

Cosby Neighbourhood Plan

Summary of Responses received at Regulation 16 stage (submission)

The following table sets out a summary of responses received to the submission consultation of the Cosby Neighbourhood Plan and seeks to comply with Regulation 4(3)(b)(iii) of The Neighbourhood Planning (Referendums) Regulations 2012. All of the responses received were considered by the Examiner when preparing his assessment of, and recommended modifications to, the Cosby Neighbourhood Plan.

The following summary of comments received reflects the views put forward by respondents. They have been abridged as faithfully as possible to ensure that the essence of the original representation is maintained.

Blaby District Council, October 2022.

Respondent	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of Response
Natural England	Comment	Provided an introduction to Natural England and their role in planning. Welcomed the requirement within policy CNDP3 (design principles) for developments to incorporate SuDS which demonstrate all four aspects of good SuDS design. No specific comments on the plan; supplied an Annex containing information sources for neighbourhood planning groups.
Resident A	Comment	Notes that: Victory Park is not identified for protection within the Plan and asks whether this means it is not protected from future development, and that the map of the Parish does not seem to be up-to-date.
Severn Trent Water	Comment	Acknowledge that a number of their previous comments have been incorporated but raise concerns that previous comments on water efficiency (Policy CNDP3) and flood alleviation projects (Policy CNDP4) have not been incorporated. The specific requirements for water efficiency could be made clearer by changing the existing policy wording. Comments that local green spaces can provide suitable locations for schemes such as flood alleviation and that the policy should be changed. Provides general guidelines on: Position Statement, Sewage Strategy, Surface Water and Sewer Flooding, Water Quality, Water Supply, and Water Efficiency.
Sport England	Comment	General comments on compliance with national policy relating to sport and playing fields. Refers to local authority playing pitch strategies as evidence to support neighbourhood plans; design guidance for new or improved sports facilities; increase in demand for sports facilities arising from new housing developments; and guidance on Active Design.
Catesby Estates	Object	Objects to the Neighbourhood Plan as submitted and requests the inclusion of reserve housing sites. The lack of flexibility in the Plan (through omission of reserve housing sites) means the Plan fails Basic Condition (a) – regard to national policies and advice contained in the Secretary of State guidance. Acknowledges that the Neighbourhood

Respondent	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of Response
		<p>Plan repeats Local Plan strategic housing policies but identifies that these are 9 years old and will be replaced by a New Local Plan; references the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan as more up-to-date evidence that the housing requirement for the District may be higher than what is currently in the Local Plan. Comments that Cosby is a sustainable location and will probably accommodate future housing growth, therefore reserve housing sites should be identified; requests oral hearing sessions.</p>
Leicestershire County Council	Comment	<p>Highways Specific Comments:</p> <p>Policy CNDP1: street furniture within a development should be in line with LCC specifications if it is to be adopted. Anything above LCC specifications requires commuted sums.</p> <p>Policy CNDP3: LCC no longer adopts green spaces, verges or trees; these spaces should be maintained by a management company. LCC does not have any standards for vehicle charging points.</p> <p>Policy CNDP8: new development should only mitigate its own impact, developers are not required to mitigate existing situations unless existing concerns are made worse by a new development. Explains the procedure for considering proposals affecting Public Rights of Way.</p> <p>Policy CNDP9: LCC (as Local Highways Authority) would not look to adopt any footway / cycleway links that do not serve the frontage of any properties. Advice of a planning refusal would only be given where the residual highway impact of a development is severe once any mitigation is considered.</p> <p>Highways General Comments:</p> <p>Expectation that any highway measures associated with any new development would need to be fully funded by the developer. Securing S106 contributions for public transport services is normally focused on larger developments. Due to financial constraints, LCC</p>

Respondent	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of Response
		<p>has limited funding available to undertake minor improvements and expects third-party funded infrastructure work to conform with national and local policies and guidance.</p> <p>Flood Risk Management: General advice on flood risk management in line with national and local policy and guidance.</p> <p>Planning, Minerals and Waste Planning: Can provide information on existing and future operations, refers to Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Areas.</p> <p>Property Education: Provides guidance on school places in relation to housing allocations.</p> <p>Strategic Property Services: No comments.</p> <p>Adult Social Care: Reference should be made to recognising the growth in the older population and that development seeks to include bungalows of differing tenures to accommodate the increase; refers to the Adult Social Care Accommodation Strategy.</p> <p>Environment, General Comments: LCC would like to see Neighbourhood Plans cover all aspects of archaeology and the historic environment.</p> <p>Archaeology and the Historic Environment: the inclusion of heritage in the Neighbourhood Plan will strengthen the management of heritage issues; refers to the Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Environment Record (LRHER) and sources of information available nationally.</p> <p>Climate Change: Neighbourhood Plans should look to contribute to and support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and increase the county's resilience to climate change.</p> <p>Landscape: would like to see the inclusion of a local landscape assessment taking into account national and local evidence and encourage the development of local heritage listings.</p>

Respondent	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of Response
		<p>Biodiversity: refers to national and local sources of evidence that Neighbourhood Plans can use to protect and improve the natural environment based on local evidence and priorities.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure: comments that Neighbourhood Plan groups have the opportunity to plan for GI networks at a local scale to maximise benefits for their community and reflects the Local Authority's GI Strategy.</p> <p>Brownfield, Soils and Agricultural Land: refers to national guidance on the topic and comments that Neighbourhood Plans should consider mapping agricultural land classification in the Plan.</p> <p>Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs): refers to guidance on undertaking SEAs.</p> <p>Impact of Development on Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC): refers to LCC approach to considering proposed developments' impact on HWRC; states developer contributions may be sought in accordance with local policy and legislation.</p> <p>Communities: sets out opportunities available to Neighbourhood Plans and refers to guidance on community resources.</p> <p>Economic Development: recommend including economic development aspirations in the Plan.</p> <p>Fibre Broadband: sets out expectations for high speed broadband connections.</p> <p>Equalities: refers to LCC's Equality Strategy and the Public Sector Equality Duty.</p> <p>Accessible Documents: refers to requirements for documents to be available in a web-accessible format.</p>
Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	Comment	Introduction to Avison Young and National Grid. Identification that no assets are affected by proposed allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan area.

Respondent	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of Response
Blaby District Council	Comment	<p>Provides specific comments on policies. Policy CNDP4 Protecting Local Green Space: considers that the detail to support the proposed designations of Local Green Space is lacking in depth and does not reflect the strength of the policy. Identifies factual error within the draft policy text.</p> <p>CNDP5 Protecting Other Open Space: identifies inconsistencies between the policy, Policies Map, and the titles of Open Space within the policy and how these can be overcome. An open space is illustrated to be protected that is not listed in the policy and the titles of green spaces are very similar which could be misleading. Identifies grammatical error within the policy and recommends an alteration.</p> <p>CNDP6 Protection of Existing Community Facilities and Local Shops: recommends wording changes to the policy and requests that additional text is added to inform applicants how they can demonstrate that local retail provision is no longer required to allow for the loss of such a facility.</p> <p>CNDP7 Access to the Countryside: considers that the policy does not conform with national legislation and policy and that text should be deleted from the policy. Identifies that statutory provisions apply to Public Rights of Way and therefore text should be removed from the policy.</p>
Environment Agency	Comment	<p>Notes that whilst the Cosby Brook, a Main River of the Environment Agency, runs along the western edge of the settlement boundary and that there is an associated flood zone with this watercourse, no site allocations are proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan and therefore they have no adverse comments to make.</p>
The Coal Authority	Comment	<p>Blaby District Council is outside of a coalfield and so there is no requirement to consult The Coal Authority and / or notify The Coal Authority of any emerging neighbourhood plans.</p>

Respondent	Support / Object / Comment	Summary of Response
Resident B	Comment	Identifies concerns with traffic within the village.
Resident C	Comment	Supports all the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan but notes that no proposals are incorporated to make roads safer.
National Highways	Comment	Notes that the M1 motorway runs along the eastern boundary of the Parish and contains no accesses from within the Neighbourhood Plan area. As the plan does not propose any development or transport-related policies that are likely to impact on the network, consider that the plan should be determined at a local level.
Historic England	Comment	Notes that the Neighbourhood Plan Area includes a number of important designated heritage assets. Recommends liaising with the local planning authority and county council archaeology service to obtain details of heritage assets in the area. Provides links to relevant guidance. Suggests involving local voluntary groups.
Barton Willmore on behalf of landowner	Comment	The settlement boundary for Cosby should be included on the Neighbourhood Plan Policies Map. Preparation of the Cosby Neighbourhood Plan should be delayed until the strategy within the emerging local plan becomes apparent.
Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland CCGs	Support	Supports the vision set out in the Neighbourhood Plan. Supports the protection of facilities in Cosby. Provides general comments on community, green space, design, active travel and reducing carbon emissions.