

Scalford Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

| No. | Chapter/ Section | Policy Number | Respondent | Comment | Response | Amendment |
|-----|--------------------------|------------------|------------|---|---|-----------|
| 1 | 7.3 Page 52 Para 4 | | Resident | <p>“The pub is an important asset to the village, with the potential to be of greater benefit to the community”.</p> <p>I am curious to know:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why so few villagers use it, including members of the Parish Council & Scalford Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Committee on a regular basis or indeed at all? 2. “The pub is an important asset to the village, with the potential to be of greater benefit to the community” HOW? (we will accept all viable & profitable suggestions) <p>Should you wish to comment or publish comments on our business, it would be far better to do so from a position of knowledge or perhaps as a regular customer!</p> <p>76% of questionnaire respondents regarded the Pub as important to life in Scalford.</p> <p>I photographed the responses to the survey at the village hall presentation & your figures do not add up. As quoted in the proposed plan 99 responses were received to the survey (19%) Yet at the display in the village hall only 60 people responded to the pub’s importance in life in Scalford Parish.</p> <p>With 7 (12%) not concerned at all (opt1) 6 (10%) little concern, 10 (17%) indifferent, 16 (27%) concerned & 21 (35%) very concerned as to the pub’s role in Scalford.</p> | <p>Thank you for these comments.</p> <p>The Pub is widely regarded as an important community asset and it is important that this is recognised in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> | None |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | So at best 37 (56%) pub important, 10 (33%) indifferent & 13 (11%) pub not important. If you take the figures in a wider context 99 responses in total (19%) 81% did not respond, then does the pub concern many people in the parish at all? | | |
| 2 | Page 20 | Policy H2 | Resident | <p>I must strongly object to half of my private garden being classed as open countryside! Clearly this is not the case - my orchard and overgrown vegetable patch are in this area, and goodness knows what the legal and other ramifications might be if half of my private garden is deemed to be open countryside, for whatever reason.</p> <p>The garden runs alongside the paddock that you have labelled elsewhere as number one. Please adjust the boundary accordingly.</p> | <p>Thank you for commenting.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been applied following a methodology that has been consistently applied. An adjustment here would require adjustments elsewhere and this is not considered appropriate. There are no legal ramifications – it is purely a planning designation.</p> | None |
| 3 | Appendix 6 Ref 113 & 115 in Appendix 8 | | Resident | <p>Received 7th July 2019</p> <p>I see in the draft neighbourhood plan some of my land is referred to in the Green spaces section.</p> <p>I have read appendix 6 and cannot see how you can possibly attribute a score of 16/25? Can you please provide me with your score card and reasoning you attribute this score. I kindly ask you to remove this as it is clearly an error.</p> <p>Subsequently the below was received on 25th July 2019</p> <p>The map is wrong. Meadows 113/115 do not contain good or fair ridge and furrow</p> <p>The description and image in Annex 7 & 8 is completely incorrect.</p> | <p>Thank you for this comment.</p> <p>The Environmental Inventory describes the characteristics of the parcel of land and its significance locally.</p> <p>Agreed – the fields in question are 112/113.</p> | <p>None</p> <p>Change made as indicated</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---------------|--------------|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | <p>Please make available the results of the questionnaire. This request is made under section 1 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and regulation 5 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004</p> <p>The Melton plan already has 23 houses planned for other land? Why do we need the 2 sites identified on page 17 figure 2? The missing 2 homes will probably be filled by other developments. Or are you saying we need 25 plus 23 homes by 2036. This is wholly disproportionate.</p> | <p>The Questionnaire analysis is available as part of the submission documentation for the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>The Local Plan contains a minimum target. The opportunity has been taken in the Neighbourhood Plan to exceed this target to help meet a local housing need and to bring further safeguards to the Parish that are available through the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> | None |
| 4 | P56 | Policy TR3 | Resident | <p>Query regarding turning the Jubilee Way from Scalford to Melton into a cycle route over their land. – “I cannot agree with the proposal of the Jubilee Way (<i>or the former, now dismantled railway track</i>) being developed into a cycle track.</p> | <p>The policy supports the extension of the pedestrian and cycle path network ‘where appropriate’. This will not happen if the community do not support it.</p> <p>We will remove the reference to Jubilee Way in the supporting narrative.</p> | None |
| 4a | P33 Fig6.2 | Env 2 | | <p>I support the stretches of dismantled railway being designated as sites of natural environmental significance.</p> | <p>Noted</p> | None |
| 4b | P40 Fig 9 | Policy Env 5 | | <p>Also query over a field (No 167) with regards to historic ridge and furrow. “I question the accuracy of this work. I note on our land holding several errors, for example field 3631 (SK7522) has been under continual tillage since well before 2003 probably for 40 years +.</p> <p>(However) I thank all those people who have contributed so far in the formation of the</p> | <p>Noted. The colouring in the map is to be reduced as limited R&F remains.</p> <p>Thank you for this comment.</p> | <p>Change to be made as indicated.</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated.</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------------|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>preliminary version of the Scalford Neighbourhood Plan. I am sure with only a few tweaks here and there it must be close to a finished article. Please support local businesses. Regards RM.</p> | | |
| 5 | P15 | Housing | Resident | <p>Hi Robert We've finally got round to reading the document this evening. It's a very comprehensive document, well done and thank you for all the work you and the team have done. I have a couple of questions/comments. I'm not sure how detailed I need to be at the moment so if you need more from me please let me know. 1 I've read, and reread the page about LTD and I'm not clear. The 23 dwellings listed, are these included in the 36 or extra?</p> <p>2 With regards to making part of the Jubilee Way from Scalford to Melton into a cycle track, I totally disagree with this suggestion. I'm more than happy to provide a full argument against this as required .</p> <p>3 I feel it is unfair that the boundary line follows the garden boundaries of a majority of the village yet cuts straight across the gardens/runs along the house walls of Andrew Measom and Nicky and Phil Golding. More space should be allowed here - not necessarily the whole of their paddocks but certainly their drive ways and stable areas.</p> <p>Certainly where Netherhall Farm is concerned, applications have been turned down for parking within their garden and this looks like they won't be able to put garages to the back of their house either. Parking has already been mentioned as an issue within the document. I think that's it for the minute.</p> | <p>Thank you for this comment.</p> <p>They are included.</p> <p>Agreed – reference to Jubilee Way removed.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have been applied following a methodology that has been consistently applied. An adjustment here would require adjustments elsewhere and this is not considered appropriate.</p> | <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated.</p> <p>None</p> |
| | P56 | Policy TR3 | | | | |
| | P20 | H2 | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|------------------------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | Many thanks | Noted | None |
| 6 | | | Melton Borough Council | <p>Dear Neighbourhood Plan Group,</p> <p>RE: Scalford Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation</p> <p>Thank you for sending the Scalford Neighbourhood Plan (regulation 14 version) to Melton Borough Council for comment.</p> <p>Melton Borough Council fully supports the community’s initiative to produce a Neighbourhood Plan and recognises that this is a community-led process. The advice contained within this letter is intended to assist the Neighbourhood Plan Group / Parish Council in ensuring a submission version Neighbourhood Plan is developed that will withstand examination and any possible legal challenge.</p> <p>Melton Borough Council’s response is based on the Regulation 14 consultation documents provided via email to Jorge Fiz Alonso on 17th June, 2019. This response is structured with regard to the basic conditions as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as applied to Neighbourhood plans by Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004):</p> <p>A. Whether the Plan has regard to National Planning Policy and advice; B. Whether the Plan contributes to Sustainable Development. C. Whether the Plan is in general conformity with the Council’s own development plan; and D. Whether the Plan complies with various European Obligations;</p> | <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> | <p>None</p> <p>None</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>The Melton Local Plan 2011-2036 was adopted by Full Council on October 10, 2018. It sets out the Council policies for the use and development of land across the whole of the Borough. The Local Plan is the main part of the development plan for the Borough and will be given full weight by the Council in making decisions on planning applications. This also means that, as stated above, Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies within the adopted Local Plan. Also, as specified in para 1.8.5 of the Local Plan:</p> <p>Direct Line: 01664502502 Please ask for: J Fiz Alonso e-mail: planningpolicy@melton.gov.uk Date: 25th July 2019</p> <p>2 Page Melton Borough Council consultation response 'For the purpose of testing conformity of Neighbourhood Plans with the Local Plan, all policies included in the Local Plan up to and including Chapter 8 are regarded as strategic policies. Whilst the remaining policies will be relevant for determining planning applications, they are not viewed as strategic policies for the purpose of testing Local Plan conformity.'</p> <p>These issues were subject of scrutiny and debate during the independent Examination of the Local Plan and the wording cited here follows the process of assessment and adjudication by the Inspector.</p> <p>Additionally, we recommend to the Neighbourhood Plan Group access to the Examiner's report for the Ab Kettleby</p> | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>Neighbourhood Plan at: https://www.meltonplan.co.uk/abkettleby.</p> <p>To help your understanding of our comments, we have structured our comments into themes.</p> <p>General Appendices It was notified to the Qualifying Body that the website was not including the appendices on it. This was notified on the 19th June. This was quickly sorted by the PC in the same day, but it could have had an impact on early consultation responses (on the 17th, 18th and 19th of June).</p> <p>Table of contents Some pages don't match (e.g. Monitoring and Review).</p> <p>Figure 1 (map) Please keep the copyright and acknowledge text (the full extend)</p> <p>Page 6 Also important is the NPPF. Revised in 20019 – please amend. Pages 10 and 12 (the vision) You mention that there is a low representation of people aged between 20 and 39, and you link this to a potential lack of affordable and suitable accommodation, however, this is not addressed in your vision (page 12). Is this something you might want to include? Pages 710 (headings within the chapter) Numbering does not match with chapter number Figure 25 The figure covers some of the footer text Housing Page 15 As part of meeting this remaining requirement, the Local Plan has allocated one site at Scalford, land to the south of Melton Road (shown below at Figure 2)</p> <p>Figure 2 does not show the allocation. Please amend Page 16: If one or both of the planning</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>No stakeholder raised concerns and late responses were allowed to address this issue.</p> <p>These typos will be resolved in the Submission version</p> <p>The vision specifically identifies the need to provide a mix of housing to meet the needs of the community and this is considered to be an appropriate general statement in a broad vision.</p> <p>These typos will be resolved in the Submission version</p> <p>We do not feel it necessary to add in the allocation which is not an allocation in the NP</p> | <p>None</p> <p>Changes to be made as indicated.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Changes to be made as indicated.</p> <p>None</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>permissions were to lapse, then the sites' allocation through this Neighbourhood Plan means they remain committed developments.</p> <p>We would suggest revisiting this. Considering these sites as Melton Borough Council consultation response commitments even though they have lapsed, will depend on particular circumstances. We do not think it is appropriate to consider a site, that for example is not available anymore, as a commitment. Their allocation could add an additional level of certainty (although, the permissions already cover this), but they would need to be delivered to meet the housing requirement for the village as per the narrative of the housing section in the Neighbourhood Plan document.</p> <p>Further information about the progress in these sites can inform the next stage of the Neighbourhood Plan. National planning guidance... for information only, it has been recently revised. https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-landavailability-assessment Page 16</p> <p>The process undertaken in assessing available sites is described in the supporting information. Please specify which one (Appendix 5?) Policy H1 If the policy is exclusively linked to the conditions linked to the planning permissions, it might be redundant. You may want to specify particular policies if a site lapses, otherwise they will not be effective as they cannot be retrospective conditions for the planning permissions already granted.</p> | <p>Noted. We will revise the text as proposed.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The appropriate appendix is appendix 5, as referenced on page 3 in the contents page.</p> <p>It is understood that the conditions will only become fully operative if the current permission lapses.</p> | <p>Change to be made as indicated.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>Policy H4 Paragraph 4.2.17 in the Local Plan does not restrict windfall development to within the built-up area, it may be on the edge of the settlement. Thanks to the LTD policy, windfall development beyond the LTD at Scalford would not normally be supported. The policy, therefore will need to enable windfall development within and on the edge of Chadwell and Wycomb. Please consider the following amendment for a) in policy H4: a) Fills a gap in an otherwise built up frontage or on other sites within the Limits to Development of Scalford with no more than ten dwellings; fills a gap in an otherwise built up frontage or on other sites within or on the edge of Chadwell and Wycomb with no more than three dwellings; - please see the Examiner recommendations for the Ab Kettleby NP: https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/2778e0_a444e0c628ee43149bfb04831fc620fe.pdf</p> <p>Housing Mix Page 21 The NP cites the Leicestershire and Leicester HEDNA, 2017 as evidence for housing mix. However, to marry up with the Local Plan, the evidence to use as a guide is table 8 of the LP (sourced from the MBC Housing Needs Study, 2016) The latter is used, because as stated in the reasoned justification to policy C2 of the LP: it is based on the demographic change likely to be associated with the delivery of 245 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>Page 21 The NP also cites a suggested housing mix for the period of 2011 – 2031 rather than the plan period of 2011 – 2036.</p> <p>Page 22 This section states “there is no public bus service link between Melton Mowbray</p> | <p>We wish to apply a consistent approach to development across the Parish. As the principle of development wholly within the Limits to Development is accepted for Scalford we will apply this approach to ensure development occurs wholly within the built-up areas of Chadwell and Wycomb.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agreed – we will remove this sentence</p> | <p>None</p> <p>Reference to the Local plan to be added in.</p> <p>Timescale to be extended to 2036</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>and Nottingham. This is significant since families on low incomes would find shopping, entertainment opportunities and after school activities for post-eleven-year old's very limited". However, there is a regular public bus service between Melton Mowbray and Nottingham. In addition, this sentence does not directly relate to housing mix.</p> <p>Affordable Housing Page 24 In addition to the last sentence: "Affordable Housing for people with a local connection will be encouraged and supported", I recommend for the attached local connection cascade to be included either in the document or as an appendix.</p> <p>Design Text on page 11 para 1 Small error in text... 'Around 15% of households live in private rented accommodation which is in line with the region, lower than the region (14%) and below the national (17%) rates'.</p> <p>General comments on level of design guidance in NP</p> <p>Despite strong objectives to ensure that the NP helps to maintain the village charm and local character the level of detail within the NP as to how this could be achieved is overall low. All of the existing built up areas in Scalford are within the Conservation area. This has already been subject to a MBC conservation appraisal which might be of interest to the NPG as a basis for reviewing and expanding upon the existing information and guidance on local character and design requirements for the NP.</p> | <p>Agreed. We will include reference to the cascade approach of MBC.</p> <p>Noted. The words will be replaced with 'broadly in line'</p> <p>Noted. However, it is considered that the design policy in the NP (policy H6) describes the approach to development in sufficient detail. We will add in a comment that all NP policies apply to clarify this.</p> | <p>Change to be made as indicated</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated.</p> <p>None</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| | | | <p>http://www.melton.gov.uk/directory_record/2460/scalford</p> <p>General comments SCA1 The SCA1 (MLP allocation) is not discussed in great detail within the NP allocations. It is at an important gateway to village and the impact of development here is particularly important. The NP may wish to add any further clarity such as design requirements for this development above the detail that exists in MLP site allocation policy SCAL1 to help shape the type of development that occurs there and help it to reflect local character.</p> <p>7.4 Traffic and transport The NP identified in this section local frustration to traffic from Twin Lakes as well as Scalford being used as a rat run to move around Melton Mowbray. Although not forming part of the NP policy, the NP may might wish to consider making reference to proposed by-pass that will link north Melton Mowbray from close to twin lakes to the Nottingham road, this once complete is likely to have a significant positive impact on this aspect of local problem traffic and it would help local people understand that their concerns are being addressed by wider local planning policy.</p> <p>POLICY TR2 Technology is still developing in this area and NP may wish to reconsider whether specifying 7kw cabling or higher is best way to achieve ambitions for electric charging points. 7kw cabling may add to total development costs and negatively impact overall viability. Over the</p> | <p>It is not considered necessary to reference more strongly policies in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Noted. This will be picked up on any NP review once the impact of this development is known.</p> <p>This policy reflects the direction of travel in national policy development, especially in the context of the current government consultation on providing cabling in new homes for electric cars, with a strong possibility that this will become part of building regs next year.</p> | <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>course of the NP optimum kw cabling may change as technology advances and battery requirements may change. Having policy that specifies the precise kw of cabling may therefore have unintended negative consequences. Cabling type is not specified within the local plan or the NPPF. 7kwh cabling is currently considered 'faster' charge cabling (around 4 hours) with 3.7kw cabling being slower charging (around 8 hours). The latter may actually be more suitable for residential properties given overnight charging opportunities and lower overnight network energy requirements, reflecting government long term ambitions for most recharging to be done overnight at the home when there is lower energy demand. The NP does not make any reference to there being sufficient capacity in the local network to support this policy of 7kw or higher cabling or indicate whether any discussions have occurred with the network operator regarding the feasibility of 7kw cabling installation. Consideration may need to be made to the wording of this to remove specific reference to 7kw cabling. However this then becomes a repetition of Melton Local Plan policy EN9 (8) (Charging points for electric cars). It is also noted that recent inspectors report for the Ab Kettleby Neighbourhood Plan recommended the removal of references to specific kw cabling requirements. The historic building pattern of Scalford means that a number of properties do not have off street parking. Over the longer term, as the country moves further towards electric charging vehicles, how local residents can safely charge their vehicles is likely to become a more significant local issue. Scalford no longer has a service station/garage for the purchase of fuel or potential future provision</p> | <p>Specific cabling for electric vehicles is currently 7kw and is likely to increase over the Plan period as technology advances.</p> <p>The Examiner for the Ab Kettleby Neighbourhood Plan deleted the policy on electric vehicles, however other policies supporting electric car charging have passed examination (see Saddington and Ashby de la Zouch Neighbourhood Plans).</p> <p>The Parish Council will explore potential funding opportunities in conjunction with other bodies but does not feel it necessary to introduce a Community Action along these lines.</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | <p>of fast charging electric points for public use. It is encouraging that the NP has recognised this issue, providing support of public accessible charging points. This policy could be further supported with a community action. For example for the Parish Council to investigate over the course of the NP period opportunities to support or seek grant funding to install charging points for example at communal car parking areas or within local businesses for use by the public and local residents, particularly those who are most likely to have visitors who travel by car.</p> <p>Support for existing businesses and employment – supporting text p57 Little reference to Scalford Hall (now known as Scalford Country House Hotel) or Scalford Court Care Home. Both are large employers within the NP area, the latter with plans approved to significantly expand. The NP may wish to consider undertaking consultation with Scalford Court residents to establish their views if it has not already done so</p> <p>Policy H1 – parking Due to the historic built form, there is a lack of off street parking in Scalford and off street car parking was an issue raised within the NP. Is the NPG satisfied that the parking requirements in H1 are sufficient to not add to on street parking. In rural areas where car use is typically higher it is not unusual to see higher parking requirements in NPs, NPG may wish to consider inclusion of 3 parking spaces for 3 rather than 4 bedroom dwellings or inclusion of visitor spaces.</p> <p>Employment and Infrastructure 7.4 Traffic and transport We would advise that the images of</p> | <p>It is considered that the general NP policies on employment are sufficient in this regard.</p> <p>We are satisfied that the specific provision in policy H1 is sufficient. The general policy requirement in policy TR1 leaves it open to applicants to demonstrate the need for parking and for a decision to be taken on the evidence provided.</p> | <p>None</p> <p>None</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|-------------------------|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | | <p>cars on page 55 may need to be disassociated with the text to the side of them especially with wording such as inconsiderate parking. I acknowledge that the number plates have been redacted however I feel that people in the village may still be aware of the owners therefore I would suggest the following either placing the pictures within an appendix as evidence or making the words and pictures less disassociate with a change of wording or image.</p> <p>Policy TR1 The last sentence below point e) would follow legislation and be less restrictive if the wording was changed to “Housing development will be supported if where possible they are designed around people rather the car. Alternatives should be provided where possible, including ample supply of footpaths, cycle ways and public transport”. Otherwise I feel that this may contradict the purpose of our housing strategy which is to implement housing growth.</p> <p>Policy TR2 Using the wording 7kW cabling is restricting to future development and the future prospects of electric vehicles, additionally to comply with Policy EN9 of the Melton local plan wording similar to “Charging points for electric cars.” Would be more appropriate to all kinds of development rather than the very specifics of 7Kw.</p> <p>Policy TR3 If the public rights of way are not within the realm of that development then the developer has no obligation to upgrade maintenance and extend any public rights of way within the development plan area. I am not sure how successful this policy will be</p> | <p>Noted. We will remove reference to inconsiderate parking and replace it with ‘some people park on pavements making it difficult to navigate wheelchairs and prams.’</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>The policy says ‘should’ rather than ‘must’ and is therefore not overly prescriptive.</p> <p>Noted, however the policy will apply where it is within the development site.</p> | <p>Change to be made as indicated</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|------|
| | | | <p>especially when the creation of public footpaths is already part of TR1.</p> <p>Policy BE1 The last line of of part b) “marketing campaign lasting for continuous period of at least 6 months” how will this be monitored and who will monitor this. Additionally, could you specify what justifies that specific time period?</p> | <p>The justification will need to be provided at planning application stage. The time period is justified in demonstrating that efforts have been made to continue employment on the site.</p> <p>This period has been successfully applied in Made NPs at many NPs in the Borough including Wymondham and Edmondthorpe, Clawson Hose and Harby, Waltham on the Wolds and Thorpe Arnold and many others elsewhere.</p> | None |
| | | | <p>Policy BE2 Point d) states “not involve the loss of dwellings” my question is what if it is a change of use from a dwelling to a business what will the stance of this policy be then, this could reduce the opportunities to for business growth.</p> | <p>The intention is to support business growth but not at the cost of existing homes.</p> | None |
| | | | <p>Policy BE4 point a) stated “the use proposed is appropriate to the tranquil rural location” what is going to be classed as appropriate and who will make this decision that it is deemed appropriate.</p> | <p>This will need to be demonstrated on application and determined by the Borough Council.</p> | None |
| | | | <p>Additionally part d) seems to contradict the whole point of this policy and that is to encourage growth and business which should be produced to be successful. Additionally some conversion of existing buildings may take the shape of restaurants or cafes which are very unlikely to be easily returned to farming use. This part of the policy may make the buildings that are produced of lower quality.</p> | <p>Part d) is about balance of harm versus benefit and will apply to new buildings and not conversions.</p> | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | | <p>Tourism (page 60) Scalford Hall Hotel place the latest update in the plan has the hotel now been opened as it is sated that it is due to reopen in 2019.</p> <p>Environment ENV1 109/110 could be classed as an extensive tract of land. The NP states that five sites have scored 60% (16/25) or more of the maximum possible however</p> <p>Appendix 8 shows that ‘Sheepwash field’ only scored 15. If this is the case, the site should be removed from Policy ENV1 ENV2 (Fig 6.1) Although not necessarily in conflict, the policy and the map identifies an area where the allocation is. The requirement indirectly imposed through ENV2 to the allocation might need to be watered down in order to avoid conflict with the site-specific policies in the Local Plan.</p> <p>ENV3 Figures 7.2 & 7.3 have not numbered the open spaces. Should this be done for clarity?</p> <p>ENV9 (figure 13) Viewpoint 2 may be in conflict with the Local Plan. We also consider that the policy is too restrictive “must not significantly harm their viewpoints”.</p> <p>Page 31 (figure 5) – Local Green Space Due to its detachment and size Fields 109 and 110 may be considered extensive tracks of land.</p> | <p>Noted. This will be changed.</p> <p>Much larger sites adjoining much smaller communities have been designated as local green space in other neighbourhood plans – see Hungarton; Thurcaston and Cropston and North kilworth</p> <p>The scoring has been checked and the field scores sufficiently to justify its designation as a Local Green Space. The scoring has been amended.</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>The policy wording has passed examination in other NPs (see Medbourne and Arnesby) so it is not agreed that this is too restrictive. View 2 follows the line of the road into Scalford. The hedges and lie of the land frame the view and development should be sensitive to this.</p> <p>Much larger sites adjoining much smaller communities have been designated as local green space in</p> | <p>Change to be made as indicated.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated.</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>National guidance advises that LGS will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used where the green space is reasonably close to the community it serves; where it is demonstrably special to the local community, where it is local in character and is not an extensive area of land.</p> <p>ENV4 Only local planning authorities may identify non designated heritage assets. The PPG continues with the statement that a substantial majority of buildings have little or no heritage significance and thus do not constitute heritage assets. Only a minority have enough heritage interest for their significance to be a material consideration in the planning process. The Council is not in a position to include these in their list (at this stage)</p> <p>ENV5 The map shows extensive areas and further assessment may be required, in order to provide a justification to that level of protection for the whole area</p> <p>BE2 The policy creates a strong presumption against development outside the LTD, including existing buildings amongst which are existing businesses 'other forms of commercial/employment related development appropriate to a countryside location'. You may want to revisit this as it seems to be particularly vague.</p> <p>Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) The SEA Screening will be issued any time soon after the Regulation 14 consultation (Submission Plan). The screening opinion has been sent out to statutory consultees and the</p> | <p>other neighbourhood plans – see Hungarton; Thurcaston and Cropston and North kilworth</p> <p>This is not the case PPG says 'There are a number of processes through which non-designated heritage assets may be identified, including the local and neighbourhood plan-making processes' Para 040 ref ID 18a-040-20190723 revised 23 07 2019.</p> <p>The areas are graded for their significance and the policy requires the benefit to be balanced against the harm caused.</p> <p>The suitability of the development will be determined on application.</p> <p>Noted</p> | <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-------------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>Council is now seeking further advice from the Conservation Officer from the Council as a consequence of the comments from Historic England. Subject to substantial modifications, a new SEA screening opinion will need to be undertaken for or after the Regulation 16 consultation of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The community are congratulated for making considerable progress on the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Melton Borough Council again welcomes the opportunity for continued communication on the interlinking relationship between the Neighbourhood Plan and Melton Local Plan.</p> <p>Should you wish to discuss any of the points made in this correspondence, please do not hesitate to get in contact so that together we can progress towards a Neighbourhood Plan that will stand the test of examination and responds accordingly to the community's desire for suitable, sustainable development.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Jim Worley Assistant Director for Planning and Regulatory Services Melton Borough Council</p> | | |
| 7 | | | Leicestershire CC | <p>Scalford Neighbourhood Plan Comments Request – 15 June 2019</p> <p>Leicestershire County Council is supportive of the Neighbourhood plan process and welcome being included in this consultation.</p> <p>Highways Specific Comments Assessment of the acceptability of proposed site access arrangements will be undertaken once a planning application is submitted for consideration. Any necessary highway</p> | <p>Noted</p> <p>The following general comments are noted</p> | <p>None</p> <p>None</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | <p>mitigation borne out of new development would need to be fully funded by developer contributions. It should be noted that a new development should only mitigate its own residual impact; it cannot be expected for developers to mitigate existing concerns. The LHA would normally expect development proposals to comply with prevailing relevant national and local policies and guidance, both in terms of justification and of design</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>To be eligible for S106 contributions proposals must fulfil various legal criteria. Measures</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Where potential S106 measures would require future maintenance, which would be paid for from the County Council's funds, the measures would also need to be assessed against the County Council's other priorities and as such may not be maintained by the County Council or will require maintenance funding to be provided as a commuted sum.</p> <p>With regard to public transport, securing S106 contributions for public transport services will normally focus on larger developments, where there is a more realistic prospect of services being commercially viable once the contributions have stopped i.e. they would be able to operate without being supported from public funding.</p> <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</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>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> <p>Flood Risk Management Specific Comments The draft neighbourhood plan says in its the farm diversification policy (BE4) that no development should increase flood risk however this isn't in the policy for new housing development (H6)</p> <p>General Comments 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> <p>The LLFA is not able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent development where development sites are at low risk of flooding or can demonstrate appropriate flood risk mitigation. • Use existing flood risk to adjacent land to prevent | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>development. • Require development to resolve existing flood risk.</p> <p>When considering flood risk within the development of a neighbourhood plan, the LLFA would recommend consideration of the following points: • Locating development outside of river (fluvial) flood risk (Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)). • 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.</p> <p>All development will be required to restrict the discharge and retain surface water on site in line with current government policies. This should be undertaken through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Appropriate space allocation for SuDS features should be included within development sites when considering the housing density to ensure that the potential site will not limit the ability for good SuDS design to be carried out. Consideration should also be given to blue green corridors and how they could be used to improve the bio-diversity and amenity of new developments, including benefits to surrounding areas.</p> | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>Often ordinary watercourses and land drainage features (including streams, culverts and ditches) form part of development sites. The LLFA recommend that existing watercourses and land drainage (including watercourses that form the site boundary) are retained as open features along their original flow path and are retained in public open space to ensure that access for maintenance can be achieved. This should also be considered when looking at housing densities within the plan to ensure that these features can be retained.</p> <p>LCC, in its role as LLFA will not support proposals contrary to LCC policies.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Flood risk mapping is readily available for public use at the links below. The LLFA also holds information relating to historic flooding within Leicestershire that can be used to inform development proposals.</p> <p>Risk of flooding from surface water map: https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map Flood map for planning (rivers and sea): https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/</p> <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</p> | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>prudent to consider the inclusion of a developer contributions/planning obligations policy, along similar lines to those shown for example in the Adopted North Kilworth NP and the Adopted 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. North Kilworth Adopted Plan Great Glen Adopted Plan</p> <p>Mineral & Waste Planning The County Council is the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority; this means the council prepares the planning policy for minerals and waste development and also makes decisions on mineral and waste development.</p> <p>Although neighbourhood plans cannot include policies that cover minerals and waste development, it may be the case that your neighbourhood contains an existing or planned minerals or waste site. The County Council can provide information on these operations or any future development planned for your neighbourhood.</p> <p>You should also be aware of Mineral Consultation Areas, contained within the adopted Minerals Local Plan and Mineral and Waste Safeguarding proposed in the new Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Plan. These proposed safeguarding areas and existing Mineral Consultation Areas are there to ensure that non-waste and nonminerals</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>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> <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.</p> <p>It is recognised that it may not always be possible or appropriate to extend a local school to meet the needs of a development, or the size of a development would yield a new school. However, in the changing educational landscape, the Council retains a statutory duty to ensure that sufficient places are available in good schools within its area, for every child of school age whose parents wish them to have one.</p> <p>Property Strategic Property Services No comment at this time.</p> <p>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</p> | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | | <p>people which promotes that people should plan ahead for their later life, including considering downsizing, but recognising that people’s choices are often limited by the lack of suitable local options.</p> <p>Environment Specific Comments P6 – Just a small error: 2019 has been mistyped as 20019 in the third paragraph.</p> <p>P10 – States that around 16% of residents were aged under 16 which was above the national (19%), borough and regional (18%) rates. But shouldn’t this be below?</p> <p>P11 – Contradicts itself by stating (on the fifth line down) “which is in line with the region, lower than the region (14%)”.</p> <p>P12 – Section 4, point v. Mentions maintaining the character of the Parish and the safety of residents/visitors in relation to any potential increase in traffic volume but this could be expanded on to encompass the health of residents/visitors, as an increase in traffic volume would mean an increase in vehicle emissions.</p> <p>P22 – The paragraph beginning “Home ownership in Scalford...”. The content in the first and second sentences is repeated in the third sentence. In general, this paragraph seems a repeat – would you suggest it should be removed?</p> <p>P25 – First sentence. “ensure that” needs removing as it has been repeated.</p> | <p>Thank you for this comment.</p> <p>Thank you for pointing this out</p> <p>Thank you for pointing this out</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Noted. The paragraph will be reworded to remove the duplication.</p> <p>Agreed</p> | <p>Correction to be made as proposed.</p> <p>Correction to be made as proposed.</p> <p>The words will be replaced with ‘which is broadly in line’</p> <p>Change to be made as proposed.</p> <p>Change to be made as proposed.</p> <p>Change to be made as proposed.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | | <p>P45 – Under the “Important Views” section. In the second paragraph, of has been mistyped as “pf”.</p> <p>P48 – This section is strong in mentioning biodiversity protection for a range of wildlife including bats, birds and hedgehogs.</p> <p>There is a section dedicated to electric vehicles and their charging which is good and extremely relevant in relation to the Government’s intentions for the future of electric vehicles.</p> <p>There is no reference to wind power or solar power. It could be useful to mention these as the Government looks to move towards clean, green power.</p> <p>General Comments 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>Agreed</p> <p>Noted. Thank you for this comment</p> <p>Noted. The Qualifying Body decided that the Local Plan policy on Renewable Energy was sufficient</p> <p>These general comments are noted</p> | <p>Change to be made as proposed.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | <p>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’</p> <p>Advisory Document (2006) published by English Heritage.</p> <p>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.</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>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</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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. 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</p> | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>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</p> <p>Practice for the sustainable use of soils on construction sites which could be helpful to neighbourhood planning groups in preparing environmental policies.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>to off-set the impact have to be initiated. Contributions to fund these projects are requested in accordance with Leicestershire’s Planning Obligations Policy and the Community Infrastructure Legislation Regulations.</p> <p>Communities Consideration of community facilities is a positive facet of Neighbourhood Plans that reflects the importance of these facilities within communities and can proactively protect and develop facilities to meet the needs of people in local communities. Neighbourhood Plans provide an opportunity to;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Carry out and report on a review of community facilities, groups and allotments and their importance with your community. 2. Set out policies that seek to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protect and retain these existing facilities, • support the independent development of new facilities, and, • identify and protect Assets of Community Value and provide support for any existing or future designations. 3. Identify and support potential community projects that could be progressed. <p>You are encouraged to consider and respond to all aspects of community resources as part of the Neighbourhood Planning process. Further information, guidance and examples of policies and supporting information is available at www.leicestershirecommunities.org.uk/np/useful-information.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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/equalitystrategy2016-2020.pdf</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|------------------|---|-------|------|
| | | | | NIK GREEN (MRS) Policy Officer E: neighbourhoodplanning@leics.gov.uk 29 July 2019 | | |
| 8 | | | Highways England | <p>Consultation on the Draft Version of the Scalford Parish Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>We welcome the opportunity to comment on the Scalford Parish Draft Neighbourhood Plan which has been produced for public consultation and covers the Plan period 2019 to 2036. The document provides a vision for the future of the area and sets out a number of key objectives and planning policies which will be used to help determine planning applications.</p> <p>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 our role to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. In relation to the Scalford Parish Neighbourhood Plan, our principal interest is in safeguarding the A46, A52 and A1 Trunk Roads which route about 8 miles west, 10 miles north and 12 miles east of the Plan area.</p> <p>We understand that a Neighbourhood Plan is required to be in conformity with relevant national and Borough-wide planning policies. Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan for the Parish of Scalford is required to be in conformity with the adopted Melton Local Plan (2011-2036) and this is acknowledged within the document.</p> | Noted | None |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | <p>We note that the Neighbourhood Plan covers the villages of Scalford, Chadwell and Wycomb. We understand that except for Scalford which is classified as Service Village and has an allocated housing target of 36 dwellings, the adopted Melton Local Plan contains no specific housing provision for the remainder of the Plan area.</p> <p>It is noted that the Scalford Parish has already met this residual requirement with 43 dwellings already being built or receiving planning approval by March 2017. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges that there is currently no outstanding residual requirement for Scalford in the period to 2036.</p> <p>Registered office Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford GU1 4LZ Highways England Company Limited registered in England and Wales number 09346363</p> <p>However, to ensure the delivery of the housing requirements for the Parish, Policy H1 also allocates two sites of 6 and 2 dwellings respectively, which have been recently granted planning permission.</p> <p>Due to the small scale of development growth being proposed, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the operation of the SRN.</p> <p>We therefore have no further comments to provide and trust the above is useful in the progression of the Scalford Parish Neighbourhood Plan.</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|------------------|---|--------------------------------|------|
| | | | | <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Scarlett Griffiths Spatial Planning & Economic Development Team Email: Scarlett.Griffiths@highwaysengland.co.uk</p> | | |
| 9 | | | Natural England | <p>Salford Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 15 June 2019</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk. Yours sincerely Matthew Dean Consultations Team</p> | Noted | None |
| 10 | | | Historic England | Neighbourhood Plan for Salford Parish | This general response is noted | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>Thank you for consulting Historic England about your Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The area covered by your Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of important designated heritage assets. In line with national planning policy, it will be important that the strategy for this area safeguards those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets so that they can be enjoyed by future generations of the area.</p> <p>If you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the planning and conservation team at your local planning authority together with the staff at the county council archaeological advisory service who look after the Historic Environment Record. They should be able to provide details of the designated heritage assets in the area together with locally-important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may also be available on-line via the Heritage Gateway (www.heritagegateway.org.uk) http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk). It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as the local Civic Society or local historic groups in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Historic England has produced advice which your community might find helpful in helping to identify what it is about your area which makes it distinctive and how you might go about ensuring that the character of the area is retained. These can be found at:-</p> <p>https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|----------------|---|-------|------|
| | | | | <p><u>neighbourhood/></u></p> <p>You may also find the advice in <i>“Planning for the Environment at the Neighbourhood Level”</i> useful. This has been produced by Historic England, Natural England, the Environment Agency and the Forestry Commission. As well as giving ideas on how you might improve your local environment, it also contains some useful further sources of information. This can be downloaded from:</p> <p><u><http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf></u></p> <p>If you envisage including new housing allocations in your plan, we refer you to our published advice available on our website, “Housing Allocations in Local Plans” as this relates equally to neighbourhood planning. This can be found at <u><https://content.historicengland.org.uk/image_s-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/heag074-he-and-site-allocation-local-plans.pdf/></u></p> <p>If you have any queries about this matter or would like to discuss anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> | | |
| 11 | | | Coal Authority | <p><u>Scalford Neighbourhood Plan – Draft</u></p> <p>Thank you for the notification of the 17 June 2019 consulting The Coal Authority on the above NDP.</p> <p>The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body which works to protect the public and the environment in coal mining areas. Our statutory role in the planning system is to provide advice about new development in the</p> | Noted | None |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|---------------|--|-------|------|
| | | | | <p>coalfield areas and also protect coal resources from unnecessary sterilisation by encouraging their extraction, where practical, prior to the permanent surface development commencing.</p> <p>As you will be aware the Neighbourhood Plan lies within the defined coalfield. However, it does not contain any surface coal resources or recorded risks from past coal mining activity at shallow depth.</p> <p>On this basis the Coal Authority has no specific comments to make in respect of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Melanie Lindsley</p> <p>Melanie Lindsley <i>BA (Hons), DipEH, DipURP, MA, PGCertUD, PGCertSP, MRTPI</i> Development Team Leader (Planning)</p> | | |
| 12 | | | Network Rail. | <p>Scalford Parish, Draft Neighbourhood Plan - Statutory Consultation period - 17 June - 29 July 2019</p> <p>Network Rail has no comments to make.</p> <p>Kind Regards, Network Rail</p> | Noted | None |