 27	Review	Closed	See line 292 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Safe pedestrian access to and from the site "none in place and none along Shawell Lane" Rag Rating "Red". Interestingly this site along with site 5A is the only site to score "Red".	Review	Closed	See line 292 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	There are existing footpaths along Shawell Road. The road is very wide and there are wide grass verges to extend the footpaths. It seems inconceivable that Lutterworth Road site only scores "Amber" for pedestrian access when the " Width of the carriageway will probably need to be expanded "	Review	Closed	Pedestrian access does not exist on either side of the road for Site 7, even up to the proposed site. It is by no means certain that permission could be achieved to put one in place. A footpath exists right up to Site 4 which runs by property owned by the Site 4 owner.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 7 Shawell Road and Site 8 Kilworth Road Published Reports Errors 28 and 29	Review	Closed	See line 294 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Any known contamination issues? Both sites have been scored "Amber" as there is an agricultural waste heap adjacent to both sites. This is normal accepted agriculture practice as recommended by DEFRA. The muck heaps are only temporary and have now been spread. All fields in the Parish are subject to this practice. This matter has been raised several times but seems to have fallen on deaf ears. Common sense has gone out of the window! It does raise the question what if Rugby Road site 6 had had a muck heap on it would Mr. Doran have seen it?	Review	Closed	We disagree with the proposed changes to sites 7 and 8 – a planning authority would require investigation of these muck heaps, which is beyond the remit of these assessments. We note that this is entirely consistent with site 4, where a reported old tip has led to an amber score also.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	There are overwhelming factual inaccuracies in the reports prepared by Mr. Doran of Your Locale. It must be questioned as to how Mr. Doran can make so many mistakes given that there are clear published Your Locale guidelines. Certain criteria only seem to apply to certain sites. There seems to be one rule for some sites and one rule for others. One would question as to whether Mr. Doran has provided entirely independent advice as claimed by the Parish Council. Clearly some sites have been scored or described favourably whilst other sites have been downgraded.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	It is interesting to compare the descriptive published language of two almost identical farm gateways (safe vehicular access to and from the site) just a few metres apart on the Rugby Road:	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 6 Opposite 1-8 Rugby Road:	Review	Closed	See line 300 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	"Access is straightforward from an existing farm gate and a new access to meet Highways safety standards is possible in this or another position, given the large frontage to Rugby Road in the same ownership"	Review	Closed	See line 300 below.	No action.

Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 3 Rugby Road Expansion Site:	Review	Closed	See line 300 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	"none at present but fairly straightforward (and expensive) to provide an access from Rugby Road of a suitably wide visibility splay to meet current highways safety standards"	Review	Closed	We cannot see how this makes any difference to the assessment scores. The existing access has different implications for each site.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Another example to illustrate the descriptive tones relating to Important trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows which favour sites:	Review	Closed	See line 305 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 6 Opposite (1-8) Rugby Road:	Review	Closed	See line 305 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	"A couple of individual trees mark the boundaries and these will need to be retained, small sections of intermittent hedgerow need to be retained if possible"	Review	Closed	See line 305 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Site 8 Kilworth Road:	Review	Closed	See line 305 below.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	"Individual trees are found along the boundary of the site and there is a continuous run of ancient hedgerow along the Kilworth Road Boundary. Both features would have to be protected as far as would be possible in a high-quality design solution, although it is likely that some trees would need to be felled to provide access."	Review	Closed	Wording has been amended.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	You could almost say that Mr. Doran has got his sites mixed up!	Review	Closed	We disagree.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	I would respectfully request that the Parish Council members and housing group walk around the village and physically look at the sites and the descriptions used. Then I am sure that you will agree with the matters raised in this letter and the constructive feedback provided. There is lack of robust accurate information that needs to be corrected.	Review	Closed	This has been done many times over the last 3 years. The consultation process and feedback therefrom has enabled NPAC to better understand the views of parishioners and to make amendments to assessments when required.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	As landowners, we were invited in early May 2017 to consider putting forward our land for assessment by Your Locale. We were given every assurance that Mr. Doran was totally independent and that all site assessments were subjected to a vigorous second check by the Parish Council members and the sub housing group to ensure consistency with other site assessments. Unbelievably basic checks have failed and cross referencing has not been applied. This is so disappointing as we really believed they would be done.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	Furthermore, I would question the validity and the admissibility of Map 3 on page 48 "Sites identified by villagers as valued and with local significance" (April 2016). This evidence compiled by parishioners at the consultation event. There was simply no system in place to ensure that the villagers views were fairly collected (like two stickers per person or so). There were packs of stickers readily available whereby you just helped yourself. Some villagers readily sought to adopt the attitude of "not in my back yard" and put more than their fair share of stickers on sites close to where they lived. Toddlers enjoyed placing stickers on the map for the "Fun of It".	Review	Closed	It is normal at open events to garner as much information as possible from those attending. This is only part of the evidence base, and we are well aware that only a small proportion of parishioners attended these events. This has been reflected in our deliberations.	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	A closer examination reveals something quite unusual. The Rugby Road Glebe land (site 3) has nearly four times as many stickers on it than the Rugby Road site 6 land. This really does not make sense as no public footpaths are present on this site and this site is not used by the Parishioners of Swinford. Unlike site 6 which is used daily by the villagers walking their dogs!	Review	Closed	Perhaps this suggests that site 3 is used more by parishioners than you may be aware!	No action.
Parishioner	21/08/2017	I trust that you will rectify all mistakes made and republish accurate assessment reports along with the revised scores for all sites.	Review	Closed	Amendments will continue to be made to assessments and the NP if agreed.	No action.

Geoff Armstrong (Armstrong Rigg)	21/08/2017	(NOTE: Original representation and Parish Council response included as appendices) Dear Ms Clarke, Representations to Consultation on the Swinford Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 14 Town and Country Planning, England, Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012) On behalf of our clients, Mr and Mrs Morris, we are writing to submit representations to the current Regulation 14 consultation on the draft Swinford Neighbourhood Plan. Please see attached a letter detailing our representations. We trust that the issues identified in this letter will be taken into account in the further development of the Neighbourhood Plan and we look forward to working with the Parish Council going forward. Yours sincerely, Geoff Armstrong	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Geoff Armstrong (Armstrong Rigg)	21/08/2017	We made previous representations to Swinford Parish Council's consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan's 'Revised Housing Section Presentation' on 4th July 2017 (see Appendix 1) and we received your letter in response to these representations sent on behalf of the Parish Council on 25th July 2017 (See Appendix 2). It is not our intention in making these representations to repeat previous comments made regarding the site assessment process undertaken in developing the Neighbourhood Plan, as we understand from your letter that these comments will be taken into consideration by the Parish Council when they undertake the next review of the plan (which we assume will follow the current consultation period).	Note	Closed	For completeness, we have commented separately on the detailed points raised in your letter of 4 July 2017 (see separate feedback).	No action.
Geoff Armstrong (Armstrong Rigg)	21/08/2017	In this letter we instead simply seek to: Resubmit our clients proposals for Land at Kilworth Road (Site 8) in order to clarify their proposals for the site; and Highlight where there are clear factual inaccuracies in the site assessments undertaken that we feel must be amended in order to ensure that a fair, accurate and consistent approach has been followed.	Note	Closed	See below.	No action.
Geoff Armstrong (Armstrong Rigg)	21/08/2017	Site 8 – Land at Kilworth Road As detailed in our previous representations, we feel that there are several factual inaccuracies contained in the assessment of our client's site at Kilworth Road (see list in section below). First and foremost amongst these is that our client's site is identified as having a capacity for 20-22 dwellings and is therefore scored negatively. This assessment appears to simply be based on the site size of 0.72ha multiplied by a benchmark standard of 30 2 dwellings per hectare which gives a figure of 21.6. This assessment is not considered appropriate or fair for two reasons:	Review	Closed	See line 316 and line 317 below.	No action.
Geoff Armstrong (Armstrong Rigg)	21/08/2017	Firstly, it is clear that this benchmark has not been applied consistently across the sites as Site 6 at 0.76ha is assessed as having a capacity 18-20 dwellings. There has clearly been a mistake made here which has affected the assessment of our client's site as the site assessment criteria used specify that site's over 20 dwellings should be scored negatively and sites between 10-19 dwellings should be scored as neutral.	Review	Closed	The number of houses on a site is not a simple calculation based on site size. A judgement is made taking into account, shape, depth, highways impact and other factors.	No action.

Geoff Armstrong (Armstrong Rigg)	21/08/2017	Secondly, it appears that no assessment has been made of the appropriateness of 30 dwellings per hectare on our client's site. 30 dwellings per hectare is often used as a benchmark standard in more suburban areas, but it is not considered appropriate for the rural character of Swinford. For example, following a detailed assessment of local character and site constraints, the recent planning application at the Berries, Stanford Road achieved 19 dwellings per hectare in a scheme that will respect and enhance the character of the village. There is also a contradiction in the Your Locale assessment in this regard as the site is assessed as both having a capacity for 30 dwellings per hectare and under 'Safe vehicular access to and from the site?' as requiring highway works that 'will severely restrict the developable area of the building plots' therefore indicating that 30 dwellings per hectare would not be possible.	Review	Closed	The number of houses on a site is not a simple calculation based on site size. A judgement is made taking into account, shape, depth, highways impact and other factors. In the draft NP we have set out a preferred number of houses on all allocated sites which is less than the number suggested by YourLocale, and less than the 30dph you refer to. This reflects the stated preference of parishioners for lower density which is in keeping with the surroundings in the vicinity	No action.
Geoff Armstrong (Armstrong Rigg)	21/08/2017	We consider that approximately 15 dwellings would be an appropriate level of development on our clients' site. This would give a density of 21 dwellings per hectare that we feel is more appropriate for the site's edge of village location and more in keeping with the character of the village. We request that the Parish Council re-assess our client's land on this basis.	Review	Closed	We need to be mindful of the potential to seek planning permission for many more houses than you suggest. We are comfortable that YourLocale have properly considered the numbers per site.	No action.
Geoff Armstrong (Armstrong Rigg)	21/08/2017	Factual Inaccuracies - In our letter of 4th July 2017 we raised serious concerns regarding the accuracy and consistency of the assessment process undertaken to determine the preferred site allocations and recommended that the Parish Council undertake further work to ensure that the most sustainable sites are chosen for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. Some of our previous comments related to a lack of accurate information and professional judgement used to inform the assessments, but others simply highlighted factual inaccuracies in the assessments undertaken and errors made in assessing the sites against the Parish Council's published assessment criteria.	Review	Closed	The assessments are only one part of the evidence we have used to allocate sites - the most important aspect to consider from our perspective is the views of parishioners. The assessments themselves have been amended as a result of consultation, as is the case with this Reg 14 review.	No action.
Geoff Armstrong (Armstrong Rigg)	21/08/2017	Our comments regarding the lack of evidence and professional judgement used in the assessments still stand and we urge the Parish Council to consider our previous representations in this regard and in particular those elements that are based on professional surveys conducted as part of our work on the planning application at the Berries, Stanford Road (e.g. ecology, landscape, heritage, etc...). However, without the Parish Council investing considerably more time and money to conduct their own more detailed assessments, it is understood that there is a reluctance to accept the views of our experts for fear that they may be biased. I can assure you that this is not the case, but we do understand the Parish Council's reluctance in this regard. In these representations we therefore simply seek to highlight the clear factual inaccuracies and errors made in assessing the sites against the Parish Council's published assessment criteria. These mistakes are easy to resolve and would result in a greatly improved assessment in the best interests of the community of Swinford.	Review	Closed	Thank you.	No action.

Geoff Armstrong (Armstrong Rigg)	21/08/2017	(NOTE: Revised site assessment included in the representation, unable to recreate in this spreadsheet. Distributed to NPAC). The table above identifies several factual inaccuracies and mistakes in the assessments carried out for potential site allocations for the Swinford Neighbourhood Plan. If these mistakes are corrected it has an important impact on the conclusions drawn from the assessment process (i.e. which sites to allocate for residential development) as shown in the table below.	Review	Closed	The detailed comments on the points raised are covered in a separate note.	No action.
Geoff Armstrong (Armstrong Rigg)	21/08/2017	(NOTE: Revised preferred site list included in the representation, unable to recreate in this spreadsheet. Distributed to NPAC). Based on the assessment above, it is clear that Swinford Parish Council's current preferred site for the allocation of 17 homes at Lutterworth Road (Site 4) is not the most sustainable option available. Sites 3, 6, 7 and 8 all perform better than Site 4 and should be allocated ahead of it.	Review	Closed	We have amended all the assessments following all of the feedback (including yours), and the allocations have been reviewed in light of that evidence.	No action.
Geoff Armstrong (Armstrong Rigg)	21/08/2017	Draft Housing Policies Draft Policy H2 of the Neighbourhood Plan deals with housing provision. It states that there "will be a minimum target of 35 dwellings over the period to 2031, excluding existing commitments and completions and windfalls, which will be fully met by the allocation of housing sites in Policy H3. Policy H3 proposes to allocate Site 6 for 15 dwellings, Site 4 for 17 dwellings and Site 7 for 3 dwellings.	Review	Closed	See line 324 below.	No action.
Geoff Armstrong (Armstrong Rigg)	21/08/2017	The assessment above clearly shows that Site 4 cannot be considered to be one of the most sustainable sites in the village. Clear mistakes have been made in the assessment of this and other sites which when corrected show that the most sustainable sites for development are numbers 6, 7 and 8. Policy H3 should therefore be amended to allocate these three sites.	Review	Closed	As already noted we have amended all the assessments following all of the feedback (including yours), and the allocations have been reviewed in light of that evidence.	No action.
Geoff Armstrong (Armstrong Rigg)	21/08/2017	We are pleased to confirm that our clients land at Sites 7 and 8 is deliverable for sustainable development of 3 and 15 dwellings respectively. Based on the target of 35 dwellings set by Policy H2, this would leave 17 dwellings for the Parish Council to allocate on Site 6. This is a slight increase on the currently proposed 15 homes to be allocated on this site, but is considered a deliverable figure given the slightly larger area of this site in comparison with Site 8 and would result in an appropriate density of development on Site 6 of 22 dwellings per hectare.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Geoff Armstrong (Armstrong Rigg)	21/08/2017	It is understood that there is a current planning application pending determination for 5 dwellings at Chapel Street, Swinford (Ref: 17/01091/OUT). If approved this application would reduce the requirement for allocated sites to 30 dwellings. Given the preference of Swinford's residents for smaller developments, as expressed in the public consultation for the Neighbourhood Plan, it is recommended that any reduction in numbers would be best achieved by reducing the size of the largest sites first. For example, Site 6 could easily be reduced to 14 dwellings and Site 8 to 13 dwellings, which coupled with 3 dwellings at Site 7 would give a total of 30.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Geoff Armstrong (Armstrong Rigg)	21/08/2017	We trust that the issues identified in this letter will be taken into account in the further development of the Neighbourhood Plan and we look forward to working with the Parish Council going forwards.	Review	Closed	Thank you.	No action.

Parishioner	21/08/2017	I refer to your message below which, having been away I have only just has chance to follow up. It is troubling to note that my original points were missed and indeed raise the obvious question - are there any more missed from others? Having taken the trouble to go through the first draft, I think it appropriate that my queries and comments are addressed and responded to, albeit some may have been addressed in the second draft having been raised by others. However I have noticed that at least one of my queries is still un-answered, so would ask that all my points be addressed.	Reply	Closed	Replied to acknowledge receipt of email. Points originally submitted and missed are dealt with on lines 17 - 24 above.	No action.
Parishioner	17/08/2017	We are as you know one of the stakeholders and have reviewed the revised Plan. We only have one question relating directly to the Plan. The map on page 24 is supposed we believe from the explanation given prior to it to show a 'revised Limits to Development Boundary'. The map shown is different to that in the original first submission Plan and this later version we don't believe is any different to the current Limits to Development Boundary? Also there is no annotation as to the representation of the yellow / orange shaded areas on the map?	Review	Closed	Noted.	Updated 'Limits to Development' map required.
Parishioner	17/08/2017	We have also during this consultation period taken time to thoroughly review the Environmental inventory and raise the following points:	N/A	Closed	N/A	No action.
Parishioner	17/08/2017	Field 241 - Is the adjoining Barn mentioned here ours (in our farm Yard)? If so how has or who has assessed that this is a bat roosting area and that there are 4 BAP species (what are these)? Also we do not believe there is a 'permissive path' here - there never was when we tenanted the land. What is a 'permissive path'?	Review	Closed	The barn does belong to the Mourant's. Assessment was carried out by John Martin from YourLocale and the NPAC Environment Theme Group. What evidence is there of bat roosting? Question formal agreement for path.	Include 'BAP' and 'Permissive Path' in definitions in the Environmental Inventory.
Parishioner	17/08/2017	Field 192 - There is no access from footpath X9 - certainly not for the public - only for ourselves as the landowner - this is misleading therefore please amend. Also as above who or how has an assessment been made which suggests there are foxes, rabbits and 2 BAP species and both locally present woodpeckers.	Review	Closed	Footpath X9 crosses Field 192 from Simons Close gate to south corner of the field to meet X51. Assessment was carried out by John Martin from YourLocale and the NPAC Environment Theme Group.	No action.
Parishioner	17/08/2017	Field 155 - There is no ownership shown - it should please show - Mourant.	Review	Closed	Noted.	Update ownership details in the Environmental Inventory.
Parishioner	17/08/2017	Field 006 - Just wanted to check where this field is - probably us not concentrating but can't seem to find it on the map?	Review	Closed	Tiny triangular copse / spinney to the North of Field 007.	No action.
Parishioner	17/08/2017	Field 190/191 - The ownership here is Mourant so you can add this. Again who/how has an assessment been made relating to birds?	Review	Closed	Noted. Assessment was carried out by John Martin from YourLocale and the NPAC Environment Theme Group.	Update ownership details in the Environmental Inventory.
Parishioner	17/08/2017	Field 197 - This is not our field - not sure whose it is?	Review	Closed	Noted, investigate ownership.	Remove Mourant from ownership details in the Environmental Inventory.
Parishioner	17/08/2017	Field 012 - This talks of a spinney in the field. With the way in which your map is drawn the spinney mentioned is actually outside the Parish boundary. So you should strictly remove mention of it.	Review	Closed	Agreed, remove.	Remove reference to 'spinney in the field' in the Environmental Inventory.
Parishioner	17/08/2017	Where there is any mention of Texaco ownership of land, that is no longer true - we believe it is SwayFields Rugby.	Review	Closed	Noted.	Update ownership details in the Environmental Inventory.

Parishioner	17/08/2017	Hopefully the additional information above is helpful. We would be grateful if you would please come back to us in relation to all the points raised in this letter.	Reply	Closed	Updated Regulation 14 spreadsheet to be made available to view on the website.	Once complete, put Regulation 14 comments spreadsheet on the website.
Parishioner	23/08/2017	The commitment to explore the establishment of a one-way system for the centre of the village is welcome, indeed to be applauded. Anecdotally I have heard more voices in support of the concept than against it.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Parishioner	23/08/2017	Many other comments/concerns/suggestions expressed by residents do not appear to have been treated adequately.	Review	Closed	Disagree, all comments received through the Regulation 14 Consultation will be responded to and made available.	No action.
Parishioner	23/08/2017	Any that have been made have been "publicised" at an open-day event.	Review	Closed	Not sure what this means, is the writer suggesting that those complaining should have been given a role at open events? Everyone had the opportunity to see the displays and ask questions - what more could be done?	No action.
Parishioner	23/08/2017	They were merely printed on a display board. Little(any)attempt made to explain, or even highlight, them to other residents. There is a high probability that most visitors to an open day would not question topics they did not recognise, and which were lost in the detail. Even if a resident did ask, the only answers forthcoming would be from an NPAC perspective. There could be no explanation or support from the original author of the comment/concern/suggestion. I believe each of the views and concerns should have been aired in an open meeting (as opposed to an open day) with the comment/concern explained to all the attendees.	Review	Closed	The process followed is tried and tested and is sufficient for the purpose.	No action.
Parishioner	23/08/2017	This may have meant numerous open meetings, which would have given a better result, would have been completely in keeping with the process. By not exploring resident comments/concerns/suggestions in open meetings, the NPAC is now seen by the community as keeping control of everything, believing that it "knows best". The concerns of the community are subordinated to the opinion of the NPAC. This has turned off, or at least significantly diluted, the "resident-driven" quality of the NP.	Review	Closed	People had ample opportunity to become involved and for those that chose not to, to comment on the emerging proposals.	No action.
Parishioner	23/08/2017	Questions relating to apparent inconsistency in the assessment of proffered potential housing sites were treated as challenges, and dismissed in a patronising, indeed, insulting - manner.	Review	Closed	The process is the same as that followed elsewhere and described as 'robust'. There is always a degree of subjectivity but the process has been clear and transparent.	No action.

Parishioner	23/08/2017	Confidence in the NPAC would have been regained if this had been taken seriously, rather than with a defensiveness that has created suspicion. I am just one of several who have seen the detailed analysis on this topic by Mrs Julie Morris, and find her work compelling. It impels me to agree with her opinion. The original idea of seeking to visualise and influence the direction in which our village evolves was stated in the background on Swinford's website as The Localism Act (2011) introduced a new planning initiative which gives Parish Councils the opportunity to engage with their local communities and prepare what is known as a 'Neighbourhood Plan' which will help to shape future development in their areas. Once 'made', these plans will become part of the strategic development plan produced by district councils and therefore, carry full legal weight in the determination of planning applications. (The italics are mine, for emphasis). However, the full extent of this seems to have been cast aside.	Review	Closed	How so? The PC and the NPAC has engaged fully throughout the process, way above the minimum requirements.	No action.
Parishioner	23/08/2017	The term 'future development' should address how a village whose built environment is largely unchanged from the 19th century adapts to 21st century conditions and problems.	Review	Closed	The NPAC feels it does.	No action.
Parishioner	23/08/2017	The life cycle of a community such as ours (as opposed to individual residents) is measured in centuries. In such a period there is constant evolution of: modes of transport, working patterns / places, housing standards, general lifestyle. Currently the heart of the village suffers problems in respect of transport. The approach of the NPAC towards this does not seem realistic, it certainly fails to convince, let alone enthuse, the interested observer.	Review	Closed	The NP is limited in what it can do in this regard.	No action.
Parishioner	23/08/2017	There seems to be an NPAC attitude of "That is too big and controversial for us to consider". Instead, the NPAC has (or had) an opportunity to grasp the nettle, and sow the seed in the minds of the community of the approaching need for major evolution. Such change is long term. Taking it into consideration now can avoid imminent decisions compounding current problems, thus making their resolution more contentious and difficult. Instead of addressing this confidently, the NPAC seems to have been overawed by the thought that such strategic thinking is the exclusive province of HDC. This belief may be true for the detail of future planning. Ignoring it almost guarantees that the heart of the village becomes some sort of residential museum, regardless of any increasing inconvenience. To interpret this as a wish for total change to an ultra-modern style would be a terrible mistake.	Review	Closed	Residents had opportunity to put forward 'big ideas' in the consultation process, this resulted in suggestions such as a one way system. It is not possible to explore these ideas as part of the NP. They can take be taken forward as community actions and as aspirations for the future.	No action.
Parishioner	23/08/2017	Topics that seem to have been ignored, or abandoned, include:	N/A	Closed	N/A	No action.
Parishioner	23/08/2017	Road Layout: Thoughts of a 'passing bay' in Chapel Street are not considered to be a serious approach to the overall subject, the topography of the road mitigates against it, its length of about 200 metres offers no spaces for such a bay except by using the junction with Chapelfields, causing other traffic issues, or encroaching on frontage of private property elsewhere in Chapel Street, necessitating compulsory purchase.	Review	Closed	See above.	No action.
Parishioner	23/08/2017	Comment re review/widening pavements near the school appear more hopeful than realistic. Widening of the pavement would result in making the road narrower. How that helps is not understood at all.	Review	Closed	See above.	No action.
Parishioner	23/08/2017	Visitor parking, both on a domestic level and for village events.	Review	Closed	See above.	No action.

Parishioner	23/08/2017	Mitigation of impact on Stanford Hall traffic.	Review	Closed	See above.	No action.
Parishioner	23/08/2017	The focus appears to be almost entirely on housing.	Review	Closed	See above.	No action.
Parishioner	23/08/2017	It appears from the outside more and more that the exercise has become one of doing whatever HDC says, to produce a document supporting whatever HDC wants. This is NOT what the NPAC was formed for or entrusted with!	Review	Closed	We have to comply with the HDC Local Plan or the Plan will be rejected.	No action.
Parishioner	23/08/2017	As it stands, I do not believe this Plan is ready for putting forward to a referendum. It is not yet comprehensive or mature.	Review	Closed	This is a personal view that is not supported.	No action.
Parishioner	24/08/2017	It seems that only comments made in writing or online are entered into NPAC documents. Were all verbal comments offered at the Open days recorded? Or ignored?	Review	Closed	Of course comments made verbally cannot be included. The NPAC would have been heavily criticised if it had of done so and there would have been complaints of misrepresentation.	No action.
Parishioner	24/08/2017	The draft NP published makes no reference to the 'Right to Build'. At an NPAC open day I raised the matter of acknowledging and catering for the 'Right to Build' Bill, which got its 3rd reading in Parliament in March 2015. This Bill specifically supports self-build schemes, with a relatively benign definition of 'Self build'. It would be in keeping with the history of Swinford, and its track record of self building, for the NPAC to make provision for it. I also made the same statement at a meeting (PC?NPAC?) attended by at least some of the NPAC members. At that meeting I stated the number of Swinford homes that were within the government definition of self build. At more than 17% of the homes in Swinford, the history and practice is well established. I can provide the addresses of those properties. Indeed, the home of the Clerk to the PC is one such. There is no reason to believe the appetite for self build has gone. Contemporary evidence suggests it is still strong. It should not be beyond the ability, or the will, of the NPAC to accommodate the principle of self build, and encourage that any residents of the community have access to a plot from within the allocation being made. Why was this topic ignored or even avoided deliberately? For information, the government's definition of self build includes: Homes designed and built by there owners themselves; Homes designed and built entirely by professionals, but to owner specification; Homes built by the owner managing the individual trades, but to a professional design. In short, any bespoke as opposed to open market speculative build.	Review	Closed	There is nothing in the NP to prevent or discourage self-build.	No action.
Parishioner	24/08/2017	HDC's imposition of a MINIMUM number of houses, and the NPAC's meek acceptance of that - is in direct contravention of the principles of the Localism Act of 2011. This is not having regard for national planning policy, nor, being in general conformity with strategic policies. It is subjugation by HDC.	Review	Closed	This is entirely 'with regard' for national planning policy which requires NPs to meet the minimum housing requirements determined by the Local Planning Authority. The NPAC cannot resist that requirement and if it did so it would be thrown out by an examiner.	No action.
Parishioner	24/08/2017	Has any query been made (other than to HDC) into the legality of HDC over-ruling the provisions of that Act? Or their right to impose such conditions before an NP is even submitted?	Review	Closed	This is completely wrong. HDC has applied the Act, not over-ruled it.	No action.
Parishioner	24/08/2017	Several parishioner comments show community resistance to a single large development, but preference for multiple smaller developments. These have always been met with the NPAC response 'smaller allocations across multiple sites would not protect the village from those sites being further developed'. This could equally apply to a single large development, especially if the original density is less than the maximum. Also, any site becomes compromised as soon as it is developed, becoming at risk of further development.	Review	Closed	This is precisely the point that the NPAC made, developing fewer sites minimises that compromise.	No action.

Parishioner	24/08/2017	Although the NPAC has been 'advised not to adopt such an allocation policy' the community has been offered no explanation or justification for this advice.	Review	Closed	No justification is required.	No action.
Parishioner	24/08/2017	Several responses to parishioner concerns appear to be a metaphoric shrug of the shoulders. In particular one comment challenged the statements of a consultant, effectively showing them to be irreconcilable with reality. This regarded the widening of Lutterworth Road together with installing a footpath, yet retaining the trees which impose a space constriction preventing this. Instead of recognising the inadequacy of the consultant's statement, the NPAC simply pass the buck to Highways Authority!	Review	Closed	Our consultant considers there to be a solution for the issue you raise, but ultimately the solution will be determined by the developer, the planning authority, and the Highways Agency.	No action.
Parishioner	24/08/2017	A reference to potential contamination of the Lutterworth Road site is shrugged off as a concern for the developer, yet elsewhere the Kilworth Road site was downgraded for 'contamination' because it had stored a muck heap. Since when has the muck that farmers spread as fertiliser/soil conditioner been 'contamination'? Furthermore, the lack of accuracy and consistency in such a context is more than concerning, it is disturbing indeed.	Review	Closed	Completely disagree. Both sites have potential issues, and both have been grade the same as a result. It is not he job of the sustainability assessments to perform full environmental surveys.	No action.
Parishioner	24/08/2017	An earlier comment referring to the risk of development with unsuitable and exploitative leasehold/contractual arrangements has not been addressed anywhere in the NPAC. If it has, I cannot recognise it as such. I will be very happy to acknowledge my error if it can be shown that it is addressed. Developments of the type referred to are now formally acknowledged as a major problem nationwide, often sold under misleading circumstances that are built in to the complete business model of the developer. For the NPAC to ignore this when it has an opportunity to provide protection to the community is to turn its back on the community. The NPAC should explain exactly why it refuses to state that such development plans should be identified and excluded.	Review	Closed	The detailed contractual arrangements between a developer and a buyer are a matter for those parties and their legal representatives. This is outside the scope of the NP.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	Leicestershire County Council is supportive of the Neighbourhood plan process and welcome being included in this consultation.	Note	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation.	No action.

Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	<p>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. 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. To be eligible for S106 contributions proposals must fulfil various legal criteria. Measures must also directly mitigate the impact of the development e.g. they should ensure that the development does not make the existing highway conditions any worse if considered to have a severe residual impact. They cannot unfortunately be sought to address existing problems. Where potential S106 measures would require future maintenance, which would be paid for from the County Council's funds, the measures would also need to be assessed against the County Council's other priorities and as such may not be maintained by the County Council or will require maintenance funding to be provide as a commuted sum.</p>	Note	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	<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 being commercially viable once the contributions have stopped i.e. they would be able to operate without being supported from public funding.</p>	Note	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	<p>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.</p>	Note	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	<p>Highways 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.</p>	Note	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation.	No action.

Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	The LLFA is not able to: <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. 	Note	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	When considering flood risk within the development of a neighbourhood plan, the LLFA would recommend consideration of the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Locating development outside of river (fluvial) flood risk (Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)). Locating development outside of surface water (pluvial) flood risk (Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map). Locating development outside of any groundwater flood risk by considering any local knowledge of groundwater flooding. How potential SuDS features may be incorporated into the development to enhance the local amenity, water quality and biodiversity of the site as well as manage surface water runoff. Watercourses and land drainage should be protected within new developments to prevent an increase in flood risk. 	Note	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation. Following previous consultation ENV 10 wording added to the housing policy.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	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.	Note	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation. Following previous consultation ENV 10 wording added to the housing policy.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	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.	Note	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation. Following previous consultation it was agreed to include in HS3 the 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.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	LCC in our role as LLFA will object to anything contrary to LCC policies.	Note	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	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.	Note	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation. After last consultation it was agreed to seek advice from John Martin from YourLocale as to whether this should be incorporated into ENV 10.	No action.

Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	<p>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.</p> <p>www.northkilworth.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/nk-draft-low-resolution-1.pdf www.greatglen.leicestershireparishcouncils.org/uploads/175670305aeaf48650823074.pdf</p>	Note	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation, although examples of Great Glen and North Kilworth quoted this time. After last consultation it was agreed to include a S106 Policy in the plan.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	<p>Planning 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. Although neighbourhood plans cannot include policies that cover minerals and waste development, it may be the case that your neighbourhood contains an existing or planned minerals or waste site. The County Council can provide information on these operations or any future development planned for your neighbourhood. You should also be aware of 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>	Review	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation. After last consultation it was agreed to seek advice from John Martin at YourLocale as to whether this should be incorporated into ENV 10.	LCC have confirmed there are no Mineral or Waste issues for the Parish of Swinford.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	<p>Education Whereby housing allocations or preferred housing developments form part of a Neighbourhood Plan the Local Authority will look to the availability of school places within a two mile (primary) and three mile (secondary) distance from the development. If there are not sufficient places then a claim for Section 106 funding will be requested to provide those places. It is recognised that it may not always be possible or appropriate to extend a local school to meet the needs of a development, or the size of a development would yield a new school. However, in the changing educational landscape, the Council retains a statutory duty to ensure that sufficient places are available in good schools within its area, for every child of school age whose parents wish them to have one.</p>	Note	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	<p>Property Strategic Property Services No comment at this time.</p>	Note	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation.	No action.

Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	Adult Social Care It is suggested that reference is made to recognising a significant growth in the older population and that development seeks to include bungalows etc. of differing tenures to accommodate the increase. This would be in line with the draft Adult Social Care Accommodation Strategy for older people which promotes that people should plan ahead for their later life, including considering downsizing, but recognising that people's choices are often limited by the lack of suitable local options.	Note	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation. Already included in H5.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	Environment The following paragraphs contain our standard comments for all Neighbourhood Planning groups; however we are gratified to find that the environmental policies included within the plan are very thorough. As mentioned within these policies, appropriate communication would naturally take place between the sought after tree warden once appointed and the County Council, through the anticipated actions of the warden. Equally the comment about working with the County Council regarding footpaths and bridleways shows an efficient and considerate intent to engage with the most appropriate stakeholders. With regard to the environment and in line with the Governments advice, Leicestershire County Council (LCC) would like to see Neighbourhood Plans cover all aspects of the natural environment including climate change, the landscape, biodiversity, ecosystems, green infrastructure as well as soils, brownfield sites and agricultural land.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	Environment Climate Change The County Council through its Environment Strategy and Carbon Reduction Strategy is committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Leicestershire and increasing Leicestershire's resilience to the predicted changes in climate. Neighbourhood Plans should in as far as possible seek to contribute to and support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and increasing the county's resilience to climate change.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	Environment Landscape The County Council would like to see the inclusion of a local landscape assessment taking into account Natural England's Landscape character areas; LCC's Landscape and Woodland Strategy and the Local District/Borough Council landscape character assessments. We would recommend that Neighbourhood Plans should also consider the street scene and public realm within their communities, further advice can be found in the latest 'Streets for All East Midlands ' Advisory Document (2006) published by English Heritage.	Review	Closed	Noted, see map 10 in section h, referring to scenes within the village itself.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	Environment Biodiversity The Natural Environment and Communities Act 2006 places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their duties, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) clearly outlines the importance of sustainable development alongside the core principle that planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Neighbourhood Plans should therefore seek to work in partnership with other agencies to develop and deliver a strategic approach to protecting and improving the natural environment based on local evidence and priorities. Each Neighbourhood Plan should consider the impact of potential development on enhancing biodiversity and habitat connectivity such as hedgerows and greenways.	Review	Closed	The NPAC believes they have taken this approach in the Plan.	No action.

Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	The Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre (LRERC) can provide a summary of wildlife information for your Neighbourhood Plan area. This will include a map showing nationally important sites (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest); locally designated Wildlife Sites; locations of badger setts, great crested newt breeding ponds and bat roosts; and a list of records of protected and priority Biodiversity Action Plan species. These are all a material consideration in the planning process. If there has been a recent Habitat Survey of your plan area, this will also be included. LRERC is unable to carry out habitat surveys on request from a Parish Council, although it may be possible to add it into a future survey programme. Contact: planningecology@leics.gov.uk, or phone 0116 305 4108.	Review	Closed	Please refer to the Environment Inventory Appendix. The NPAC believes that these aspects have been covered.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	Environment Green Infrastructure Green infrastructure (GI) is a network of multi-functional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities, (NPPF definition). As a network, GI includes parks, open spaces, playing fields, woodlands, street trees, cemeteries/churchyards allotments and private gardens as well as streams, rivers, canals and other water bodies and features such as green roofs and living walls.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	The NPPF places the duty on local authorities to plan positively for a strategic network of GI which can deliver a range of planning policies including: building a strong, competitive economy; creating a sense of place and promote good design; promoting healthier communities by providing greater opportunities for recreation and mental and physical health benefits; meeting the challenges of climate change and flood risk; increasing biodiversity and conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Looking at the existing provision of GI networks within a community can influence the plan for creating & enhancing new networks and this assessment can then be used to inform CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) schedules, enabling communities to potentially benefit from this source of funding.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	Neighbourhood Plan groups have the opportunity to plan GI networks at a local scale to maximise benefits for their community and in doing so they should ensure that their Neighbourhood Plan is reflective of the relevant Local Authority Green Infrastructure strategy. Through the Neighbourhood Plan and discussions with the Local Authority Planning teams and potential Developers communities are well placed to influence the delivery of local scale GI networks.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	Environment Brownfield, Soils and Agricultural Land The NPPF encourages the effective use of brownfield land for development, provided that it is not of high environmental/ecological value. Neighbourhood planning groups should check with DEFRA if their neighbourhood planning area includes brownfield sites. Where information is lacking as to the ecological value of these sites then the Neighbourhood Plan could include policies that ensure such survey work should be carried out to assess the ecological value of a brownfield site before development decisions are taken.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.

Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	Soils are an essential finite resource on which important ecosystem services such as food production, are dependent on. They therefore should be enhanced in value and protected from adverse effects of unacceptable levels of pollution. Within the governments "Safeguarding our Soils" strategy, DEFRA have produced a code of practice for the sustainable use of soils on construction sites which could be helpful to neighbourhood planning groups in preparing environmental policies.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	High quality agricultural soils should, where possible be protected from development and where a large area of agricultural land is identified for development then planning should consider using the poorer quality areas in preference to the higher quality areas. Neighbourhood planning groups should consider mapping agricultural land classification within their plan to enable informed decisions to be made in the future. Natural England can provide further information and Agricultural Land classification.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	Environment Impact of Development on Civic Amenity Infrastructure Neighbourhood planning groups should remain mindful of the interaction between new development applications in a district area and the Leicestershire County Council. The County's Waste Management team considers proposed developments on a case by case basis and when it is identified that a proposed development will have a detrimental effect on the local 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.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	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. The identification of potential community projects that could be progressed would be a positive initiative.	Review	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation. After previous consultation it was agreed to add a Community Action and update a policy to incorporate this.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	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.	Note	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation. It was agreed after the last consultation that this is not relevant for Swinford.	No action.

Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	Superfast Broadband 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. 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 should be considered.	Note	Closed	Noted. Same response as previous consultation.	No action.
Nik Green (Leicestershire County Council)	25/08/2017	Equalities While we cannot comment in detail on plans, you may wish to ask stakeholders to bear the Council's Equality Strategy 2016-2020 in mind when taking your Neighbourhood Plan forward through the relevant procedures, particularly for engagement and consultation work. A copy of the strategy can be view at: www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2017/1/30/equality_strategy2016-2020.pdf	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Parishioner	25/08/2017	P15 <i>The Parish has a limited social and community infrastructure which includes a Pub, Village Hall, Primary School, children's play area and Church. This does not mention WI, Swinford Skirts, Skittles and Darts teams, SODS, Swinford Shorts</i>	Review	Closed	Noted.	Incorporate..'there are a number of active community groups within the village'.
Parishioner	25/08/2017	P26 <i>there being a fifth node at the junction where the roads from Lutterworth and Walcote converge. Do you mean to include Swinford Corner, 1 mile out of the village?</i>	Review	Closed	The Plan covers the Parish, not just the Village.	No action.
Parishioner	25/08/2017	Maps P48/60 The first of these maps shows as turquoise dots views that villagers marked as important. The second, with arrows, seems to have been drawn totally disregarding these opinions.	Review	Closed	Map 10 shows village street views and also incorporates views over countryside whereas Map 3 shows sites valued by villagers.	Check this is clear in the Plan.
Parishioner	25/08/2017	Assessment Site Six <i>This is a small extension site on the edge of the current built form. As development has already taken place opposite this is a logical place to grow the settlement. If this is a logical site, why is it given red status?</i>	Review	Closed	The site has been allocated in the draft Plan.	No action.
Parishioner	25/08/2017	Site Eight <i>The new properties would overlook a large number of neighbouring units, properties currently enjoying an open aspect. Why is interfering with an open aspect a "red" here, but not mentioned in connection with site four?</i>	Review	Closed	The sites are very different in terms of current built form. Site 8 impacts on a large number of properties across Kilworth Road. Site 4 has an impact of two properties only, which are adjacent to the site.	No action.
Parishioner	25/08/2017	Site Four <i>None at present but very straightforward to provide an access from Lutterworth Road with a suitably wide visibility splay to meet current highways safety standards. The "width" of the carriageway may also need to be expanded. How can this happen and still preserve the tree-lined approach to the village? As regarded so highly in notes about Stanford Road.</i>	Review	Closed	This is considered possible with a careful design solution.	No action.
Parishioner	25/08/2017	Site Four <i>Relationship with existing pattern of built development? See Site Eight above.</i>	Review	Closed	See line 403 above.	No action.

Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Please find below the combination of comments from officers. There may be some repetition, but I have tried to group the comments together to relate to policies.	N/A	Closed	N/A	No action.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Page 10 Local Planning Policy Context: Adoption is now timetabled for October 2018 (see Local Development Scheme)	Review	Closed	Noted.	Amend as necessary.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Map on page 34 needs to be improved – noted that the draft states this, however it is not clear and could be criticised as the pre submission draft should be the draft that the group intends to submit. Amendments are of course permitted to this draft.	Review	Closed	Noted.	Insert improved map.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Policy H1 – some of the criteria are very loosely worded e.g. <i>Proposals should minimise the impact on general amenity and give careful consideration to cabling, satellite dishes, aerials, burglar alarms, noise, odour and light.</i> A developer may give 'careful consideration' but it may still not be what the community want.	Review	Closed	Noted.	Amend wording.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	H1 – seems very detailed and given previous comments from examiners, would it be better to have a more general policy with detailed design criteria in an appendix? Referral to another policy is clunky.	Review	Closed	Noted.	Review.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	H3 repeats bits of the design policy H1. – There is no need to highlight the need to read in conjunction with other policies, that is understood. The 40% affordable results in non whole numbers, it might be better to detail exact number of affordable houses.	Review	Closed	Noted.	Change words slightly.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Parking criteria states 'modern cars' but a smart car is a modern car and required very little space.	Review	Closed	Noted.	Change wording to modern 'family' cars.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	General point: cross referencing of policies is not required – Examiner comments on previous NDPs. E.g. Policy H3.	Review	Closed	Noted.	Remove policy cross-references.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Page 38 – need to reference appendix for housing needs report.	Review	Closed	Noted.	Need to add reference.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Policy H5 – probably needs to be rephrased as the last sentence does not make sense. H5 I think this could be better worded as it is quite woolly, perhaps it could say sites should deliver more than 70% of the units as 3 bed or fewer.	Review	Closed	Noted.	Re-phrase last sentence. Review wording in general.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	H6 how will this be monitored?	Review	Closed	We would suggest by the Parish Council in conjunction with Harborough District Council.	Include a comment in H6 to this effect.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Policy H6 - probably better to use 'distributed throughout the development' rather than scattered.	Review	Closed	Noted.	Amend wording.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Policy H6 – who will monitor the criteria for eligibility. This is an issue, because if the criteria are over and above HDC criteria they will not be monitored. Check the criteria against HDC policy.	Review	Closed	Monitoring by the Parish Council.	Include a comment in H6 to this effect.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Map 1: Needs to be copyright included.	Review	Closed	Noted.	Add copyright details.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	ENV1 rather than not supported it would be better to say not permitted. Supported implies local support, not a planning decision.	Review	Closed	The Parish Council cannot permit, only "not Support". Only HDC can <u>permit</u> development. Once the NP is ratified and accepted by HDC then it can be used to 'permit' or disallow any development proposals.	No action.

Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Why is Community action ENV1 not a policy, surely the plan wants to protect OSSRs and require at least recompense if any are developed. Also using same numbering for CA is confusing. Community actions would be better either at the end of the document or the end of each section.	Review	Closed	Noted. Community Action is appropriate to this section as it says what the Parish Council will do.	Re-number CA's throughout the document.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Local Green Space , OSSR sites, Sites of Environmental Significance and Ridge and Furrow sites run the risk of creating a 'protection zone' around the village. This may be picked up by an Examiner as being a too restrictive combination of polices. If all these sites are to be protected where does future development go? Site 6 – identified for development seems to be identified in the Ridge and Furrow policy ENV5 for protection. Check the consistency of the policies against each other.	Review	Closed	Remove Map 5, only use Map 6 (best examples). Map 5 to be retained in unpublished documents.	Remove Map 5. Re-number remaining maps and check cross-references.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Map 6 is the best examples of ridge and furrow. Is this what is being protected because the policy refers to Map 5.	Review	Closed	Noted.	Edit policy.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Map 7 – listed buildings is unclear where the boundaries are. Also needs a copyright. What do the numbers on map 7 refer to?	Review	Closed	Noted.	Statutory buildings needs to be numbered on page 57. Add copyright details. Add note - 'please note map is not scaled and therefore boundaries cannot be included'.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Locally listed buildings ENV6 need to be listed in the policy and clearly marked with boundaries and labels on a plan.	Review	Closed	Map being prepared. Add number of properties in list.	Need to include map and list.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	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. Care should be taken with this policy as some examiners consider a policy to protect views is overly restrictive – some examiners , however have permitted such policies. ENV7 this policy is unlikely to survive examination as currently worded. – Development that impacts in any way is too prescriptive. It might be better to say that views should be respected and development should seek to preserve the view. Is the view to Stanford Hall along the extension of the conservation area, I assumed this was a view. That was important to the setting of the Hall.	Review	Closed	Remove "in any way" from Policy. Replace with .."The numbered views below should be respected and developments should seek to preserve them."	Amend.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Map 14 – would this and the flood maps be better place in an appendix? It is not referred to in any text in the plan. Map 14 is out of place.	Review	Closed	Move map to the beginning of the Environmental Inventory Appendix. Include an appendix - 'Maps of Flooding and Watercourses in Swinford.	Move Map 14 to the Environmental Inventory. Create a 'Maps of Flooding and Watercourses in Swinford' appendix and include Maps 12 and 13.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Policy S2 Limits to development will need a better map – Note that any development with in the LtD is considered acceptable. Limits to development – this map does not appear to include the areas identified as allocations, also what are the yellow highlighted areas?	Review	Closed	Agreed.	Updated 'Limits to Development' map required.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	A better map of sites will be needed – as it is impossible to see labels and labels are not referred to consistently	Review	Closed	Agreed.	Better map required.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Note one of the ridge and furrow fields Map 5 in ENV5 is actually the designated site for allocation – this should be clarified. Policy ENV5 I note that some of the areas of ridge and furrow are the allocated sites, is this consistent?	Review	Closed	Agreed.	Remove Map 5. Re-number remaining maps and check cross-references.

Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	ENV6 – are there any locally designated assets? Community action refers to a list of non-designated assets, but there is no list. Policy ENV6 locally significant buildings should be included within the policy for clarity.	Review	Closed	Additional text written, map and list prepared.	Add new text, list and map.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	ENV8 is discussed as being a community action, but appears to be a policy ENV8 footpaths, again not supported is a bit woolly. Monitoring is not policy and should be moved to the explanation, i.e. bullets 2 and 3 should be in explanation. What about cycle routes?	Review	Closed	Remove 2 & 3 bullets and create a Community Action. In text: add "....forms of exercise. National Cycleway No 50 passes through the Parish and encourages exercise to parishioners and many passing visitors.	Amend.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Policy ENV9 biodiversity mentioned in 2 points. Bullet a how is health and wellbeing measured or assessed? These should probably be deleted.	Review	Closed	Agreed, remove bullet points.	Delete from plan.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	ENV10. NPPF does require development to be directed away from areas of flooding, this statement is misleading. All new development to be covered by FRA is too onerous, only larger sites require FRA, or those in zones 2 or 3. The map for surface flooding would be helpful if it showed the built area in more detail. Policy ENV 10 – All new development. This would be too onerous for extensions etc. consider rewording. Policy ENV10 is really covered by national policy, is it sufficiently local?	Review	Closed	Map moved to Appendix 7. Change ENV10 to reflect NPPF.	Move Map to Appendix 7 and update policy.
Mathew Bills (HDC)	30/08/2017	Policy T1 what about cycle provision?	Review	Closed	Noted.	Add bullet point re. cycle provision.