

# **Saddington Parish Neighbourhood Plan**

## **Submission Version 2018 – 2031**

**Report of Examination**

**July 2018**

**Undertaken for Harborough District Council with the support of Saddington Parish Neighbourhood Forum on the submission version of the plan.**



**Independent Examiner:**

Liz Beth BA (Hons) MA Dip Design in the Built Environment MRTPI

## Contents

Summary .....	3
<u>1.</u> Introduction and Background .....	4
1.1 Neighbourhood Development Plans .....	4
1.2 Independent Examination .....	4
1.3 Planning Policy Context .....	6
<u>2.</u> Plan Preparation and Consultation .....	7
2.1 Pre-submission Process and Consultation .....	7
2.2 Regulation 16 Consultation Responses .....	8
3. Compliance with the Basic Conditions .....	9
4. Compliance with National Policy and the adopted Development Plan .....	11
5. The Referendum Boundary .....	21

### **Abbreviations used in the text of this report:**

The Saddington Parish Neighbourhood Plan is referred to as ‘the Plan’ or ‘Saddington NP’.

Saddington Parish Neighbourhood Forum is abbreviated to ‘Saddington PNF’ or ‘qualifying body’.

Harborough District Council is abbreviated to ‘Harborough DC’ or the Local Planning Authority ‘LPA’.

The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) is abbreviated to ‘NPPF’.

The National Planning Practice Guidance is abbreviated to ‘NPPG’.

The Harborough Core Strategy 2011 is abbreviated to ‘HCS2011’.

## Summary

- I have undertaken the examination of the Saddington Parish Neighbourhood Plan during July 2018 and detail the results of that examination in this report.
- The Saddington Parish Neighbourhood Forum have undertaken extensive consultation on this Plan, and it complies with legislative requirements. The Plan is well researched and comprehensive in its coverage, while always locally relevant. The Harborough Core Strategy 2011 provides a comprehensive strategic policy framework.
- I have considered the comments made at the Regulation 16 Publicity Stage, and where relevant these have to an extent informed some of the recommended modifications.
- All proposed policies have remained in after this examination, although I did not consider the evidence for Policy ENV3 sufficiently strong to justify the inclusion of many of the proposed sites.
- Subject to the modifications recommended, the Plan meets the basic conditions and may proceed to referendum.
- I recommend the referendum boundary is the designated neighbourhood plan area.

**Acknowledgements:** Thanks to Local Authority and qualifying body staff for their assistance with this examination. My compliments to the Saddington Parish Neighbourhood Forum, who have produced a locally responsive and very readable Plan.

# 1. Introduction and Background

## 1.1 Neighbourhood Development Plans

1.1.1 The Localism Act 2011 empowered local communities to develop planning policy for their area by drawing up neighbourhood plans. For the first time, a community-led plan that is successful at referendum becomes part of the statutory development plan for their planning authority.

1.1.2 Giving communities greater control over planning policy in this way is intended to encourage positive planning for sustainable development. The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF) states that:

“neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and deliver the sustainable development they need”.

Further advice on the preparation of neighbourhood plans is contained in the Government’s Planning Practice Guidance website:

<http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/neighbourhood-planning/>

1.1.3 Neighbourhood plans can only be prepared by a ‘qualifying body’, and in Saddington that is the Saddington Parish Neighbourhood Forum. Drawing up the neighbourhood plan was undertaken by the Forum Management Committee, working to the Saddington PNF.

## 1.2 Independent Examination

1.2.1 Once Saddington PNF had prepared their neighbourhood plan and consulted on it, they submitted it to Harborough DC. After publicising the plan with a further opportunity for comment, Harborough DC were required to appoint an Independent Examiner, with the agreement of the qualifying body to that appointment.

1.2.2 I have been appointed to be the Independent Examiner for this plan. I am a chartered Town Planner with over thirty years of local authority and voluntary sector planning experience in development management, planning policy and project management. I have been working with communities for many years, and have recently concentrated on supporting groups producing neighbourhood plans. I have been appointed through the Neighbourhood Plan Independent Examiners Referral Service (NPIERS). I am independent of any local connections to Saddington and Harborough DC, and have no conflict of interest that would exclude me from examining this plan.

1.2.3 As the Independent Examiner I am required to produce this report and recommend either:

- (a) That the neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum without changes; or
- (b) That modifications are made and that the modified neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum; or
- (c) That the neighbourhood plan does not proceed to a referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.

1.2.4 The legal requirements are firstly that the Plan meets the 'Basic Conditions', which I consider in sections 3 and 4 below. The Plan also needs to meet the following requirements under Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990:

- It has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body;
- It has been prepared for an area that has been properly designated by the Local Planning Authority;
- It specifies the period during which it has effect;
- It does not include provisions and policies for excluded development;
- It does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area.

The Neighbourhood Plan complies with the requirements of Paragraph 8(1). The Neighbourhood Area was designated on the 18<sup>th</sup> July 2016 by Harborough DC, at the same time as the Neighbourhood Forum was designated. The plan does not relate to land outside the designated Neighbourhood Area. It specifies the period during which it has effect as 2018 – 2031 and has been submitted and prepared by a qualifying body, the Saddington Parish Neighbourhood Forum. It does not include policies about excluded development; effectively mineral and waste development or strategic infrastructure.

1.2.5 I made an unaccompanied site visit to Saddington to familiarise myself with the area and visit relevant sites and areas affected by the policies. This examination has been dealt with by written representations, as I did not consider a hearing necessary.

1.2.6 I am also required to consider whether the referendum boundary should be extended beyond the designated area, should the Plan proceed to a referendum. I make my recommendation on this in section 5 at the end of this report.

## 1.3 Planning Policy Context

1.3.1 The Development Plan for Harborough District, not including documents relating to excluded mineral and waste development, is the Harborough Core Strategy 2006 – 2028 adopted in 2011, and saved policies from the Harborough District Local Plan 2001. There is a new local plan currently at examination, but as an emerging plan it is not yet part of the formal development plan, and therefore not policy that the Basic Conditions require the Saddington NP to be in general conformity with. The Core Strategy Policies are considered strategic for the purposes of the Basic Conditions.

1.3.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out government planning policy for England, and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) website offers guidance on how this policy should be implemented. Although the NPPF has been updated during this examination, that document makes clear (para 214 of Appendix 1 and footnote 69) that neighbourhood plans submitted before January 2019 will need to have regard to the previous 2012 version of the NPPF – which I have continued to use for the purposes of this examination.

1.3.3 During my examination of the Saddington NP I have considered the following documents:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012 (*updated version does not apply*)
- National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 and as updated
- Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
- Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
- The Localism Act 2011
- The Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 (as amended)
- Submission version of the Saddington Parish Neighbourhood Plan
- The Basic Conditions Statement submitted with the Saddington NP
- The Consultation Statement submitted with the Saddington NP
- Housing Needs Report Oct2016 for the Saddington NP
- The Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Determination for the Saddington NP
- The Harborough Local Plan Habitats Regulations Assessment August 2017
- Neighbourhood Area Designation (map)
- Harborough District Core Strategy 2006 – 2028
- Harborough District Local Plan 2001 Saved Policies
- Area of Separation Review 2017 Landscape Partnership for Harborough District Council
- Turning the Plough Update Assessment 2012 Gloucester CC for English Heritage
- Representations received during the publicity period (reg16 consultation)

## 2. Plan Preparation and Consultation

### 2.1 Pre-submission Process and Consultation

2.1.1 Saddington is a village in an otherwise rural parish in the County of Leicestershire, about 10 miles south of Leicester. The terrain is undulating with the Grand Union Canal partly in a tunnel, and an associated reservoir for water supplies. Saddington is a hilltop village in a mainly pastoral landscape.

2.1.2 Saddington has a Parish Meeting, but not a Parish Council, and a Parish Meeting is not a qualifying body. An application for designation as a neighbourhood planning forum was made therefore to Harborough DC on the 4<sup>th</sup> May 2016, who consulted on the application for six weeks. The Forum was approved after the consultation period by the Portfolio Holder for Planning Services on the 18<sup>th</sup> July 2016.

2.1.3 The Forum was initiated with an invite sent to every household and business in the parish, which resulted in 40 residents and 4 employees applying to join. The Forum Management Committee (FMC) that was set up to undertake the main work on production of the Plan had five officers appointed by the Forum, and no limit on the number of other members on the committee. Minutes of the Saddington PNF meetings were posted on the Saddington NP website.

2.1.4 The Consultation Statement sets out the nature and form of consultation prior to the formal Reg14 six week consultation. Letters were sent early in the process to stakeholders that included neighbouring parish councils, statutory consultees, local businesses and a landowner, and bodies representing people with protected characteristics and other voluntary organisations operating in the neighbourhood area.

2.1.5 A questionnaire was distributed to every household, and made available online early in 2017, 45% of households responded to it. The key issues identified by the responses led to three theme groups being set up to draft policies, and later in 2017 a second community open event consulted on the draft policies.

2.1.6 The Saddington PNF formally approved a pre-submission version of the Plan on the 14<sup>th</sup> November 2017 for the formal six week consultation required by regulation 14 (Reg14) of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. This ran from the 20<sup>th</sup> November 2017 to the 12<sup>th</sup> January 2018, and all stakeholders and residents and businesses in Saddington were informed about it.

2.1.7 Representations were received from residents, statutory bodies and developers during the Reg14 consultation period, and several amendments have been made to the plan as a result of constructive suggestions for changes. I am satisfied that due process has been followed during the consultation undertaken on the Plan. The Consultation Statement details all consultation activities, and the record of comments and objections received during the regulation 14 consultation shows that these were properly considered, and where appropriate resulted in amendments to the plan to accommodate points raised.

2.1.8 The Saddington PNF agreed the post-Reg14 changes to the Plan on the 15<sup>th</sup> February 2018. The amended plan, together with a Basic Conditions Statement, a Consultation Statement, the Screening Opinion and a plan showing the neighbourhood area was then submitted to Harborough DC on the 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2018.

## **2.2 Regulation 16 Consultation Responses**

2.2.1 Harborough DC undertook the Reg 16 consultation and publicity on the Saddington NP for six weeks, from the 11<sup>th</sup> April 2018 to the 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2018. Nine representations were received during this consultation, including four statutory bodies making no specific comments but offering generic advice. Leicestershire County Council offered detailed advice, at too late a stage to be as useful as it may have been earlier. Anglian Water offered support for Policies H2 and ENV10.

2.2.2 Two national housebuilding companies and the LPA have made comments, often in some detail, on individual policies and the Plan generally. Issues they raise that are pertinent to my consideration of whether the Plan meets the basic conditions are considered in sections 3 and 4 of this report below.



### 3. Compliance with the Basic Conditions.

3.1 General legislative requirements of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA) other than the Basic Conditions are set out in paragraph 1.2.4 above. The same section of this report considers that the Saddington NP has complied with these requirements. What this examination must now consider is whether the Plan complies with the Basic Conditions, which state it must:

- Have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- Be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area; and
- Be compatible with and not breach European Union (EU) obligations and human rights law.

3.2 The Basic Conditions Statement discusses how the Plan promotes the social, economic and environmental goals of sustainable development. Social goals are met by allocation of land for new housing. Environmental sustainability is promoted with the protection and conservation of the natural and historic environment, and economic sustainability with the support for the rural economy and small scale business development. The Plan is positively promoting development in the parish despite having no formal housing allocation in the development plan. I accept that the Plan does contribute to sustainable development in line with the Basic Conditions.

3.3 A screening opinion determination has been issued by Harborough DC which considers whether Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is required for the Saddington NP. This document (page 16 and table Appendix 3) also considers whether Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) is required for the Plan, and determines that it is not. Both the Core Strategy and emerging Local Plan have had full HRA screening undertaken, which has determined that the higher level plans do not have likely significant environmental effects on any Natura 2000 site and further HRA is not required. There are no Natura 2000 sites within Harborough District, and Natura 2000 sites beyond the district boundary are at a distance where indirect impact is not likely. The SEA Screening Determination decided that SEA was not needed, and states that (page 64):

“The table above has demonstrated that in the opinion on the Local Planning Authority the policies of the Saddington Parish Neighbourhood Plan do not give potential for significant detrimental effects on local historic or environmental sites, Natura 2000 sites, or Habitat Regulations.”

These environmental requirements in EU law are the main EU Directives that neighbourhood plans need to comply with.

3.4 The Saddington NP in my view complies with Human Rights Legislation. It has not been challenged with regard to this, and the Basic Conditions Statement recognised that consulting with a wide cross-section of the community guards against unintentional negative impacts on particular people and interest groups.

## 4. Compliance with National Policy and the adopted Development Plan

4.1 The final and most complex aspect of the Basic Conditions to consider is whether the Saddington NP meets the requirements as regards national policy and the development plan. This means firstly that the Plan must have regard to national policy and guidance, which for this neighbourhood plan is the NPPF (2012 version) and the NPPG. Secondly the Plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan. The phrase 'general conformity' allows for some flexibility. If I determine that the Plan as submitted does not comply with the Basic Conditions, I may recommend modifications that would rectify the non-compliance.

4.2 The Plan and its policies are considered below in terms of whether they comply with the Basic Conditions as regards national policy and the development plan. If not, then modifications required to bring the plan into conformity are recommended.

Modifications are boxed in this report, with text to *remain in italics*, new text **highlighted in Bold** and text to be deleted ~~shown but struck through~~. Instructions for alterations are underlined.

4.3 The format of the Plan is clear and the content is generally land-use based. A separate 'Community Actions' section sets out proposals for future projects in the parish, as is required by the Neighbourhood Planning Regs 2012. It has been suggested that numbered paragraphs would make references to the document clearer, but this is not a Basic Conditions issue. Some updating of the text is required, but again this is something that can be agreed after this examination and is not a Basic Conditions issue.

4.4 **Policy H1: Residential Site Allocations** There is no formal housing allocation for Saddington in the Development Plan or the emerging Local Plan, and development in rural settlements such as Saddington is strictly controlled in the HCS2011. The emerging local plan suggests that housing to meet local needs will be acceptable in rural settlements, and the Forum has undertaken with consultants a Housing Needs Report to assess the housing needed. A site allocation assessment then looked at available sites, and two allocations have been made with guidance on the type of housing that will meet local need. The allocations are therefore an example of positive planning in a neighbourhood plan. They are of a small size suited to the scale and setting of the village, and Policy H1 complies with the Basic Conditions.

**4.5 Policy H2: Limits to Development** The Plan has defined a new settlement boundary using coherent and stated criteria. It is based on the boundary in the HCS2011, but extended to include the designated sites and other small areas consistent with the new criteria. It has been criticised as not being consistent with the emerging Local Plan's discarding of settlement boundaries, but the emerging Local Plan is not relevant strategic policy for the purposes of this examination as it is not yet adopted and part of the development plan. Even if it were, that it does not set boundaries does not automatically mean that neighbourhood plans may not.

4.5.1 An amendment could be made to bullet point g), which does not need the first phrase, but this is not a Basic Conditions issue. The policy complies with the Basic Conditions.

**4.6 Policy H3: Housing Mix** The evidence for this policy comes mainly from Census data, as presented in the Housing Needs Report for the parish that was undertaken in 2016. The evidence suggests under-occupation of larger (4 bed or more) homes in Saddington, particularly by households of older people, and larger homes are a greater percentage of the housing stock in the village than in the rest of Harborough district or nationally. The aging population in the district is projected to rise substantially as a percentage of the whole population during the life of the Plan, and I am satisfied that the evidence base is an adequate basis for the identified housing mix. The policy also supports new residential development meeting local needs.

4.6.1 The Policy is not very clear at present though on mobility standards to be used, and it has been pointed out that the county needs assessment 2017 referred to is incorrectly referenced. There is a recognised standard from the Building Regulations Part M 2016 commonly used to define a building built to accessible standards, which in this context I consider an acceptable use of technical standards within a neighbourhood plan. Thus for the clarity and accuracy required of Policy by the NPPF 2012 (para 154), I recommend Policy H3 is amended as shown in Modification 1.

**Modification 1:** Policy H3 is recommended to be altered as follows:

*New housing development proposals should provide a mixture of housing types specifically to meet identified local needs in Saddington. Development should deliver more than 50% of the units as 3-bed or fewer (which can include accommodation for older people which should be built to the **M4(2) Building Regulations 2016 standard or any future standard updating this).** ~~recognised mobility/wheelchair standard).~~*

*All proposals will be expected to demonstrate how the proposal will meet the current and future housing needs of the parish as evidenced in the Parish Housing Needs Survey Report 2016 and the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing and Employment Development Needs **Assessment Analysis** 2017 or any more recent document updating either of these reports.*

**4.7 Policy H4: Brownfield Sites** The Policy does not read clearly as currently framed, and the phrase ‘high environmental significance’ is imprecise. Clarification on intent was sought by me from the qualifying body, and in order that the Policy has the clarity required by the NPPF and meets the Basic Conditions, I recommend that it is amended as shown in Modification 2.

**Modification 2:** Policy H4 to be reworded as follows:

*Development proposals for the redevelopment or change of use of redundant land or buildings within the Limits to Development will be supported but ~~provided it is not of a high environmental significance.~~ **development on redundant land of high ecological value will not be supported, unless policies in the development plan that conserve and enhance ecological value are complied with.***

**4.8 Policy H5: Building Design Principles** The Policy sets out development guidelines well, but there is a small correction needed to bullet d) in order that the sense makes it clear that existing biodiversity on a site is to be enhanced, not extra biodiversity added. Again in order to have the clarity required by the NPPF I recommend the Policy is amended as shown in Modification 3.

**Modification 3:** Bullet point d) in Policy H5 is recommended to be altered as shown:

*d) Development should ~~be enhanced by~~ biodiversity and relate well to the topography of the area, with existing trees, boundaries and hedges preserved whenever possible.*

**4.9 Policy H6: Use of Street Lighting** The policy justification includes reference to saving energy and guidance on reducing light pollution in the NPPF, and there is a benefit to wildlife from low light levels mentioned in the Policy itself. However the reference to ‘no additional street lighting within Saddington village’ is dealing with a potential highway safety issue, which is not landuse. The Highway Authority will need to be free to make decisions on highway lighting, and so in order that the Policy meets the Basic Conditions I recommend that Policy H6 is amended as shown in Modification 4.

**Modification 4:** The third sentence of Policy H6 to be deleted. The fourth sentence to be amended as follows:

*Any new or replacement street lights or curtilage lights **are strongly encouraged to ~~should~~ use LED (or better, for low energy and lifetime) sources and be adequately shaded to prevent upwards light-spill.***

**4.10 Policy ENV1: Area of Separation** The policy has been criticised as having no evidence to support it, and including an area of land granted for residential development on appeal. The latter point is correct, and the boundaries of the Area of Separation will need to be modified to exclude this recent planning permission. However the principle of Areas of Separation has been acknowledged and used by the LPA for several decades, and is supported by Policy CS1 in the HCS2011. A recent review of Areas of Separation in the district, commissioned by the LPA in 2017, accepts that neighbourhood plans in the district may also consider areas of separation, and in some instances have already done so (page 1).

4.10.1 The separation of the neighbouring larger settlement of Fleckney with Saddington Village is about 800m at its closest, and visually both settlements can be clearly seen across reasonably level

land that rises up towards Saddington. The recent planning permission will reduce the separation further, and I accept that the proposed Area of Separation meets the criteria for definition in the Harborough study (page 4-5). The rural setting of Saddington is important for its overall character. The proposed Area of Separation is much wider at the boundary with Fleckney, but around Saddington the limits to development policy, and the location of land within countryside where development is more strictly controlled makes this a reasonable definition. However the boundary cannot include the recent planning permission for residential development on the edge of Fleckney (Ref 16/01355/FUL). This has been deemed compliant with strategic policy at national and district level on appeal, and the designation of the Area of Separation therefore needs to exclude it in order to comply with the Basic Conditions. I recommend that Figure 6 that shows the designation of the Area of Separation is amended as set out in Modification 5.

**Modification 5:** Figure 6 to be amended so that the Area of Separation boundary no longer includes land subject to planning permission ref 16/01355/FUL and included in the red outline to that permission.

**4.11 Policy ENV2: Local Green Spaces** The policy has proposed three areas of green space for designation. An assessment has been made of many ‘parcels of open land’ in the parish, and 26 were identified as having notable natural, historical or cultural features. The sites were scored using the nine criteria in the NPPF, although in fact there is no intention that spaces must score highly on all the criteria. Four areas were considered to have scored highly enough to be worthy of designation, the highest scoring, the churchyard, being discounted as it was already protected. The identification of the most special green areas is thus missing the churchyard, a pity as designation in my view is as much about identifying the special green spaces as protecting them.

4.11.1 I consider all of the three proposed areas for designation acceptable. Although the Bullbeds field is more extensive than the other two, it has historic gravel workings within it, as well as remnant ridge and furrow medieval field systems. The latter are a particular local feature, Saddington Parish is featured in the ‘Turning the Plough’ Update Study from English Heritage. The policy speaks of development needing to not have an adverse effect on the Local Green Space (LGS) ‘or their settings’. This amounts to an unacceptable extension of the protection offered to these special green spaces beyond the designated boundary, and is contrary to the NPPF policy with

regard to LGS. In order that Policy ENV2 meets the Basic Conditions therefore, I recommend it is amended as shown in Modification 6.

**Modification 6:** The first sentence of Policy ENV2 is recommended to be amended as follows:

*Development proposals that would result in the loss of, or have an adverse effect on, the following Designated Local Green Spaces (refer to Figure 7 with map and details below), ~~or their settings~~, will not be permitted other than in very special circumstances:*

**4.12 Policy ENV3: Protection of Sites and Features of Environmental Significance** I asked for clarification on the sites to be protected in this policy, and received a table reducing the number of potential sites to 26, including the three designated LGS sites. The sites identified in the new table are often a complete field, and the wildlife score not high, with details of the habitat wildlife interest sketchy. There is a separate policy looking to protect fields with significant remnant ridge and furrow, and Policy ENV5 protects local wildlife sites and green corridors. I do not consider most of the sites listed to meet the criteria for a site of environmental significance on the evidence provided. Although parts of them may have worthy features, designating a whole field because of this is too restrictive. Consequently there is not the evidence required by the NPPG (Ref ID: 41-040-20160211) for Policy ENV3 to meet the Basic Conditions in its current format. The description of Saddington Reservoir and St Helen’s Churchyard do indicate environmental significance, and as the LGS sites are protected by Policy ENV2, I recommend that the policy is revised to protect these two sites only, as shown in Modification 7, in order that it complies with the Basic Conditions.

**Modification 7:** Policy ENV3 is recommended to be revised as follows:

~~29 further~~ **The following sites shown on figure 8 (environmental inventory, appendix 5, and map Figure 8 below)** have been identified as being of local significance for biodiversity (species and habitats) and / or history. They are important in their own right and are locally valued. Development proposals that affect them will be expected to protect or enhance the identified features.

**Saddington Reservoir**

**St Helen’s Churchyard**

Figure 8 to be amended to show these two sites only. Supporting text to be amended to refer to the environmental inventory as evidence for Policy ENV5.



4.13 **Policy ENV4: Important Open Spaces** The policy identifies areas of important open space in the village of Saddington and they are shown adequately on figure 9. However the two sites to be designated as LGS also included in this policy need to be removed for the clarity of policy required by the NPPF. Policy ENV4 allows for replacement of an Important Open Space if an acceptable alternative is provided, which is not compatible with Policy ENV2 designating LGS. I recommend that Figure 9 is amended and the LGS sites removed in order that it meets the Basic Conditions with regard to clarity of policy for the designated LGS sites as shown in Modification 8. Policy ENV4 also needs to be corrected with the superfluous 'or' in the last line removed.

**Modification 8:** Figure 9 to be altered to remove the two Local Green Spaces currently shown on it (numbered 171 and 172). The text of Section 7.2.5 to remove reference to these two sites being protected as Important Open Space.

4.14 **Policy ENV5: Biodiversity and Wildlife Corridors** Complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.15 **Policy ENV6: Local Heritage Assets of Historical and Architectural Interest** The Policy has an evidence base (Appendix 9) that identifies nine buildings and features as having local heritage importance, with a good description of each one. The Policy needs to identify this Appendix for the clarity required of policy by the NPPF (para 154) in order that it complies with the Basic Conditions. I recommend therefore that Policy ENV5 is altered as shown in Modification 9.

**Modification 9:** Policy ENV6 is recommended to be altered as follows:

*Development proposals that affect ~~an identified~~ non-designated building or structure of local historical or architectural interest **identified in Appendix 9**, or its setting, will be expected to conserve or enhance the character, integrity and setting of that building or structure.*

4.16 **Policy ENV7: Ridge and Furrow** Complies with the Basic Conditions. The text at one point needs correcting from mentioning 'Arnesby' instead of 'Saddington'.

**4.17 Policy ENV8: Important Views** The policy is based on a survey of viewpoints in the parish, and illustrated in figure 14. As a hilltop village, Saddington's views are an important feature of the village landscape and character. However it is only public views that can be considered a landuse and landscape issue, and the list of views in Policy ENV8 does not always make this clear. Thus in order that the policy deals with landuse issues, as required by legislation and The NPPG (Ref ID: 41-004-20170728), and complies with the Basic Conditions, I recommend that it is amended as shown in Modification 10.

**Modification 10:** Policy ENV8 is recommended to be altered as shown:

*Development proposals should respect the open **public** views and vistas identified below and in figure 14:*

- a) **Public** views south to northwest from field 094 and Mowsley Road/Saddington Hall at the western edge of the village over extensive open countryside
- b) **Public** views northeast to east from field 026 into the village and over open countryside toward Fleckney, mainly grassland with hedges and trees
- c) Views east and southeast from various publicly accessible locations (including public house garden) over the valley of Langton Brook and an ornamental lake with wooded banks (parcel 136) and Saddington Reservoir (172) to the high ground marking the southern parish boundary
- d) Panoramic **public** views northwest to east from field 037 into east Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, etc., over the canal and open countryside
- e) **Public** views north and east from field 165 and Mowsley Road over the Langton Brook valley toward Saddington village (northwards) and the reservoir and open countryside (east)
- f) **The Public** view southeast from footpath Z91 across valley meadows to the hillside incorporating fields 151 and 152.

**4.18 Policy ENV9: Footpaths and Bridleways** Complies with the Basic Conditions.

**4.19 Policy ENV10: Flooding** Complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.20 **Policy ENV11: Energy Generation and Conservation** Complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.21 **Policy CF1: The Retention of community Facilities and Amenities** Complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.22 **Policy CF2: New or Improved Community Facilities** In order that the policy has the clarity required by the NPPF (para 154), the wording needs to make clear that all of the criteria listed have to be complied with. I recommend therefore that in order to comply with the Basic Conditions, Policy CF2 is amended as explained in Modification 11.

**Modification 11:** Criteria c) of Policy CF2 is to have ‘; and’ added to the end of it to indicate that all of the criteria in the policy have to be met.

4.23 **Policy BE1: Support for Existing Employment Opportunities** Complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.24 **Policy BE2: Support for Existing Employment Opportunities** In order that the policy has the clarity required by the NPPF (para 154), the wording needs to make clear that all of the criteria listed have to be complied with. I recommend therefore that in order to comply with the Basic Conditions, Policy BE2 is amended as explained in Modification 12.

**Modification 12:** Criteria f) of Policy BE2 is to have ‘; and’ added to the end of it to indicate that all of the criteria in the policy have to be met. Criteria h) and i) should indicate more clearly that they are part of criteria g) with indentation and no additional labels, just bullets.

Policy BE2 in Section 9 to be amended to be the same as in the main text.

4.25 **Policy BE3: Working from Home** Complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.26 **Policy BE4: Re-Use of Agricultural and Commercial Buildings** Complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.27 **Policy BE5: Tourism** Complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.28 **Policy BE6: Broadband Infrastructure** Complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.29 **Policy T1: Traffic Management** In order that the policy has the clarity required by the NPPF, the wording needs to make clear that all of the criteria listed have to be complied with. I recommend therefore that in order to comply with the Basic Conditions, Policy T1 is amended as explained in Modification 13.

**Modification 13:** Criteria d) of Policy T1 is to have ‘; and’ added to the end of it to indicate that all of the criteria in the policy have to be met.

## 5. The Referendum Boundary

5.1 The Saddington Parish Neighbourhood Plan has no policy or proposals that have a significant enough impact beyond the designated Neighbourhood Plan Boundary that would require the referendum boundary to extend beyond the Plan boundary. I have considered Policy ENV1 Area of Separation (as modified) carefully as part of my deliberations, but consider that the impact of this policy on nearby properties outside of the Saddington Parish boundary is not significant for the purposes of the definition of the referendum boundary. Therefore I recommend that the boundary for the purposes of any future referendum on the Saddington Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2031 shall be the boundary of the designated Neighbourhood Area for the Plan.