

# **BILLESDON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW 2022 - 2031**

**The Report of the Independent Examiner to Harborough District Council on the  
Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review**

**Andrew Matheson MSc MPA DipTP MRTPI FCIH  
Independent Examiner  
23<sup>rd</sup> May 2024**

## Summary

I was appointed by Harborough District Council, in agreement with the Billesdon Parish Council, in January 2024 to undertake the Independent Examination of the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review.

The Examination has been undertaken by written representations.

The Neighbourhood Plan proposes modifications to some of the Policies in the 'made' Plan. It continues in its purpose to bring forward positive and sustainable development in the Neighbourhood Area. There is an evident focus on safeguarding the Area's distinctive character.

The Plan Review has been underpinned by community support and proportionate community engagement. The Plan adds appropriate local detail to sit alongside the Harborough Local Plan 2011 - 2031.

Subject to a series of recommended modifications set out in this Report I have concluded that the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review meets all the necessary legal requirements and should proceed to be made by Harborough District Council.

## Report Index

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	3
The Role of the Independent Examiner	3
The Plan Review	3
Billesdon Neighbourhood Area	5
Consultation	5
Representations Received	6
The Neighbourhood Plan	6
Basic Conditions	6
The Plan in Detail:	7
Front cover	7
Contents	7
Non-technical Summary	7
1. Introduction	7
2. Profile	8
3. Sustainable Development and Vision	8
4. Housing	8
5. Employment	10
6. Services and Facilities	13
7. Traffic and Transport	13
8. Natural Environment	13
9. Local Green Space	15
10. Heritage	15
11. Design	16
Appendices	17
Policy Maps	17
EU and ECHR Obligations	18
Conclusions	19
Listing of Recommendations	20

## **Introduction**

This report sets out the findings of the Independent Examination of the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review 2022-2031. The Plan was submitted to Harborough District Council by Billesdon Parish Council in their capacity as the 'qualifying body' responsible for preparing the Neighbourhood Plan.

Neighbourhood Plans were introduced into the planning process by the Localism Act 2011. They aim to allow local communities to take responsibility for guiding development in their area. This approach was subsequently incorporated within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in 2012 and this continues to be the principal element of national planning policy. The NPPF was amended in December 2023 and it is against that version of the NPPF that this Examination is conducted.

This report assesses whether the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review is legally compliant and meets the 'basic conditions' and other statutory requirements that such plans are required to meet. It also considers the content of the Plan and, where necessary, recommends modifications to its policies and supporting text.

## **The Role of the Independent Examiner**

The Examiner's role is to ensure that any submitted neighbourhood plan meets the legislative and procedural requirements. I was appointed by Harborough District Council, in agreement with the Billesdon Parish Council, to conduct the Examination of the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review and to report my findings. I am independent of both the Harborough District Council and the Billesdon Parish Council. I do not have any interest in any land that may be affected by the Plan.

I possess the appropriate qualifications and experience to undertake this role. I have over 40 years' experience in various local authorities and third sector bodies as well as with the professional body for planners in the United Kingdom. I am a Chartered Town Planner and a panel member for the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service (NPIERS). I am a Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute.

In examining the Plan, I am also required, under paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to check whether:

- the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated Neighbourhood Area in line with the requirements of Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004;
- the Neighbourhood Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the 2004 Act (the Plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not include provision about development that is excluded development, and must not relate to more than one Neighbourhood Area);
- the Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under Section 61G of the Localism Act and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.

These are helpfully covered in the submitted Basic Conditions Statement and, subject to the contents of this Report, I can confirm that I am satisfied that each of the above points has been properly addressed and met.

## **The Plan Review**

The Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017 identifies that Qualifying Bodies may seek to review 'made' neighbourhood plans. It introduces a proportionate process for the modification of Neighbourhood Plans where a Neighbourhood Development Plan has already been made in relation to that Neighbourhood Area.

There are three types of modification which can be made through a Neighbourhood Plan Review. The process depends on the degree of change which the modification involves:

- minor (non-material) modifications to a neighbourhood plan or order which would not materially affect the policies in the plan or permission granted by the order. These may include correcting errors, such as a reference to a supporting document, and would not require examination or a referendum; or
- material modifications which do not change the nature of the plan or order and which would require examination but not a referendum. This might, for example, entail the addition of a design code that builds on a pre-existing design policy, or the addition of a site or sites which, subject to the decision of the independent examiner, are not so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the plan; or
- material modifications which do change the nature of the plan or order would require examination and a referendum. This might, for example, involve allocating significant new sites for development.

The Billesdon Parish and Harborough District Councils have, as is appropriate, considered this issue and taken the view that the proposed changes to the 'made' Plan fall into the second category: "material modifications which do not change the nature of the plan or order and which would require examination but not a referendum". I have properly considered these assessments and agree that, whilst the Plan Review includes some material modifications, these do not change the nature of the Plan, which takes a considered view of local growth, and the Review requires examination but not a referendum. I have reached this decision for the following reasons:

- revised policies largely update those in the 'made' Plan;
- where there are additional policies, these do not change the nature of the Plan when considered alongside the made Plan; and
- modifications made, or now recommended, within the Review bring the Plan up to date to reflect changes in national and local planning policy.

It is therefore appropriate for me to examine the Plan against Schedule A2 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The regulations identify that an Independent Examiner's report must recommend one of three outcomes:

- that the local planning authority should make the draft plan; or
- that the local planning authority should make the draft plan with the modifications specified in the report; or
- that the local planning authority should not make the draft plan.

I will later consider each Plan Policy in turn and identify any modifications required to ensure that they meet the Basic Conditions and my recommendations then follow.

In undertaking this Examination I have considered the following documents:

- Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review 2022-2031 as submitted
- Parish Council Modification Statement (October 2023)
- District Council Modification Statement (September 2023)
- Billesdon Revised Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions Statement (September 2023)
- Billesdon Revised Neighbourhood Plan Review Consultation Statement (September 2023)
- Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Report (January 2023)
- Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review Strategic Environmental Assessment Determination (March 2023)
- Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan 2014 - 2028

- Content at: [www.Harborough.gov.uk/directory\\_record/4156/billesdon\\_neighbourhood\\_plan\\_review\\_2023](http://www.Harborough.gov.uk/directory_record/4156/billesdon_neighbourhood_plan_review_2023)
- Content at: [www.billesdonparishcouncil.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan](http://www.billesdonparishcouncil.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan)
- Representations made to the Regulation 16 public consultation on the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan
- Harborough Local Plan 2011 - 2031
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2023)
- Neighbourhood Planning Regulations (2012)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (March 2014 and subsequent updates)

I carried out an unaccompanied visit to the Neighbourhood Area on 11<sup>th</sup> March 2024 in particular to view the sites referenced within the Plan.

The legislation establishes that, as a general rule, neighbourhood plan examinations should be held without a public hearing, by written representations only. Having considered all the information before me, including the representations made to the submitted plan which I felt made their points with clarity, I was satisfied that the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review could be examined without the need for a public hearing and I advised Harborough District Council accordingly. The Qualifying Body and the local authority have responded to my enquiries so that I may have a thorough understanding of the context and thinking behind the Plan, and the correspondence has been shown on the Harborough District Council neighbourhood planning website for the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review.

### **Billesdon Neighbourhood Area**

A map showing the boundary of the Billesdon Neighbourhood Area has been provided within the Neighbourhood Plan. Further to an application made by Billesdon Parish Council, Harborough District Council approved the designation of the Neighbourhood Area on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2012. This satisfied the requirement in line with the purposes of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan under section 61G(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

### **Consultation**

In accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, the qualifying body has prepared a Consultation Statement to accompany the Plan.

The Planning Practice Guidance says:

“A qualifying body should be inclusive and open in the preparation of its neighbourhood plan [or Order] and ensure that the wider community:

- is kept fully informed of what is being proposed
- is able to make their views known throughout the process
- has opportunities to be actively involved in shaping the emerging neighbourhood plan [or Order]
- is made aware of how their views have informed the draft neighbourhood plan [or Order].” (Reference ID: 41-047-20140306)

I note that the decision to revise the Neighbourhood Plan was taken in early 2022 and the Neighbourhood Plan Development Team organised a public meeting with on-line follow-up in March 2022, both of which were publicised through social media. The formal six-week public consultation period on the Pre-Submission Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review ran between 9<sup>th</sup> May and 20<sup>th</sup> June 2022. The Revised Plan put on Parish Council website with hard copies available at the Parish Hall and in the Library with information circulated through public events and social media. A summary report of the analysis of the 68 responses

received and the actions relating to them was prepared and is included within the Consultation Statement.

I am therefore satisfied that the consultation process was proportionate to the scale of the Review and accords with the requirements of the Regulations and the Practice Guidance and that, in having regard to national policy and guidance, the Basic Conditions have been met.

### **Representations Received**

Consultation on the submitted Plan Review, in accordance with Neighbourhood Planning Regulation 16, was undertaken by Harborough District Council from 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2023 to 17<sup>th</sup> January 2024. I have been passed 7 representations in total and these have been made available on the Neighbourhood Plan Review webpage. In reaching my own conclusions about the specifics of the content of the Plan I may later reference Regulation 16 representations and note points of agreement or disagreement with them, just as the Qualifying Body has already done for earlier consultations. That does not imply or suggest that consultation has been inadequate, merely that a test against the Basic Conditions is being applied.

## **The Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Basic Conditions**

The Independent Examiner is required to consider whether a neighbourhood plan meets the “Basic Conditions”, as set out in law following the Localism Act 2011. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the Plan 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;
- be compatible with European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) obligations.

The submitted Basic Conditions Statement has helpfully set out to address the issues in the same order as above. I note that the Local Plan is the Harborough Local Plan 2011 - 2031

I have examined and will below consider the Neighbourhood Plan against all of the Basic Conditions above, utilising the supporting material provided in the Basic Conditions Statement and other available evidence as appropriate. Unfortunately, it is sometimes the case that I have been presented with inadequate evidence to support Policy content even after specific requests. In order to reach a satisfactory conclusion for all concerned, I have been obliged to look for relevant sources of evidence and to recommend referencing these.

Having considered all the evidence and representations submitted as part of the Examination I am satisfied that the submitted Plan Review continues to have regard to national planning policies and guidance in general terms. The Plan continues to set out the community needs it will meet whilst identifying and safeguarding Billesdon’s distinctive features and character. The Review has been approached with transparency and care, with input as required and support from Harborough District Council.

Because this is a Plan Review, in the majority of instances, regard for national policies has already been established at the previous Examination. Since the original Neighbourhood Plan was ‘made’ a new Local Plan has been adopted and therefore establishing general conformity with local strategic policies has required new work. In addition, in the writing up of the current Plan document, it is sometimes the case that the phraseology is imprecise, not

helpful, or it falls short in justifying aspects of the selected policy. Planning Practice Guidance says that “A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared” (Paragraph: 041 Reference ID: 41-041-20140306). Accordingly, I have been obliged to recommend modifications so as to ensure both clarity and meeting of the ‘Basic Conditions’ more generally.

## **The Plan in Detail**

### **Front Cover**

I note that the period that the Plan covers has been clearly stated on the front cover. I queried with the Qualifying Body why the Plan start date is shown as 2022 when the Plan was not actually submitted until 2023. The Qualifying Body explained that the 2022 base date has been chosen to reflect the latest housing land supply position published by Harborough District Council; I therefore accept the logic of the start date. The “Submission Draft” in the title can now be removed.

### **Contents**

The Contents listing may need review in the light of modifications recommended in this Report.

### **Non-Technical Summary**

I have no comments on this content other than to note that the final paragraph may now be removed.

#### **Recommendation 1:**

*1.1 Delete from the front cover and the page headings “Submission Version”.*

*1.2 Review the Table of Contents in the light of the modifications recommended in this Report.*

*1.3 From the Non-Technical Summary remove the final paragraph.*

## **1. Introduction**

In paragraph 1.11 it is said that “the first Neighbourhood Plan is over five years old” and that the NPPF “was updated on 20 July 2021”, but as noted earlier, there has been a more recent 2023 review. In paragraph 1.13 it is noted that “areas with neighbourhood plans that are less than two years old can benefit from added protection” but, with the 2023 revision, that has now been extended to five years. At paragraph 1.16 where it is said that the Consultation Statement “will be made available”, that should now read ‘has been made available’. The “Next Steps” heading and paragraphs 1.17 & 1.18 can now be dropped.

#### **Recommendation 2:**

*2.1 In paragraph 1.11 update the age of the first Neighbourhood Plan and update the NPPF reference to the 2023 version.*

*2.2 In paragraph 1.13 replace “two” with ‘five’.*

*2.3 In paragraph 1.16 replace “will be made available” with ‘has been made available’.*

*2.4 Delete the “Next Steps” heading and paragraphs 1.17 & 1.18; renumber paragraph 1.19 accordingly.*



## **2. Profile**

This is a helpful addition to the Plan document. There appear to be typos in paragraphs 2.2, 2.4 and 2.7.

## **3. Sustainable Development and Vision**

No comments.

### **Recommendation 3:**

*Under the heading "2. Profile" correct the typographical errors in paragraphs 2.2, 2.4 and 2.7.*

## **4. Housing**

### **Map 2**

One of the consequences of the adoption of the Harborough Local Plan 2019 is that there are no longer defined Limits to Development. The Local Authority has stated that it is supportive in principle of Neighbourhood Plans retaining these defined Limits, but it then falls to Qualifying Bodies to evidence a justification for their boundary. The local authority has stated that "To be clear and justified the settlement boundary should follow logical boundaries that are evident on the ground". It is unclear whether the unreferenced boundary shown in Map 2 follows the one defined in the previous Local Plan. Further, a representation queries the exclusion of 'Land North of 22 Long Lane'; the location map provided as part of the representation does indeed seem to indicate that the site is excluded from the defined Limit. The Qualifying Body has commented: "The Limits to Development are essentially the same as those in the previous Local Plan other than for revisions that reflect more recent and committed developments." I note that one of those developments has not yet commenced but it has reached the point of approval of reserved matters and the Limits boundary does "follow logical boundaries that are evident on the ground" including the bypass to the north. In relation to 'Land North of 22 Long Lane' the Qualifying Body agreed that "the site benefits from planning permission for built development which is protected in perpetuity. It follows that land north of 22 Long Lane should be included within Limits to Development." I therefore conclude that the Limits to Development should be amended and the basis for the delineation should be made clear in the supporting text as well as Policy BPr2 to confirm that the Neighbourhood Plan has delineated a new Limits boundary.

### **Policy BPr1 Housing Requirement**

I noted to the Qualifying Body that this "Policy" seems actually to be a statement providing a context for other Policies that follow. Further, as written, it is implied that additional and windfall developments are needed to meet the housing requirement; but the supporting text suggests that the requirement has already been exceeded. The Qualifying Body responded: "To benefit from NPPF paragraph 14, a neighbourhood plan should contain policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement. The inclusion of Policy BPr1 makes it clear that this criterion has been met. A similar policy was included in the BNDP. It is agreed that the words 'will be' at the beginning of the policy's second sentence could be replaced by 'is'." On the basis that there is no significant Plan revision being made here, subject to the agreed amendment, Policy BPr1 continues to meet the Basic Conditions.

### **Infill Housing**

In relation to the wording of Policy BPr2, it is unclear how "high-level craft" might be assessed when considering the merits of a planning proposal; the Qualifying Body agreed that this imprecise reference should be omitted.

### **Gaulby Road Lorry Park**

I note that this site has already been allocated, albeit as a reserve site rather than as a site capable of immediate development. The content of a representation seems to suggest serious intent to develop the site, which indicates the required site deliverability. I was

however obliged to raise the following queries with the Qualifying Body in relation to the wording of Policy BPr3. The NPPF (para 16) says that Plans should: “contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals”. The following lacked the required clarity:

- “Approximately” is a vague way of indicating site capacity. I appreciate that the Plan is not required to deliver a minimum number of new dwellings but it was evident that the Qualifying Body didn’t want the site to be overdeveloped by local standards. Since it is an expectation of Local Plan Policy GD2 that development “respects the form and character of the existing settlement” this will be a more pertinent guide to site density.
- It is now a legal requirement that most housing developments will deliver a biodiversity net gain. I noted that a revision to this effect was suggested by the site owners but the Qualifying Body responded that small sites are currently exempt from mandatory biodiversity net gain. However, I don’t believe it is possible without detailed examination to assume, as per “Biodiversity net gain: exempt developments”, that the development “impacts less than:
  - 25 square metres (5m by 5m) of on-site habitat
  - 5 metres of on-site linear habitats such as hedgerows.”Therefore, the Policy needs to reference net gain, as suggested by the developer.
- I note the expectation of the retention of “important”, existing trees – again it seems wording suggested by the site owners. The question arises, important to whom or for what? The Qualifying Body suggested that “important trees” should meet BS 5837 categories A & B; this should therefore be added to the Policy.
- Where “design” is raised it is perhaps surprising that the Policy BPr20 is not cross-referenced (although that Policy will apply anyway, cross-referencing seems to be a feature of other policies). The Qualifying Body agreed that a cross-reference would be appropriate, and to Policy BPr21: Climate Change in addition.

### **Housing Mix**

This is another new Policy. It is unclear to what the following element of Policy BPr4 might be referring: “Applicants will need to demonstrate how the housing needs of older households will be met”. The immediately preceding paragraph is referencing the support needs of an ageing population, but I am doubtful that *support* needs are being addressed. Each planning application can only address the use of a particular site, not how demand will be met overall. Not every site will be suitable for every type of housing. My recommendation therefore seeks to provide appropriate clarity.

### **Affordable Housing**

I note that Policy BPr5 is a reworded Policy. The Policy seems to refer to affordable housing in general, not all of which would be expected to be “allocated”. I suggested to the Qualifying Body a small rewording that would recognise this distinction. I also commented that the reference to elements of the Local Plan Policy having been superseded would more appropriately be made in the supporting text.

### **Recommendation 4:**

*Under the heading “4. Housing”*

*4.1 Amend Map 2 to include within the Limits to Development ‘Land North of 22 Long Lane’ as defined by its Certificate of Lawfulness of Existing Development (21/01852/CLU). Also amend the key to show ‘Limits to Development (Policy BPr2)’.*

*4.2 Within Policy BPr1 replace “will be” at the beginning of the Policy’s second sentence with ‘is’.*

4.3 Within paragraph 4.13 in the second sentence add between “which” and “take account”: ‘follow the local authority practice of following logical boundaries that are evident on the ground and’.

4.4 Within Policy BPr2:

4.4.1 Reword the first sentence as: ‘Billesdon Limits to Development are defined on Map 2. Within the Limits housing development will be supported if it’.

4.4.2 From element b. delete: “using high-level craft in their application”.

4.4.3 In the final paragraph add Policy BD2 to BD4.

4.5 Within Policy BPr3:

4.5.1 Within element a. replace the words before “approximately 5 dwellings” with: ‘The housing density must respect the form and character of the existing settlement, which suggests a development of’.

4.5.2 Within element b. replace “an improvement” with ‘the statutory net gain’ and after “important boundary trees” add ‘(BS 5837 categories A & B)’.

4.5.3 Within element c. after “Billesdon” add ‘(having particular regard to Policies BPr20 & 21 of this Plan)’.

4.6 Within Policy BPr4 replace the last sentence with: ‘Development proposals should contribute to meeting the housing needs of older households or justify the absence of such provision within the site mix according to site suitability.’

4.7 In relation to Policy BPr5:

4.7.1 Add to paragraph 4.26: ‘The 25% low-cost home ownership required by Local Plan Policy H2 will be replaced by the Government’s First Homes discounted market homes requirements’ (and delete this from Policy BPr5); delete paragraph 4.27.

4.7.2 Within Policy BPr5 replace “when” with ‘where’.

As amended, revised Policies BPr1 – BPr5 meet the Basic Conditions.

## **5. Employment**

### **Working from Home**

This section including Policy BPr6 appears unchanged.

### **Internet**

The revised Policy BPr7 has clarity and is appropriately justified in the pre-ambule.

### **The Former Highway Depot (Gaulby Road)**

Whilst acknowledging that Policy BPr8 has its origins in the previous Neighbourhood Plan, I noted earlier that, in Policy terms, the incorporation of housing into a site that is outside of and not immediately adjoining the Limits to Development is potentially inconsistent with another Policy, BPr2. The justification for that development appears to be stated to derive from Local Plan Policy GD4; but this is not evidently the case. It is more appropriate to say that the proposal is in general conformity (as per the Basic Conditions test) with Local Plan Policy GD2 where there is criteria-based provision for housing development “within the existing or committed built up area”, which doesn’t quite have the boundary precision of Limits to Development. It is an expectation of such development that:

“a. it respects the form and character of the existing settlement and, as far as possible, it retains existing natural boundaries within and around the site,

particularly trees, hedges and watercourses; or

b. it includes the redevelopment or conversion of redundant or disused buildings, or previously developed land of low environmental value, and enhances its immediate setting.”

These factors should therefore be reflected in the related Neighbourhood Plan allocation Policy.

In relation to the wording of Policy BPr8 I raised a number of queries with the Qualifying Body:

- Where is the evidence that self- or custom-builder plots at this location would meet an identified need? The local authority provided the necessary evidence of significant need for such units. Brief details of the evidence should therefore be included in the Policy pre-ambble.
- There is no mechanism for “sold at an appropriate price” to be incorporated as a condition of a land use planning consent. The Qualifying Body responded that “The phrase ‘sold at an appropriate price’ will need to be tested at planning application stage, but plots should be made available at a price that is genuinely affordable to self-builders.” However, the lack of clarity as to the mechanism involved and its lawfulness does not meet the NPPF expectation (para 16) that Plans should: “contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals”. The Local Plan Policy H5 uses the phrase: “where servicing and site arrangements can be made suitable and attractive for such homes” and this should therefore provide a basis for the rewording of this element of Policy BPr8.
- I queried the justification for the constraint that proposals must “Include measures to ensure that the development takes place in a comprehensive but phased manner and avoids piecemeal development” and what might be the “measures” that are being sought? The Qualifying Body responded: “It is important for the development to take place in a comprehensive manner to ensure that, for example, the housing element is not ‘cherry-picked’ for development leaving the remaining site vacant and prone to vandalism. The additional flexibilities built into Policy BPr8 were introduced to secure the redevelopment of the site primarily for business use to provide opportunities for the expansion of existing businesses and the creation of new businesses.” It is important therefore that the Policy pre-ambble explains this approach.
- The meaning of “Not significantly adversely affect the amenities of existing or new residents *in the area*” [*my emphasis*] is not clear. The Qualifying Body clarified: “Discussions with the Fire and Rescue Service have indicated that [one of the options for the site] a Training Facility could introduce additional noise, smoke etc. which could adversely affect properties some distance away from the facility unless properly controlled.” This might therefore provide the basis for a more particular criterion.
- The scale of the parking provision obligation for adjacent uses is undefined, suggesting that it may be an unreasonable condition to impose, not meeting the tests set out in Planning Policy Guidance; encouraging provision would be more realistic.
- It is unclear why HGV journeys might be generated by the site, but also the indicated consultation with the Highways Authority is then upstaged with the requirement for “weight restrictions and signage”.
- It is unexplained how “no greater adverse impact on the nature conservation” might be measured but, as noted above, the law now requires an overall net gain in biodiversity.
- As noted previously, how are “important” trees to be identified?
- There is a numbering difficulty with this Policy with a,b,c etc being used at two levels.

## **Business in the Countryside**

Policy BPr9 has been updated only to reflect changes in planning references; it continues to meet the Basic Conditions.

### **Recommendation 5:**

*Under the heading “5. Employment”:*

*5.1 Add to the pre-amble to Policy BPr8 as follows:*

*5.1.1 Add to paragraph 5.13: ‘This flexibility maintains general conformity with the criteria-based approach of Local Plan Policy GD2.’*

*5.1.2 Add a new paragraph after 5.13 (and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly): ‘Data held by Harborough District Council indicates that, to meet its Duty under Self-build and Custom Housebuilding legislation, the Council should have granted permission for at least 87 self-build/custom build plots by October 2023. However, planning permission for only 27 plots had been granted. Policy BPr8 can therefore make a helpful contribution to meeting the shortfall. However, if the plots have been made available and marketed appropriately for at least 12 months, rather than leave the site vacant and subject to the consent of the local planning authority, the plots may be built out by a developer.’*

*5.1.3 Add a new paragraph after 5.14 (and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly): ‘Since the residential element is intended to be enabling of the mixed redevelopment of the whole site, it is vital that the site is planned and built-out comprehensively.’*

*5.2 Revise Policy BPr8 as follows:*

*5.2.1 Amend the hierarchy of numbering to avoid duplicate referencing of BPr8a and BPr8b.*

*5.2.2 Amend element a(ii) to read as follows:*

*‘a maximum of 10 dwelling plots on up to 0.5 hectares located at the site frontage with servicing and site arrangements made suitable and attractive for self-builders or custom builders.’*

*5.2.3 Replace “The redevelopment of the site should” with ‘The development proposals should demonstrate how they will:’ and then:*

*5.2.3.1 Add a new element a. (and renumber subsequent elements accordingly): ‘respect the form and character of the existing local settlement’.*

*5.2.3.2 In element a. delete “Include measures to”.*

*5.2.3.3 In element b. delete “in the area” and add: ‘In the event that the site is to be used as a Fire and Rescue Station with Training Facility then particular controls may be required to protect residential amenity’.*

*5.2.3.4 In element c. replace “include” with ‘facilitate’.*

*5.2.3.5 In element d. delete “These measures are to include weight restrictions and signage to the site from the A47”.*

*5.2.3.6 In element f. replace the first sentence with: ‘enhance the immediate setting of the site and demonstrate appropriate regard for the nature conservation and the quiet enjoyment of the adjoining wildlife site.’*

*5.2.3.7 Amend element g. as follows:*

*'ensure on the site that important trees (BS 5837 categories A & B) and hedgerows on the site, including those along the site boundaries, are retained within a comprehensive landscaping scheme and that the statutory net gain in biodiversity is delivered.'*

As amended, revised Policies BPr7, BPr8 & BPr9 meet the Basic Conditions.

## **6. Services and Facilities**

### **Retention of Key Services and Facilities**

Policy BPr10 has been amended only to acknowledge the Local Plan and to include specified key facilities within the policy.

### **Retail**

Policy BPr11 has been amended from BNDP Policy BP15 only to make it more tightly worded.

### **Infrastructure**

Policy BPr12 is the BNDP Policy BP13 with only minor revisions.

Policies BPr10 to BPr12 continue to meet the Basic Conditions.

## **7. Traffic and Transport**

Policy BPr13 has been updated solely to amend the Policy cross-references.

Policy BPr13 continues to meet the Basic Conditions.

## **8. Natural Environment**

### **Countryside**

Policy BPr14 is an extended version of BNDP Policy BP18. The wording shows general conformity with the Local Plan Policies which are detailed. The Qualifying Body agreed that, in the last sentence, "Opportunities for" is superfluous wording.

### **Countryside Access**

No source is provided for the data illustrated on Map 4. The Qualifying Body has explained: "This has been prepared by the Parish Council on the basis of local information, OS mapping, 'where to walk in Leicestershire', waymarks and satellite imagery. Only the Definitive Map is conclusive in law as to the existence of a Public Right of Way". This then begs the question as to what the numbering scheme relates. At the very least the clarification that Map 4 is not the Definitive Map must be added.

A distinction appears to be being made within Policy BPr15 between publicly accessible space and the countryside – access to the latter being "particularly" valued. Also "access" seems to mean two things here – availability of useable open space and having interconnectivity with open space. The Qualifying Body has commented: "BPr15 encourages development to improve access to open spaces whether inside [the] Limits to Development or outside". For clarity therefore Policy BPr15 needs to be better worded since it might be read as encouraging development at countryside locations.

### **Ecology and Biodiversity**

Part of the amendment to Policy BPr16 has been further defining the local network of spaces as "including Local Wildlife Sites, Historic Local Wildlife Sites and Wildlife corridors". However, there are no sources provided for these boundaries and classifications on Map 5. The Qualifying Body has advised the data source as the Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre (LRERC), whose website says "We provide information and share our records with [amongst others]:"

- Local planning authorities
- Members of the public
- Neighbourhood plan groups.”

I further note that LRERC “maintains the register of Local Wildlife Sites for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland”, but not all the mapped source data has an equivalent standing/level of protection. The words “should not harm” used in the Policy cannot be justified for all the spaces shown; mitigation may be appropriate in some instances. Further, I am not provided with evidence to support the assertion that “The principal wildlife corridors in Billesdon Parish are its watercourses”. I accept that watercourses are relevant wildlife routes and therefore the proper description of the linear features highlighted in blue is ‘water course’. Some rewording of Policy BPr16 and Map 5 is therefore required.

As is evident, paragraph 8.15 is now out of date.

### **Water Management**

Policy BPr17 is a significantly extended version of BNDP Policy BP14. Whilst I am not wholly convinced that the Policy adds any local detail to local or national policies, the additional detailing is not inappropriate. Within Policy BPr17 it is unclear what “utilise resources sustainably during use” might mean and I have therefore recommended a simplification. I noted to the Qualifying Body that it is through the Building Regulations rather than the planning system that appropriate water efficiencies are defined and monitored.

#### **Recommendation 6:**

*Under the heading “8. Natural Environment”:*

*6.1 Under the sub-heading “Countryside”, within Policy BPr14, last sentence, remove “Opportunities for”.*

*6.2 Under the sub-heading “Countryside Access”:*

*6.2.1 Add to Map 4: ‘This map has been prepared by the Parish Council on the basis of local information, OS mapping, ‘Where to Walk in Leicestershire’, waymarks and satellite imagery. Only the Definitive Map is conclusive in law as to the existence of a Public Right of Way.’*

*6.2.2 Reword Policy BPr15 as follows:*

*‘Development proposals should, appropriately to their scale, ensure access to existing or provide new publicly accessible open space and, wherever feasible, improve/provide new access to the countryside around Billesdon village.’*

*6.3 Under the sub-heading “Ecology and Biodiversity”:*

*6.3.1 Update paragraph 8.15 by replacing “encourages” with ‘requires’ and deleting the last sentence.*

*6.3.2 Add to Map 5: ‘This map has been compiled from data held by the Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre (LRERC) whose records should be rechecked for the latest updates’.*

*6.3.3 In the key for Map 5 replace “Wildlife corridor” with ‘Watercourse’.*

*6.3.4 Amend the wording of the first sentence of Policy BPr16 to:*

*‘Development proposals should have appropriate regard for the network of local ecological features and habitats as illustrated on Map 5.’*

*6.4 Under the sub-heading “Water Management” amend the opening sentence of Policy BPr17 to: ‘Development proposals should, where appropriate, incorporate:’*

Policies BPr14 – BPr17 meet or continue to meet the Basic Conditions.

## **9. Local Green Spaces**

The primary change with Policy BPr18 has been the listing of the spaces already designated, which is appropriate. The closing sentence is now also more appropriate to the NPPF expectations.

Policy BPr18 continues to meet the Basic Conditions.

## **10. Heritage**

### **Non-Designated Heritage Assets**

The sources of the data mapped on Maps 7-10 are not shown. In relation to Map 10 I have accessed the Historic England Summary Report for “Turning the Plough Update Assessment 2012” and I note that this does not specifically reference Billesdon Parish. In the absence of a specific source for Map 10 I am recommending that a caution be added on the Map and in the related text.

I agree with the local authority that Policy BPr19 can build on policies of the original plan which seeks to protect the character of Billesdon and ensure development ‘is in keeping with the scale, form and character of its surroundings’. It is appropriate that a Neighbourhood Plan should identify heritage assets based on local knowledge and an appropriate assessment. I am not however presented with evidence that there has been an appropriate assessment for the purposes of the Plan. Historic England in their publication ‘Neighbourhood Planning and the Historic Environment’ says (para 64): “The use of selection criteria is important to provide robust processes and procedures against which assets can be nominated and their suitability assessed for addition to the local planning authority’s heritage list”. National Planning Policy Guidance says: “A substantial majority of buildings have little or no heritage significance and thus do not constitute heritage assets. Only a minority have enough heritage significance to merit identification as non-designated heritage assets” (Paragraph: 039 Reference ID: 18a-039-20190723).

The Historic Environment Record (HER) record will exist whether or not the historic features are recognised in the Neighbourhood Plan. Porting the HER list into the Neighbourhood Plan means that the list includes “possible” features, “undated” features, “Various finds”, “Roman pottery”, which don’t have any clear-cut relevance in a land-use plan guiding proposals; and the “Historic settlement core of Billesdon” is already recognised within the Conservation Area. Similarly, block listing every site which may, at some time, have had ridge and furrow features fails to distinguish the important areas which have current significance. It is a feature of listing schemes generally that some quality control is exercised to ensure that the best examples are conserved, rather than every example.

In the absence of any evident review of the externally sourced data, I have concluded that Policy BPr19 should not re-list HER features and the ridge and furrow record but instead require development proposals to have regard to the publicly accessible records of non-designated heritage features.

### **Recommendation 7:**

*Under the heading “10. Heritage”:*

*7.1 To Map 7 add: ‘Source: Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031 Billesdon Inset Map’.*

*7.2 Amend Map 8 to identify only the “Features of Local Heritage Interest” from Appendix 1 plus ‘Earthworks at the north end of Long Lane’; move the other HER content to Map 9.*

*7.3 Amend the opening sentence of paragraph 10.17 to:*



*'Community consultation for the first Neighbourhood Plan identified two heritage assets of local importance'; and amend the footnote to page 49 to:  
'One of these is the Medieval village earthworks north of Long Lane previously identified during consultation for the First Neighbourhood Plan'.*

*7.4 Amend Map 9 to include content moved from Map 8 and an index for the MLE references; add: 'Source: Leicestershire & Rutland Historic Environment Record (HER)'.*

*7.5 To Map 10 add: 'Source(s): [insert\*]; the map should not be relied upon to indicate the present extent of visible ridge and furrow since farming activities may degrade these features'.*

*\* if the source(s) can't be declared then the Map and references to it should be deleted.*

*7.6 Amend paragraph 10.20 to:*

*'Whilst Billesdon was not amongst the parishes surveyed, large areas of ridge and furrow remain in and around the Neighbourhood Area.'*

*7.7 Amend Policy BPr19 as follows:*

*'1. These historic features, as located on Map 8 and detailed in Appendix 1, are to be regarded as Non-designated Heritage Assets the significance of which must be assessed and addressed where planning proposals affect them or their setting:*

- i) Baptist Chapel, Brook Lane*
- ii) Cold War monitoring post north of Gaulby Road*
- iii) Billesdon Lodge Farm*
- iv) Barns at Spring Brook Farm, Coplow Lane*
- v) Home Farm*
- vi) Garden Buildings at Billesdon Coplow*
- vii) Muddy Lane*
- viii) Medieval village earthworks north of Long Lane.'*

*2. Where planning proposals are likely to affect other features recorded as being of historic interest, as illustrated on Maps 9 & 10, the significance of a site, find or asset and its setting should be understood through appropriate investigation in the historic records and proposals developed based on those investigations.'*

*7.8 At Appendix 1 add brief details and a location photograph for 'Medieval village earthworks north of Long Lane'.*

*As amended Policy BPr19 meets the Basic Conditions.*

## **11. Design**

A comparison between the original Policy BP7 and the new BPr20 shows that the content has been rewritten although, at their core, the Policies are a reference to the Billesdon Design Guide. The Design Guide itself is unaltered in its scope and presentation. Accordingly, my only recommendation relates to a correction.

### **Climate Change**

Given the NPPFs encouragement for the consequences of climate change to be addressed, a Climate Change Policy may be assessed as appropriate, although there is no discernibly local content. However, within Policy BPr21 it is difficult to discern, in the absence of further guidance, what is intended in design terms by the following (*my emphases added*):

*"d. that the building form and its construction allows for adaptation to future changes in climate;*

*e. that the building form and its construction permits further reduction in the building's carbon footprint, where feasible and viable; and*

f. that in addressing the above measures, the development's design and layout also strives [sic] to *maximise health and well-being and enjoyment of its residents*.

The Qualifying Body responded: "Following consultation in 2023, Government intends to publish the Future Homes Standard (FHS) in 2024 and then bring it into force in 2025. All new homes will then be 'zero carbon-ready', meaning that they will be zero carbon once the electricity grid has been decarbonised." It is therefore acknowledged that such matters are within the setting of national policy.

The re-inclusion of reference to biodiversity is inappropriate since that has already been addressed at a more appropriate location earlier.

**Recommendation 8:**

*Under the heading "11 Design":*

*8.1 Within Policy BPr20 amend element b. to add 'make' before "appropriate".*

*8.2 Within Policy BPr21 delete elements d – f.*

As amended Policies BPr20 & BPr21 meet the Basic Conditions.

**Appendices**

Appendix 1: Features of Local Heritage Interest

As noted above, the listing should be completed by the addition of 'Medieval village earthworks north of Long Lane'.

Appendix 2: Village Design Statement – no comment

Policy Maps: Village & Parish

In view of the recommendations above, the Maps need to be amended to remove content which has not been or is no longer within the Plan Policies (ie the contents of Maps 5 and 9) which probably means that the maps can be combined.

**Recommendation 9:**

*Amend the Policy Maps to restrict the content to that determined by the Plan's Policies, omitting content determined by others - the contents of Maps 5 and 9.*

## **European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) Obligations**

A further Basic Condition, which the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review must meet, is compatibility with European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) obligations, as incorporated into UK law.

There is no legal requirement for a neighbourhood plan to have a sustainability appraisal. A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Opinion for the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review has been used to determine whether or not the content of the Plan requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in accordance with the European Directive 2001/42/EC and associated Environmental Assessment of Plan and Programmes Regulations 2004. In accordance with Regulation 9 of the SEA Regulations 2004, Harborough District Council determined in their Report dated March 2023 that “it is the determination of the Council that there will not be any significant negative environmental effects arising from the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review as prepared at January 2023. As such, the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan with its current proposals does not require a full Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to be undertaken. The Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England have been consulted on the Screening Report of February 2023 prior to the Councils determination; they are in agreement with the Council’s view”.

As indicated in the Basic Conditions Statement, “Each policy of the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review has been assessed to determine the effects on historic environment, Natura 2000 sites and Habitats Regulation Assessment. The Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review is unlikely to have a substantial effect of the Natura 2000 network of protected sites and therefore an Appropriate Assessment is not required. A full Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) has been undertaken as part Harborough Local Plan (2011 to 2031) preparation. The HRA for the Local Plan determines that no European sites lie within Harborough District. Outside of the boundary the nearest European site is Rutland Water Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site which is located 7km to the north-east of the district boundary. 5.7 The assessment concluded in 2017 that the Local Plan will not have a likely significant effect on any internationally important wildlife sites either alone or in conjunction with other plans and projects. These conclusions are based on the fact that no Natura 2000 sites are located within the district and no impact pathways were identified linking internationally important wildlife sites outside of the district (e.g. Rutland Water SPA/Ramsar site) to development within Harborough District. Therefore an Appropriate Assessment is not required.”

As also indicated in the Basic Conditions Statement, “The Equalities Impact Assessment of the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review” (Appendix 1) has found no negative impacts on any protected characteristic by reference to data or evidence. As a result, no recommendations are made and the assessment finds the Neighbourhood Development Plan to be appropriate and that the duty prescribed by the Equalities Act 2010 is met.” No evidence has been put forward to demonstrate that this is not the case.

Taking all of the above into account, I am satisfied that the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review is compatible with EU obligations and that it does not breach, nor is in any way incompatible with, the ECHR.

## **Conclusions**

The Review of the 'made' Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan sets out some modified and new policies to guide and direct development proposals in the period up to 2031. It has been properly prepared to improve the Plan and to address changes in national and local planning policy which have arisen since the initial Plan was 'made'. My assessment is that the Plan Review includes material modifications which do not change the nature of the Plan and which require examination but not a referendum.

My Independent Examination of the Plan concludes that the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review meets the basic conditions for the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan subject to a number of recommended modifications. Modifications have been recommended to effect corrections, to ensure clarity and in order to ensure that the Basic Conditions are met but the Plan Review remains fundamentally unchanged in its role and direction set for it by the Qualifying Body.

***Accordingly, I recommend that Harborough District Council should 'make' the draft Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan Review, subject to the modifications set out in this Report.***

**Recommendations:** (this is a listing of the recommendations exactly as they are included in the Report)

Rec.	Text	Reason
1	<p>1.3 Delete from the front cover and the page headings “Submission Version”.</p> <p>1.4 Review the Table of Contents in the light of the modifications recommended in this Report.</p> <p>1.3 From the Non-Technical Summary remove the final paragraph.</p>	For clarity and accuracy
2	<p>2.1 In paragraph 1.11 update the age of the first Neighbourhood Plan and update the NPPF reference to the 2023 version.</p> <p>2.2 In paragraph 1.13 replace “two” with ‘five’.</p> <p>2.3 In paragraph 1.16 replace “will be made available” with ‘has been made available’.</p> <p>2.4 Delete the “Next Steps” heading and paragraphs 1.17 &amp; 1.18; renumber paragraph 1.19 accordingly.</p>	For clarity and accuracy
3	Under the heading “2. Profile” correct the typographical errors in paragraphs 2.2, 2.4 and 2.7.	For clarity and accuracy
4	<p>Under the heading “4. Housing”</p> <p>4.1 Amend Map 2 to include within the Limits to Development ‘Land North of 22 Long Lane’ as defined by its Certificate of Lawfulness of Existing Development (21/01852/CLU). Also amend the key to show ‘Limits to Development (Policy BPr2)’.</p> <p>4.2 Within Policy BPr1 replace “will be” at the beginning of the Policy’s second sentence with ‘is’.</p> <p>4.3 Within paragraph 4.13 in the second sentence add between “which” and “take account”: ‘follow the local authority practice of following logical boundaries that are evident on the ground and’.</p> <p>4.4 Within Policy BPr2:</p>	For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1

	<p>4.4.1 Reword the first sentence as: 'Billesdon Limits to Development are defined on Map 2. Within the Limits housing development will be supported if it:'.</p> <p>4.4.2 From element b. delete: "using high-level craft in their application".</p> <p>4.4.3 In the final paragraph add Policy BD2 to BD4.</p> <p>4.5 Within Policy BPr3:</p> <p>4.5.1 Within element a. replace the words before "approximately 5 dwellings" with: 'The housing density must respect the form and character of the existing settlement, which suggests a development of'.</p> <p>4.5.2 Within element b. replace "an improvement" with 'the statutory net gain' and after "important boundary trees" add '(BS 5837 categories A &amp; B)'.</p> <p>4.5.3 Within element c. after "Billesdon" add '(having particular regard to Policies BPr20 &amp; 21 of this Plan)'.</p> <p>4.6 Within Policy BPr4 replace the last sentence with: 'Development proposals should contribute to meeting the housing needs of older households or justify the absence of such provision within the site mix according to site suitability.'</p> <p>4.7 In relation to Policy BPr5:</p> <p>4.7.1 Add to paragraph 4.26: 'The 25% low-cost home ownership required by Local Plan Policy H2 will be replaced by the Government's First Homes discounted market homes requirements' (and delete this from Policy BPr5); delete paragraph 4.27.</p> <p>4.7.2 Within Policy BPr5 replace "when" with 'where'.</p>	
--	--	--

5	<p>Under the heading “5. Employment”:  5.1 Add to the pre-amble to Policy BPr8 as follows:</p> <p>5.1.1 Add to paragraph 5.13: ‘This flexibility maintains general conformity with the criteria-based approach of Local Plan Policy GD2.’</p> <p>5.1.2 Add a new paragraph after 5.13 (and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly): ‘Data held by Harborough District Council indicates that, to meet its Duty under Self-build and Custom Housebuilding legislation, the Council should have granted permission for at least 87 self-build/custom build plots by October 2023. However, planning permission for only 27 plots had been granted. Policy BPr8 can therefore make a helpful contribution to meeting the shortfall. However, if the plots have been made available and marketed appropriately for at least 12 months, rather than leave the site vacant and subject to the consent of the local planning authority, the plots may be built out by a developer.’</p> <p>5.1.3 Add a new paragraph after 5.14 (and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly): ‘Since the residential element is intended to be enabling of the mixed redevelopment of the whole site, it is vital that the site is planned and built-out comprehensively.’</p> <p>5.2 Revise Policy BPr8 as follows:</p> <p>5.2.1 Amend the hierarchy of numbering to avoid duplicate referencing of BPr8a and BPr8b.</p> <p>5.2.2 Amend element a(ii) to read as follows:  ‘a maximum of 10 dwelling plots on up to 0.5 hectares located at the site frontage with servicing and site arrangements made suitable and attractive for self-builders or custom builders.’</p>	<p>For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1</p>
---	--	---

	<p>5.2.3 Replace “The redevelopment of the site should” with ‘The development proposals should demonstrate how they will.’ and then:</p> <p>5.2.3.1 Add a new element a. (and renumber subsequent elements accordingly): ‘respect the form and character of the existing local settlement’.</p> <p>5.2.3.2 In element a. delete “Include measures to”.</p> <p>5.2.3.3 In element b. delete “in the area” and add: ‘In the event that the site is to be used as a Fire and Rescue Station with Training Facility then particular controls may be required to protect residential amenity’.</p> <p>5.2.3.4 In element c. replace “include” with ‘facilitate’.</p> <p>5.2.3.5 In element d. delete “These measures are to include weight restrictions and signage to the site from the A47”.</p> <p>5.2.3.6 In element f. replace the first sentence with: ‘enhance the immediate setting of the site and demonstrate appropriate regard for the nature conservation and the quiet enjoyment of the adjoining wildlife site.’</p> <p>5.2.3.7 Amend element g. as follows:  ‘ensure on the site that important trees (BS 5837 categories A &amp; B) and hedgerows on the site, including those along the site boundaries, are retained within a</p>	
--	---	--



	comprehensive landscaping scheme and that the statutory net gain in biodiversity is delivered.'	
6	<p>Under the heading "8. Natural Environment":</p> <p>6.1 Under the sub-heading "Countryside", within Policy BPr14, last sentence, remove "Opportunities for".</p> <p>6.2 Under the sub-heading "Countryside Access":</p> <p>6.2.1 Add to Map 4: 'This map has been prepared by the Parish Council on the basis of local information, OS mapping, 'Where to Walk in Leicestershire', waymarks and satellite imagery. Only the Definitive Map is conclusive in law as to the existence of a Public Right of Way.'</p> <p>6.2.2 Reword Policy BPr15 as follows: 'Development proposals should, appropriately to their scale, ensure access to existing or provide new publicly accessible open space and, wherever feasible, improve/provide new access to the countryside around Billesdon village.'</p> <p>6.3 Under the sub-heading "Ecology and Biodiversity":</p> <p>6.3.1 Update paragraph 8.15 by replacing "encourages" with 'requires' and deleting the last sentence.</p> <p>6.3.2 Add to Map 5: 'This map has been compiled from data held by the Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre (LRERC) whose records should be rechecked for the latest updates'.</p> <p>6.3.3 In the key for Map 5 replace "Wildlife corridor" with 'Watercourse'.</p> <p>6.3.4 Amend the wording of the first sentence of Policy BPr16 to:</p>	For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1

	<p>‘Development proposals should have appropriate regard for the network of local ecological features and habitats as illustrated on Map 5.’</p> <p>6.4 Under the sub-heading “Water Management” amend the opening sentence of Policy BPr17 to: ‘Development proposals should, where appropriate, incorporate:’</p>	
7	<p>7.1 To Map 7 add: ‘Source: Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031 Billesdon Inset Map’.</p> <p>7.2 Amend Map 8 to identify only the “Features of Local Heritage Interest” from Appendix 1 plus ‘Earthworks at the north end of Long Lane’; move the other HER content to Map 9.</p> <p>7.3 Amend the opening sentence of paragraph 10.17 to: ‘Community consultation for the first Neighbourhood Plan identified two heritage assets of local importance’; and amend the footnote to page 49 to: ‘One of these is the Medieval village earthworks north of Long Lane previously identified during consultation for the First Neighbourhood Plan’.</p> <p>7.4 Amend Map 9 to include content moved from Map 8 and an index for the MLE references; add: ‘Source: Leicestershire &amp; Rutland Historic Environment Record (HER)’.</p> <p>7.5 To Map 10 add: ‘Source(s): [insert*]; the map should not be relied upon to indicate the present extent of visible ridge and furrow since farming activities may degrade these features’. * if the source(s) can’t be declared then the Map and references to it should be deleted.</p> <p>7.6 Amend paragraph 10.20 to: ‘Whilst Billesdon was not amongst the parishes surveyed, large areas of ridge and furrow remain in and around the Neighbourhood Area.’</p> <p>7.7 Amend Policy BPr19 as follows:</p>	For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1

	<p>'1. These historic features, as located on Map 8 and detailed in Appendix 1, are to be regarded as Non-designated Heritage Assets the significance of which must be assessed and addressed where planning proposals affect them or their setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Baptist Chapel, Brook Lane</li> <li>ii) Cold War monitoring post north of Gaulby Road</li> <li>iii) Billesdon Lodge Farm</li> <li>iv) Barns at Spring Brook Farm, Coplow Lane</li> <li>v) Home Farm</li> <li>vi) Garden Buildings at Billesdon Coplow</li> <li>vii) Muddy Lane</li> <li>viii) Medieval village earthworks north of Long Lane.' <p>2. Where planning proposals are likely to affect other features recorded as being of historic interest, as illustrated on Maps 9 &amp; 10, the significance of a site, find or asset and its setting should be understood through appropriate investigation in the historic records and proposals developed based on those investigations.'</p> <p>7.8 At Appendix 1 add brief details and a location photograph for 'Medieval village earthworks north of Long Lane'.</p> </li></ul>	
8	<p>Under the heading "11 Design":</p> <p>8.1 Within Policy BPr20 amend element b. to add 'make' before "appropriate".</p> <p>8.2 Within Policy BPr21 delete elements d – f.</p>	For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1
9	Amend the Policy Maps to restrict the content to that determined by the Plan's Policies, omitting content determined by others - the contents of Maps 5 and 9.	For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1