

North Kilworth Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

	Chapter/ Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendments to NP
23	1.2		23 - Resident	Location of buildings and structures – On page 9 there is reference to a telephone box as a listed building, but no indication as to its location.	The change will be made	Reference deleted
24	1.2		24 – HD Council	Population of the parish is 597 according to the 2011 Census (not 3,662 as stated) up from 478 in 2001.	Noted	The change to the text will be made
31	2		31 - NKSG	A number of issues relate to the black and white print version where the maps are not very clear. On page 11 the Parish Boundary is not at all clear in B and W – can it be made bolder in the pdf and final versions and the scale increased to make specific field boundaries more obvious. Boundaries will be critical if Bosworth or South do not produce a plan or if their boundaries conflict. The paragraph below the map does not appear to relate to it.	The final plan will be printed in colour which will make it clearer to read. The text below the map will be placed earlier in the chapter.	Final Plan to be printed in colour. Text to be brought forward to be before the map.
5	3		LCC	It would be useful for this section to provide more information about villagers concerns in respect of traffic and parking issues, citing available evidence as necessary.	We agree that the section can be enhanced with reference to consultation.	More information from consultation will be inserted into this section.
24	3		24 – HD Council	Page 12 para 3: not sure what ‘the conservation nature’ means.	Agree this could be worded better.	Amend text to read ‘most important environmental aspects’
24	3		24 – HD Council	Page 13 para 2/ page 16 para 1: Timescales for the new Local Plan are now – Consultation on the draft Local Plan in Nov/ Dec 2016; and Adoption in November 2017.	Thank you for this update.	Updated timescale to be incorporated into the text.

27	4		27 – Natural England	We are pleased to note that the Plan has been developed in consultation with HDC to ensure that its policies are in conformity with the District Council's existing Core Strategy and emerging Local Plan.	Noted.	None.
31	4		31 - NKSG	Views from various villagers. Page 16 refers to a Statement of Community Consultation but it is not part of the document. Should it be? Is there a chance of putting in a synoptic timeline inside the back cover of all the events back to December 2014 and the walkabout. In Section 4 (page 14) was the initial consultation 2014 because otherwise the paragraphs below it are out of sequence.	The Statement of Consultation will be available for the submission version. Yes – this is a good idea.	None. A timeline will be added.
24	5		24 – HD Council	Page 18, section 5 para 3 – bullet point format.	Noted.	The bullet points will be amended.
24	5		24 – HD Council	Page 19, final para – Modification needs to be considered with care. From DCLG: 'In order to change a neighbourhood Plan after it has been made, a revised NP containing the changes would need to be prepared by the qualifying body. Under existing regulations the new NP would then need to go through the neighbourhood planning process (pre-submission consultation, independent examination, and referendum) before it replaces the existing NP or order. I understand that this may seem a laborious process for minor changes, but it is to ensure that the NP remains representative of the community's wishes.	Noted	None.
24	7.2.1		24 – HD Council	Page 23 para 4: last line should read 'settlements with at least two of these services'.	Noted.	Changes to be made to the text as proposed.

				Para 6: second sentence should read 'The Local Plan Options document.'		
1	7.2.1	NK2	1 – Residents	31 houses will increase traffic problems and ruin some of the village's history.	The number of houses to be developed is determined by the District Council and the NP cannot propose fewer.	None
10	7.2.1	NK2	10 - Resident	Planning and Development – This community has had a number of disjointed developments over the last decade. Hence the proposal for further large housing seems disproportionate for a supposed conservation area. Particularly, in the light of the marina development and the likelihood of increased fixed berths, the community services will likely be under enormous pressure particularly in the school and local health services.	Noted. The NP seeks to protect and enhance community services.	None
24	7.2.2		24 – HD Council	7.2.2 para 3 – would it not be worth allocating a reserve site of a further 10 – 15 homes to ensure that you do not need to review the plan.	The reference to an NP review is necessary in case of unforeseen events occurring so should remain. The revisions made to the NP will allow for sufficient development through the Local Plan period.	
4	7.2.2	NK2	Highways England	In relation to the NKNP, Highways England's principal interest is safeguarding the operation of the M1, and in particular M1 J20 which is located approximately 4 miles to the west of the plan area. Highways England comment on the Harborough District Local Plan placing the village as a Selected Rural Village, meaning that it is suitable for limited small scale development. Specifically, it is expected that the NP would need to provide for the building of a minimum of 31 new homes from	Noted.	None.

				2015-2031. It is acknowledged that this figure may change, as a result of the new Harborough District Local Plan. Highways England would expect the scale of development in North Kilworth to be relatively modest. In this context, Highways England considers that there would be no impacts on the operation of the Strategic Road Network.		
1	7.2.2	NK3	1 – Residents	My husband and I strongly object to the proposal to build a minimum of 31 houses in a ‘new housing estate’ in the village. We live on Station Road, very close to the proposed building area. We believe this could dramatically change the character of our village.	Noted. The NP cannot promote fewer houses than in the Local Plan. The approach to new development has been determined through further consultation and the draft amended accordingly.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
2	7.2.2	NK3	2 – Residents	We wish to object to the proposal in NK3 Housing allocations for houses to be built on land south of Station Road, opposite Rose Dale and we note from the map this includes both fields to the south-east of Elmcroft Road and the Manor Farmyard. This is greenfield, historic ridge and furrow grassland, open countryside and wildlife rich farmland – it is not appropriate to build on this type of land when other alternatives exist.	The approach to new development has been determined through further consultation and the draft amended accordingly.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
3	7.2.2	NK3	2 – Residents	In North Kilworth we have a rural backwater and you, the Parish Council, risk the destruction of the very thing people who want to live here value most – the countryside character of the small, self-sustaining village that is so prized in England. Along with the desire to build more houses we believe that government planning policy is aimed to protect such villages from the ravages of gold	Noted. The NP cannot promote fewer houses than in the Local Plan. The approach to new development has been determined through further consultation and	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the

				digging developers and landowners, you appear to be just rubber stamping their plans.	the draft amended accordingly.	requirement within the draft Local Plan.
2	7.2.2	NK3	2 – Residents	We estimate that some 100+ houses could be fitted in here should the developers so wish. These sites have no obvious connection to the village character and will create further urban sprawl along the A4304 road. It is only necessary to look at the recent examples of development: Millennium Close, Rose Dale and now Greenacres (ex-Gandys Roses) to see little attempt has been made to fit in with the village vernacular as detailed in the Parish Plan of 2004.	The NP will help to protect the community from disproportionate house building and specifically addresses the number of houses to be developed, supported by developer contributions where necessary to help address infrastructure issues.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
2	7.2.2	NK3	2 – Residents	The attempt to physically connect these sites to the centre of the village by 'creating a bridleway from the site into The Bogs and traffic free access to the core of the village and the school' will not help. We assume the attraction is for the many small school children from these new houses to walk through The Bogs and Millennium Green nature reserve each day in all weathers using this route – we think not- it is a permanent wetland and nature reserve.	Reference to the bridleway has been removed from the submission version of the NP	Text amended as proposed.
2	7.2.2	NK3	2 – Residents	We see 'an eastern play area to be created in the Manor Farmyard' – is this appropriate in a sensitive wildlife area and close to a nature reserve – indeed an expanded nature reserve as we read the proposal. The Bogs, described as a 'rare wetland gem' by the Environment Agency and Millennium Green, a Local Nature Reserve, are not municipal parks for playing games, amusements and swinging through the trees. There may well be many protected species present in the area e.g. great crested newts.	It is considered that this will be a useful addition to local services.	None
2	7.2.2	NK3	2 – Residents	There is some history to the attempted development of parts of this proposed site: as	Noted.	None.

				recent as 2008 planning permission was sought for the Manor Farm area and turned down for several valid reasons (and also turned down on appeal in 2010). A major problem has been that Cranmer Lane was judged as “totally unsuited to residential traffic”.		
2	7.2.2	NK3	2 – Residents	Access is the most valuable asset required to open up this land for future development for the landowner as this would allow direct road access to all the fields around the Manor Farm from the A4304 road. This would bring them all into play for future building development and the village would have little say in the matter. If a linking road e.g. a tarmac “bridleway” like on Stoney (church to mill), can be secured then access is possible to all this land and beyond the farmyard as well: behind the Millennium Green, Church Street and up to Stoney. With the new route in place it also makes development of Stoney much more feasible without traffic going through the village past the school – a serious objection at present. This is, we believe, the real purpose of the bridleway suggestion.	The issue of access has been agreed by Harborough DC as being suitable. Future development will be controlled through the NP. Reference to a bridleway has been removed.	Reference to a bridleway has been removed.
2	7.2.2	NK3	2 – Residents	If the landowner wishes to create a bridleway for public use to The Bogs and Millennium Green through the farmyard there is nothing stopping him now. We note there are no footpaths or bridleways across his land at the moment and have never heard of such an offer being made. We have heard however stories of local people being turned off the land for trespass though.	Reference to a bridleway has been removed.	Reference to a bridleway has been removed.
2	7.2.2	NK3	2 – Residents	Once the fields to the south of the village are accessible by road from the A4304 then the village will be powerless to stop the juggernaut of unrestricted development on this land rolling in the next 10 years. We estimate a further 100-200	Noted. Future development will be controlled through the NP and the wider planning system.	None.

				houses as a minimum will be possible, depending how far into the countryside the developers think they can take it. (Maybe they will just build a lot less 4,5,6 bed executive homes at £500,000+ a time though). If you think we are exaggerating take a bus ride through Kibworth and see what has happened to a quiet, self-sustaining, by passed Leicestershire village and observe the urban sprawl created in the open countryside and note how quickly this has occurred. Much more is in the planning stage for Kibworth! Do we want this for North Kilworth, the village would be swamped and very thing people value most of all, the countryside character would be lost.		
2	7.2.2	NK3	2 – Residents	We would also like to comment on the underhand way this planning proposal (Policy NK3 p25 of NKNP) has been sneaked into the Neighbourhood Plan at a late stage in an undemocratic way with no consultation. We hope the meetings with developers and landowners are minuted as a matter of public record or there are likely to be questions of legality or corruption asked surely.	Noted. Consultation did take place, however the change of SHLAA status for the preferred site from 'not-deliverable' to 'deliverable' immediately prior to the pre-submission consultation changed the order of preferred sites. There was no intention to be underhand or undemocratic – indeed the draft has been amended in light of the comments received.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
2	7.2.2	NK3	2 – Residents	Having been involved in the 2004 Parish Plan we understand only too well how difficult the task of preparing a Plan has been, however, the present need to cosy up to the developers and landowners (and HDC) escapes us. The Parish Council surely	Noted. The NP cannot promote fewer houses than in the Local Plan. The issue of housing allocations has been	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow

				represents the people of the village not vested interests. If you consult with people who are only interested in making money you will get self-serving ideas that no wider benefit to the village. How the Policy NK3 of the NP benefits the village is not obvious to us. We can see the benefits to HDC, the developers and landowners – perhaps this is all that matters to the Parish Council.	amended following further consultation. It is necessary to consult with developers and landowners to ensure the required development meets local needs.	sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
2	7.2.2	NK3	2 – Residents	We thought the NP is supposed to give a positive vision of the future to 2031 for the village to allow the Parish Council to take a lead in achieving that vision. The people around this part of the village feel badly let down – alienated, victimised, put upon, dumped on and worst of all ignored.	Noted. The consultation process has been re-run to ensure that villagers views are taken into account.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
3	7.2.2	NK3	3 – Local business	Speaking as a horse owner and horse rider of over 50 years' experience, what on earth is the point of creating a bridleway from the wettest part of the village 'The Bogs' out through a proposed 40 plus housing estate on to the main A4304 where it is downright dangerous to ride a horse, not only to the horse and rider but also to the vehicles and their drivers.	Noted. Reference to the bridleway has been removed.	Reference to the bridleway has been removed.
3	7.2.2	NK3	3 – Local business	Has anyone given any thought to the fact that this bridleway is envisaged to be shared with pedestrians linking the proposed housing estate to the middle of the village and the school, therefore young mothers with toddlers and pushchairs will be suing the bridleway, along with associated umbrellas etc, this is not a recipe for the safety of children, nor horses and their riders. Horse riders need to get out into the countryside, away from	Noted. Reference to the bridleway has been removed.	Reference to the bridleway has been removed.

				traffic, loose dogs and vulnerable people, not be riding through housing estates and amongst HGV traffic with precious little room to escape. Folk already moan if riders steer their horses on to pavements to avoid inconsiderate drivers, as it is!		
3	7.2.2	NK3	3 – Local business	The minute it rains, many parents prefer to drive their children to school, as demonstrated by the bottleneck of vehicles parked in Dag Lane and on the verges of the South Kilworth Road, the bridleway will be under-utilised, whether it is designated as a footpath or a bridleway because realistically it would be a long distance for children to walk to and from school every day, whatever the weather. If it is designated as a bridleway the surface would need to be specialist anti-slip, pedestrians safety separated from horses, and the boggy areas somehow avoided. There would also need to be a properly specified gate at the A4304 end to prevent horses escaping onto the main road and causing a serious accident (in event of a rider falling off and the loose horse making off).	Noted. Reference to the bridleway has been removed.	Reference to the bridleway has been removed.
7	7.2.2	NK3	7 - Residents	We were shocked to hear that the Parish Council is proposing a new development of up to 100 houses off Station Road at the east end of the village. We had understood that there may be a small development there, but the size of the proposal is entirely out of keeping with the character of the village and is not in line with the Village Plan, as it has been discussed and developed in recent years.	The Parish Council is proposing through the NP to meet the minimum housing requirement set by Harborough DC. The proposal for the Station Road site is around 40 houses.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
7	7.2.2	NK3	7 - Residents	We are particularly concerned by the following factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The size of the development in relation to the size and character of the village. 	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The additional traffic that will considerably reduce road safety on the main road, which is already a major concern for villagers, and is specifically addressed in 7.7.1 of the Village Plan. • The fact that the traffic will be entering the main road on a double bend. • The reduction in open space around the existing village. Section 6 of the Village Plan is specific that open spaces with clear views should be protected and Elmcroft would be adversely affected by the current proposal. • The endangering of interesting historical aspects of the village, such as the evidence of medieval farming on that site. 		Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
8	7.2.2	NK3	8 - Resident	<p>I feel very strongly that in considering where best to site our 30-40 dwellings their connection to the heart of the village i.e. school, village hall and pub etc should be paramount to our future plans. Along with this there could also be an excellent opportunity to tie in the existing new developments Rosedale and Greenacres by means of a carefully sited pedestrian crossing.</p>	This is noted – the whole village has voted again on housing allocations.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
8	7.2.2	NK3	8 - Resident	<p>The preferred site adjacent to Elmcroft Road would seem suitable to allow for this type of consolidation to evolve. Clearly there would need to be strict control over the design and number of properties together with an overall layout design that not only minimised any impact on Elmcroft residents but guaranteed the protection of additional green space including the suggested bridle/ footpaths</p>	Noted.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the

				accessing the Millennium Green and Cranmer Lane.		requirement within the draft Local Plan.
8	7.2.2	NK3	8 - Resident	There are techniques using photo montage images that can create an excellent picture of how any project will look during construction, on completion and 10 years after.	Noted.	None.
9	7.2.2	NK3	9 – Residents	We were surprised to find two fields zoned for housing development on the edge of the village to the south of Station Road on Harborough District Council’s SHLAA maps after the first draft NP had been submitted. As far as we are aware, these development sites had not formed part of the originally submitted plan and had certainly not been put forward for consultation at the public meetings held in Belgrave Hall. We were very disappointed when these sites quietly appeared, with no announcement from the Parish Council, in a subsequent amendment to the submitted plan and they now form part of an allocated housing development site of 36-40 new homes.	Noted. The timing of the revised SHLAA process was unfortunate here – but the village has had a subsequent opportunity to vote for its preferred sites.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
9	7.2.2	NK3	9 – Residents	We think it is rather disingenuous to open <i>Section 7.2.2 Housing Allocations</i> with the phrase “Following consultation with the community....” And then end it by announcing a large housing allocation site which formed no part of that consultation.	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
9	7.2.2	NK3	9 – Residents	As the draft plan points out North Kilworth has seen housing numbers rise in recent decades on a scale greater than the national average. While we understand central and local government claims that there is a great need for new house building	Noted. The NP cannot promote fewer houses than in the Local Plan.	None

				regionally, it is our understanding that most of Harborough District's quota is already filled by allocations on existing sites with the rest expected to be provided by infill. Consequently there does not seem to be a national or local need for housing development on this scale adjacent to North Kilworth. An increase of 36 homes would represent a 14% increase in the number of dwellings in the village and this seems to be a disproportionately large percentage increase for North Kilworth to bear.		
9	7.2.2	NK3	9 – Residents	The location of the sites (which would essentially be a bolt-on piece of suburbia) would distort and, we feel, damage the central character of the village.	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
9	7.2.2	NK3	9 – Residents	In addition, there are insufficient facilities to meet the implied population increase: the village school is already full almost to capacity; there are no shops in the village other than a small scale convenience outlet at the petrol station and a sub-Post Office; employment opportunities within the village are limited; GP access is limited; the sites are adjacent to an already heavily congested road. Because of this, at the moment North Kilworth enjoys the status of a Selected Rural Village in the Core Strategy.	Noted. The NP cannot promote fewer houses than in the Local Plan. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
9	7.2.2	NK3	9 – Residents	This lack of facilities means that a development of 36 or more homes by itself on the eastern edge of the village would be nothing more than a commuter	Noted. The NP cannot promote fewer houses than in the Local Plan.	None

				dormitory satellite. The lack of school or shopping facilities though is especially worrisome. In our experience, developments like this are approved on condition that developer contributions are provided to extend the local services. This increase in service provision removes the village's Selected Rural Village status and is then used by the same developers as an enabler for further housing development applications. Consequently, as has been witnessed in a large number of villages in the area, allocations like those to the south of Station Road become the thin end of a wedge that ultimately destroys the village and its character.		
9	7.2.2	NK3	9 – Residents	It is our understanding that this allocation is a result of opportunistic deal making between a land owner with unused pasture and a developer (who by their nature will want to build houses). However it is the role of Parish Council to oversee such deals and only permit them when there is a clear need and then only in appropriate circumstances.	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
9	7.2.2	NK3	9 – Residents	For the purpose of this consultation on the draft Neighbourhood Plan we would like it to be known that we approve of all sections apart from <i>Section 7.2 Housing Development</i> . We think the proposed housing allocation to the south of Station Road is a matter of utmost importance to the parish yet it has received precious little treatment in the Parish council meeting minutes in recent months. Could we ask you, as Chair of the Parish Council, to include an agenda item for the next Parish Council meeting where the Parish Council:	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sets out clearly the background to the amendment of the initially submitted draft Plan to include the current housing allocation • Explains why it feels this development is appropriate in scale and character for the village • Explores where it feels this development will lead in terms of future allocations and services provision in the village? 		
10	7.2.2	NK3	10 – Resident	Ultimately to meet the requirements for development, if there has to be further development, it would seem sensible to continue around Station Road and the marina where the traffic management is being put in place. This at least offers some coherence to development.	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
11	7.2.2	NK3	11 - Residents	<p>We have been made aware that the North Kilworth Parish Council are proposing the building of a new Housing Estate on land off Station Road, North Kilworth. With the minimum of 31 houses proposed to be erected but a maximum number is not quoted, although apparently 2 fields are designated for these new homes.</p> <p>We strongly object to this, as there was no mention of this intended housing estate at the time when the parish council opened the Village Hall for discussion as to the new village plan, i.e. The North Kilworth Neighbourhood Plan Draft 3 Policy 7.2.2 Housing Allocation.</p>	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.

11	7.2.2	NK3	11 - Residents	What is the point of having these open meetings for residents of this village, for people to air their views, when the parish council go behind the backs of our community and agree propositions underhandedly. A new development on this scale will totally change the character of this pleasant village into an urban sprawl, and obliterate beautiful views of the Leicestershire Countryside.	The PC was open in its deliberations, but changed circumstances meant that the preferred site changed prior to the draft plan undertaking pre-submission consultation.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
11	7.2.2	NK3	11 - Residents	Has there been any forethought in the amount of extra traffic on the main road through the village. If there are 31 new properties, this means there will be at least another 62 vehicles in and around our village, at all times of the day and night. Let alone the construction traffic utility and Electric and Ground Workers whilst this monstrosity is being built.	Noted. The NP cannot promote fewer houses than in the Local Plan. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
11	7.2.2	NK3	11 - Residents	The capacity of the village school is full now, so if there were to be another 100 plus children, where are they to be accommodated. With little or no amenities in this village, this has to be a dire decision made by North Kilworth Parish Council. A council that takes no notice of its residents or cares.	The NP cannot promote fewer houses than in the Local Plan. The PC cannot therefore refuse to accept new housing on this scale, but through a NP can influence where those houses are built.	None
12	7.2.2	NK3	12 - Residents	As residents of North Kilworth we object to the North Kilworth NP draft 3, page 25 policy 7.2.2 housing allocation. There has been limited consultation around this phase of development with residents and I feel the plans would dramatically alter the village for the worse, we have	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC

				concerns over the loss of green space, increasing traffic volume and damage to historic areas.		in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
13	7.2.2	NK3	13 - Resident	I am writing to express my great concern and utter disbelief regarding the recent move within this third draft of the Parish plan to suddenly add new and completely antithetical proposals to permit building on the land to the south of Station Road opposite Rose Dale referred to on p25. I support every element of the letter sent to you by (respondent 20) on 24 th Feb and so rather than repeat her very well made objections, I would just like to add the following points.	Changed circumstances meant that the preferred site changed immediately prior to the draft plan being sent out for pre-submission consultation.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
13	7.2.2	NK3	13 - Resident	It would be interesting to know if you have consulted, prior to consideration of the site, with the relevant authorities about road safety. I understand that it is very unusual to allow any proposal for an access road to such a potentially extensive development to be placed on a road where there is a double bend.	Leicestershire CC and Harborough DC are satisfied that access issues are suitable.	None
13	7.2.2	NK3	13 – Resident	A more detailed outline of what is proposed to go where on the designated land segments would be useful to see and presumably the recent destruction by fire of the agricultural buildings at the back of the area outlined would be, most fortuitously, to the advantage of the potential developer.	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site. More details of site layouts have been considered and have been built into the revised policy wording.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
14	7.2.2	NK3	14 - Resident	This afternoon I have had an anonymous letter pushed through my door concerning a proposed housing development by NKPC on Station Road opposite Rose Dale and behind Elmcroft Road houses. I'm not aware that our Parish Council has	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow

				become a construction company in the past few weeks so am wondering what the proposal is about? Where can I find further details so I can make a decision on what action I need to take?		sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
15	7.2.2	NK3	15 - Resident	The site put forward for housing (fig 4 proposals map) has always been considered to not have good access from the A4304 in previous publications of the NP. I presume that the council think access is no longer a problem despite the ever increasing traffic using the A4304.	This is a matter for Leicestershire CC and Harborough DC, both of whom consider access issues to be satisfactory.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
15	7.2.2	NK3	15 – Resident	The proposed development would more than fill the quota required up to 2031 with no need to build elsewhere in the village. I feel too many new houses in one place is not in keeping with the rural character of this ancient village and there is danger of swamping the local amenities rather than a steady support over years to come.	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
15	7.2.2	NK3	15 – Resident	Obviously housing has to be provided but I feel that a steady approach would benefit the village rather than putting the whole required allocation in one estate on the edge of the village. May be many people in the central part of the village would be in favour of this option, not because they like it, but prefer this option to one that may affect them, this is perfectly understandable but not necessarily the best way forward.	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.

				Rural villages like the beautiful village of North Kilworth were created by attractive individual properties being introduced gradually over time, a much safer approach to maintaining the charm of the village.		
16	7.2.2	NK3	16 - Resident	North Kilworth is described on page 23 of this draft as a 'Selected Rural Village' and therefore suitable for <u>limited small scale development</u> , which has to ensure sustainable growth. I don't consider a development of between 30 to 40 houses in one place at one time either small or sustainable. This would in deed put pressure on local services and amenities also, detract from the special rural character of the village. I also wonder whether there is a need for this many houses in the village when as the draft states we will meet our allocation on windfall sites over the next 16 years.	The NP cannot promote fewer houses than in the Local Plan. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site. Harborough DC will not accept the scale of new housing needed in NK to be met through windfall only.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
16	7.2.2	NK3	16 - Resident	The site put forward for housing (land south of Station Road opposite Rose Dale Fig 4) has always been considered to have poor access on to the A4304 by the Parish Council in the past. The proposed site is on a double bend and now having more recent housing developments on the other side of the A4303 creating more access roads and traffic. The new site will impact on this and add to the amount of traffic coming in and out, onto an already busy road. I consider road safety and the impact on the environment to be an issue.	This is essentially a matter for Leicestershire CC and Harborough DC, both of whom consider access issues to be satisfactory.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
17	7.2.2	NK3	17 – Residents	Re: houses on land South of Station Road, opposite Rosedale on the two fields behind the houses in Elmcroft Road.	The NP cannot promote fewer houses than in the Local Plan.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow

				<p>We think it is disgraceful that this has only just been brought to the local people's attention and that we are not given much time to object. We strongly object to the building of these new houses – reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mass population influx to North Kilworth • Mass traffic congestion on Station Road • Local amenities will not be able to cope i.e. primary school, local footpaths • Damage to the environment • More vehicle pollution • More noise pollution • More mud/ debris on the road caused by all the building works • The feeling of being 'hemmed in' by the surrounding houses • Damage to the surrounding views and countryside. <p>We love North Kilworth at its current size – and do not want mass numbers of newly built houses.</p>	<p>Changed circumstances meant that the preferred site changed immediately prior to the draft plan being sent out for pre-submission consultation.</p> <p>Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.</p>	<p>sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.</p>
18	7.2.2	NK3	18 - Residents	<p>Myself, my husband and family have been residents in Elmcroft Road for the past 25 years and thoroughly enjoy our garden and the countryside views we have from our house. You will understand then, my dismay and concern at being informed of the proposal to build a substantial amount of houses on the fields directly behind our house.</p> <p>We are very alarmed also, that this is the first we have heard about this and not even from the parish council but neighbours who have informed the residents in the street.</p>	<p>Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.</p>	<p>The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.</p>

				We are of course, worried about the disruption this will cause to our quiet street but also our loss of privacy from houses that will overlook our gardens. I wish to put my objection to this proposal in writing to let you know how totally against this we are.		
19	7.2.2	NK3	19 - Resident	Please accept this email as our strong objection to the proposed building of new houses as highlighted in the North Kilworth NP Draft 3 page 25. We are in full agreement with the reasons stated in the excellent letter, addressed to yourself, from (Respondent 20) on 24 th February 2016.	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
20	7.2.2	NK3	20 - Resident	Indeed on line 7 page 25 it states that the proposed site has the potential to provide 36-40 houses and on line 10 goes on to assert that 'should it become necessary to provide additional homes... the Plan will be reviewed immediately'. This despite the acknowledgement in section 7.2.3 Windfall sites that 'windfall sites are expected to come forward over the lifetime of the Plan.. averaging about one dwelling a year.. they will continue to provide a reliable source of housing supply' lines 1,2,8,9,10,11 page 27.	The NP cannot promote fewer houses than in the Local Plan. Harborough DC will not accept the scale of new housing needed in NK to be met through windfall only.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
20	7.2.2	NK3	20 - Resident	The field next to the Station Road is an ancient medieval field bearing the ridge and furrow earth works as referenced on Line 15 page 8, a feature which on Lines 23-24 the document goes on to state that 'There is a strongly held wish among residents that the historic settlement character should not be compromised by development'.	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the

						requirement within the draft Local Plan.
20	7.2.2	NK3	20 - Resident	<p>NK3, like the North Kilworth Plan 2013 – 2020 repeatedly reiterates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the desirability and importance of ‘attractive green spaces’ line 25 page 9, • the need to protect important views line 8 page 19 • the protection of open spaces of local importance line 14 page 9 • and in Section 6 Meeting the Requirements for Sustainable Development b) Environment page 20 ‘In order to protect and enhance our.. historic environment we are seeking to ensure.. important open spaces and views within North Kilworth are protected from development, to protect the village identity and to retain the rural nature of its surroundings.’ <p>Well I can only assume that members of the Parish Council have omitted to visit the ‘land south of Station Road’ because from the perspective of any average individual, it cannot be denied that the view from Elmcroft Road over the medieval field towards the canal and across to the Laughton hills, is in fact one of the most attractive views in the whole of the village (whether or not it appears on your designated lists of important views and open spaces) and you are all cordially invited to come and spend some time looking at it from any of a number of gardens.</p>	The list of proposed important views and Local Green Spaces was shared at open events within the Parish and all comments taken into account. The prominence of views is stronger if from public areas rather than from back gardens.	None
20	7.2.2	NK3	20 - Resident	I question the need for so many houses to be built on any individually allocated site, since by your own reckoning an estimated 15 houses will materialise on windfall sites over the lifetime of the	The NP cannot promote fewer houses than in the Local Plan.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to

				Plan – this surely reduces the need for 30+ houses to be built on this or any other allocated site?	Harborough DC will not accept the scale of new housing needed in NK to be met through windfall only.	Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
20	7.2.2	NK3	20 - Resident	As stated in 7.7.1 Traffic Management ‘demand for travel needs to be balanced with the need to reduce congestion and other potential negative effects such as road safety and impact on the environment’. A housing development of 30-40 houses would undoubtedly have an impact on traffic flow to and from the A4304. Most homes have at least one car, many two, some even three or four vehicles especially in the more wealthy households with young adult children. That means that you have a potential increase of 60 – 100 vehicles from this one housing development.	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site, including the potential to spread development across more than one site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
20	7.2.2	NK3	20 - Resident	There is undoubtedly a need for more homes, especially affordable homes for young people desperately trying to get on the housing ladder or alternatively rent at an affordable rate and clearly the Parish Councillors must address this. I also accept that it must be extremely frustrating for landowners wishing to draw capital from the sale of their land for building, to be denied at every end and turn. My primary objection is to the fact that suddenly, ‘out of the blue’, virtually all future house building in North Kilworth is being lumped on a site, regardless of its historical, attractive and open aspects, all of which are stated in NK3 as prime considerations in the future planning of the village.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
20	7.2.2	NK3	20 - Resident	Consequently my feeling is that a deal has been done regarding certain aspirations around ownership of the Millennium Green, and other	No deals have been done other than discussing the village requirements to	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an

				undoubted benefits to the village, including the provision of a children's play area, road crossing over the A4304 and bridleway from Station Road to the Bogs, but all having also an adverse effect solely on the residents of Elmcroft Road and Station Road.	accompany the development. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
20	7.2.2	NK3	20 - Resident	I feel sure that Councillors do wish to care for the health and wellbeing of all the inhabitants of North Kilworth, but it may not be obvious to people who are happy living in the centre of the village, that those of us who purchase property on the very edge of the village, may do so for a deep psychological need to be at the edge, with a sense of space, rather than feeling considerable stress by being enclosed by houses all around them and that the sudden prospect of that space being shut down is actually horrific, especially when it had been clearly safeguarded as part of a Green Belt.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site. The land in question is not a part of the Green Belt as suggested.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
20	7.2.2	NK3	20 - Resident	May I therefore offer for your consideration the following suggestions, which hopefully take something of the needs of everyone in to account: 1. The aspirations laid down in the NK Plan 2013-2020 states that there 'was a general disapproval of high density housing... as this was felt to be inappropriate for the plot sizes and the relationship with the adjacent built form and open space.. L-shaped footprints [are] regarded as a desirable solution to the problem of providing small dwellings at a high density without detracting from the village' Paragraph 4 page 12. If the designated use of the land south of Station Road must be changed to allow some building, I suggest that it be for	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site. Development requirements have been built into the revised policy wording to accommodate these changes.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.

				a much smaller number of houses, no more than 15, similar to the development on the opposite side of the road on the former site of Ghandi's Roses. That the houses be built parallel to the Af430 and along the far edge of the field adjacent to the boundary hedgerow, this would give everyone a sense of open space while allowing for a reasonable number of houses.		
20	7.2.2	NK3	20 - Resident	2. That this housing site is provided with hedgerows and trees planted to surround the development and along the proposed bridle path, providing increased privacy for everyone as well as the environmental benefits of biodiversity also aspired to in the NK Plan.	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site. This suggestion will be considered as part of any design solution.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
20	7.2.2	NK3	20 - Resident	3. That the site to the west of the village, on the South Kilworth Road be reconsidered for a further 15 houses thereby spreading the distribution of both houses and traffic around the village whilst keeping plot sizes in keeping with the effort to maintain the overall character of the village.	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site. This includes housing across more than one site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
20	7.2.2	NK3	20 - Resident	4. That rather than providing an extended children's play area of the site of the Manor Farm Yard boundaries, that this could be created adjacent to the new housing development on the land to the south of Station Road, thereby maintaining for	These are good suggestions that will be taken into account in relation to the detailed design conditions of the chosen site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to

				<p>generations to come, the open space and hopefully some of the medieval ridge and furrow aspect within that space. This would give access to a playing area for children on the north eastern side of the village near the several new developments of the Millennium Close, Rose Dale, the Ghandi's Roses estate, as well as the proposed new building project itself. I also believe it would also be a healthier site, being open and drier than the area around the Bogs and Manor Farm Yard which is already an area subject to mosquitoes in the summer and increasingly so as we experience the warmer/ wetter weather that is developing as climate change progresses. Without wishing to be alarmist, in view of the current anxieties around the Zita virus, the avoidance of pregnant mothers with small children on a site close to likely breeding grounds for mosquitoes, must surely be an important consideration.</p>		<p>be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.</p>
20	7.2.2	NK3	20 - Resident	<p>5. That in view of the boggy nature of the area around Manor Farm Yard, and since there are little or no publicly accessible, sizable areas of woodland in or around the village, that a woodland copse of natural British trees be planted – a bluebell wood would certainly become a most valuable and enhancing feature in the village.</p>	<p>This suggestion will be put to the developer as part of conditions attached to development.</p>	<p>The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.</p>
22	7.2.2	NK3	22 – National Grid	<p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>

				<p>assets and high pressure gas pipelines and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate/ High Pressure apparatus.</p> <p>National Grid has identified the following High Pressure Gas Transmission pipeline as falling with the Neighbourhood area boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FM02 – Duddington to Churchover <p>From the consultation information provided, the above gas transmission pipeline does not interact with any of the proposed development sites.</p>		
22	7.2.2	NK3	22 – National Grid	<p>Whilst there is no implications for National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate/ High Pressure apparatus, there may however be Low Pressure (LP)/ Medium Pressure (MP) Gas Distribution pipes present within proposed development sites. If further information is required in relation to the Gas Distribution network please contact plantprotection@nationalgrid.com</p>	Noted	None
23	7.2.2	NK3	23 - Resident	<p>The one site put forward for new houses has many advantages and disadvantages. A significant disadvantage of building many houses here is the loss of visual amenity and the presentation of a less appetising vista. The green spaces and the views from outside the village are worthy of consideration, and where possible worth conserving.</p>	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site and limits introduced on the number of new homes on any one site	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
24	7.2.2	NK3	24 – HD Council	<p>Consider setting out a minimum number of homes to be delivered on the site. Ref to NK5 should be NK6. There needs to be a link to the hydro-geological study referred to in the policy.</p>	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow

						sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
24	7.2.2	NK3	24 – HD Council	May be worthwhile stating the specification for the bridleway – i.e. accessibility for school children etc.	Reference to the bridleway has been removed.	Reference to the bridleway has been removed.
24	7.2.2	NK3	24 – HD Council	Policy NK3 final bullet point; suggest deleting ‘to minimise surface water run-off’. This would pick up on the mitigation & enhancement measures recommendations outlined (page 37) in the Harborough Local Plan Options Consultation Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report (Sept 2015) which the council will be taking in to consideration as it progresses with the preparation of the New Local Plan. A copy of this document can be found on the council website here SA and SEA – New Local Plan / Harborough District Council.	Agreed	Amendments to be made.
25	7.2.2	NK3	25 - Residents	<p>We wish to object to the current form of these plans for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loss of a fantastic view which we now have from our home, of beautiful countryside. • The loss of the above countryside which has been designated green belt, and the field is an ancient medieval field. • The effect this will have on the local wildlife (deers are regularly seen in this field from our lounge window) • The extra pressure this will have on local amenities especially St Andrews Primary School • The increase in traffic on the already busy and dangerous ‘A’ road 	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The size of this development. 		
26	7.2.2	NK3	26 - Residents	We live on Station Road right opposite the proposed development site. We strongly object to the proposed housing as it will greatly impact several areas, including fantastic views, greatly increased traffic due to construction which would be for months or a couple of years even due to the amount of houses proposed and the impact it would have on de-valuing house prices in the local area.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
26	7.2.2	NK3	26 - Residents	Already we have seen a vast increase in traffic due to the two other new developments, the former Gandy's Roses site and the new Marina site which already is into it's second year of development and nowhere near completion.	Noted	None
26	7.2.2	NK3	26 - Residents	I have lived and worked in North Kilworth for several years and would be totally devastated if I had to move because of a deflation in value of our house, we bought our house because of the most fantastic views to Naseby. It is because of reasons stated above we so strongly object to the revised planned development in 'Our Village', North Kilworth.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
29	7.2.2	NK3	29 - Resident	<p>The idea of extending the Bogs into the area of the Manor Farm Barns field and returning this to wetland would be a great asset to the village and greatly enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>An adventure playground on the dryer parts would benefit the village also.</p>	Noted	None
29	7.2.2	NK3	29 - Resident	The field opposite Rosedale proposed for development has an area of 2 hectares which, with	Noted. Further consultation has taken	The identification of a preferred site has

				<p>the current new build density in North Kilworth of 25 homes/ hectare, could provide for 50 new houses. (ref policy NK3 and Figure 4: Proposals map). This would seem to be more than adequately meet the housing development needs for North Kilworth, as a selected rural village suitable for limited small scale development, of 30 – 40 homes by 2030. The extra addition of the lower field (an area of 1.6 hectares) could provide for another 40 homes. This would go well beyond building requirements for North Kilworth and seems very excessive and out of proportion to the size of the village.</p> <p>By granting such a large area of land for potential development, it has taken any idea of localism away, and put the future of North Kilworth in the hands of developers. I do not remember such a large area being proposed at any of the open meetings.</p>	<p>place in relation to the preferred housing site.</p> <p>Maximum housing numbers per site will be specified in the NP to help manage future development.</p>	<p>been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.</p>
30	7.2.2	NK3	30 - Resident	<p>The area indicated as proposed permitted housing development (figure 4: proposals map) to the side of Elmcroft Road and opposite Rosedale, is not as was indicated at the last open meeting.</p> <p>The area proposed for building was only the top field, adjacent to the main road.</p>	<p>Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.</p> <p>Noted. The revised SHLAA in November 2015 linked together two previously separate sites.</p>	<p>The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.</p>
30	7.2.2	NK3	30 - Resident	<p>This top field was proposed with the offer of a bridle path leading to the Manor Farm barns field and the gift of this field to the village. The addition of this field added to the Millennium Green and Bogs area for return of part to wetland, as it always</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>

				was ecologically, would be a great asset, as wetlands of this nature are very rare. The streams are returning naturally and are working towards this state at present.		
30	7.2.2	NK3	30 - Resident	Any playground should be of the adventure sort as hard surfacing would be inappropriate in a wetland, and would be difficult to maintain anyway as the water, always there, would destroy it. Such a playground would have to be surrounded by secure fencing as there are many dangers in the area (e.g. the substation) and nearby deep water. It would also be difficult to supervise the activities of the children.	Noted	None
30	7.2.2	NK3	30 - Resident	The propose estate opposite Rosedale will generate the volume of traffic of a level previously opposed by Harborough District Council.	Harborough DC has deemed the site to be suitable for development through an initial sifting of the SHLAA.	None
30	7.2.2	NK3	30 - Resident	A reduced number of houses built opposite Rosedale and in line with the main road, would be more in keeping with existing building in this area.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
30	7.2.2	NK3	30 - Resident	It could be possible to divide the building allocation of 30-40 houses between more than one site. The cost of the barns field, for example, could be offset between a number of developers.	Yes, this has been considered and addressed in further consultation.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC

						in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
30	7.2.2	NK3	30 - Resident	Insufficient information was given on the proposal to develop land opposite Rosedale at the last open meeting. It is quite possible that villagers did not realise the implications of building the proposed estate and the offsetting of the Manor Farm barns field.	This is accepted. Circumstances changed immediately prior to the draft NP being prepared. Further consultation has since taken place.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
31	7.2.2	NK3	31 - NKSG	I was contacted by an Elmcroft resident who suggested that the plan for the Station Road site be restricted to the area identified in the March 2015 consultation.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
32	7.2.2	NK3	32 - leaflet	Are you aware .. that our North Kilworth Parish Council are proposing the building of a new housing estate upon land off Station Road, opposite Rose Dale? In their proposals they speak of a minimum of 31 houses but do not give a maximum figure. They have allocated two fields for building at the back of resident's homes in Elmcroft Road with the capacity for 100 new houses (approximately 4 hectares at 25 houses per hectare).	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.

				If this proposal goes ahead it will significantly change the character of our village, increasing the housing stock by almost a third. It is also totally against the Development Plan which calls for small builds around the village. NOT ONE GREAT HOUSING ESTATE! We do not oppose a small build of say 10-15 houses similar to Rose Dale, but such a potentially massive estate on one site is outrageous.		
32	7.2.2	NK3	32 - leaflet	The North Kilworth Draft 3 states on Lines 23/24 page 8 'There is a strongly-held wish among residents that the historic settlements character should not be compromised by development. Yet this proposal would ruin some of our village's history in that both fields suggested have examples of medieval 'Ridge and Furrows' dating back to the beginning of the villages existence and were farmed by the villages until the 18 th century Enclosures Act. So this proposal is contrary to the stated aims of the said Development Plan.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
32	7.2.2	NK3	32 - leaflet	It would also obliterate all country views for Elmcroft Road residents, thereby contravening the stated aim: Section 6. Meeting the requirement for sustainable development. Paragraph B) line 15 page 20 'In order to protect and enhance our... historic environment we are seeking to ensure .. important open spaces and views within North Kilworth are protected from development, to protect the village identity and to retain the rural nature of its surroundings.	The list of proposed important views and Local Green Spaces was shared at open events within the Parish. It was from these events that decisions about which views to incorporate were considered.	None
32	7.2.2	NK3	32 - leaflet	Such an estate would also add hugely to the village traffic problem. We already have an expected increase of traffic through the village with the ongoing development of Magna Park and the new Marina and to add the traffic from up to 100	Harborough DC have deemed the site to be suitable for development through an initial sifting of the SHLAA.	None

				homes onto an already busy 'A' road and in the middle of a double bend is also against 7.7.1 Traffic Management 'demand for travel needs to be balanced with the need to reduce congestion and other potential negative effects such as road safety and impact on the environment' Lines 8-10 page 50.		
33	7.2.2	NK3	33 - Resident	As a resident of North Kilworth for over 35 years, I was appalled to hear that there is a proposal to build, what I would call an 'estate', on fields on land opposite Rose Dale. Regardless of its location I would oppose such a concentrated development. I have fully supported the village plan up to this date, some house building is required, but to retain the character of this old and pleasant village, it must be spread in a sympathetic way.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
33	7.2.2	NK3	33 - Resident	I think that memories are short, one of the stated aims of the plan is to protect the rural nature of the village and its surroundings, including the views. The view from Stoney, across the Avon valley is a case in point, and must be preserved at all costs. That same view across the Avon valley is available from the proposed development site and if go ahead is given, will be lost to the village forever. This is prime agricultural land within the green belt with historic medieval field patterns and should not be lost to the village.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
33	7.2.2	NK3	33 - Resident	As a keen astronomer and astrophotographer of many years standing, I have watched over the years, as light pollution has increased steadily over the village i.e. driving range at golf course and other street light lit developments. There are numerous and ever growing campaigns across the	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to

				country to bring darker skies back to the UK. The night sky to the east of the village is the only relatively unpolluted area we have left (lights of Leicester to the North, Lutterworth/ Rugby to the West, Northampton to the South). Have we all forgotten what a magnificent sight the Milky Way is on a dark night? Why should we deny our children and grandchildren this spectacle (or don't people care anymore). Any concentrated development involving numerous street lights will destroy this last little bit of unspoilt magic, but then I'm biased of course – you can't photograph the wonders of the Universe through a light polluted sky. I truly hope that common sense will prevail and more appropriate sites will be considered as they become available.		be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
34	7.2.2	NK3	34 - Resident	It has come to my attention that in the only very recently published latest draft of the NP there are proposals to turn the fields at the end of my garden in to a building plot. These fields have always been designated as Green Field sites and form an important boundary to the village housing line and are used for agricultural purposes including grazing and crops. I object very strongly to the use of these fields being changed to building land.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
34	7.2.2	NK3	34 - Resident	I've lived in North Kilworth all my life and in Elmcroft Road since this house was first built. I've always lived on the edge of the village because I'm a country lad through and through and need to look out onto the countryside. It is so important to me, folks that live surrounded by houses wouldn't understand how important it is to people like me, I can't abide looking at houses and can't believe this	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the

				proposal to build 30 – 40 houses on these fields – it’s devastating to me.		requirement within the draft Local Plan.
34	7.2.2	NK3	34 - Resident	North Kilworth has already had most of the new housing located along Station Road, increasing the traffic onto the main road. It can already take some time to move out of Elmcroft Road because of the already increased traffic. Now however you are proposing to extend the housing further in this area and increase even more the number of cars getting out onto the main road.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site. Harborough DC considers the site suitable for development through an initial sifting of the SHLAA.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
34	7.2.2	NK3	34 - Resident	What has happened to the proposal to build down on South Kilworth Road near the Sports and Social Club? This new proposal to build on ‘land south of Station Road opposite Rose Dale’ might be convenient for those of you living in the village but in in way does it take into any consideration whatsoever the needs and wellbeing of those of us living on this side of the village. The Parish Council is meant to be caring for all parts of the village. I rely on you to modify these proposals and turn back to the idea of building along the South Kilworth Road site which will affect no-one and has the advantage of being close to the school for the many young families who will be living in these houses and away from the main road.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
35	7.2.2	NK3	35 - Resident	With regard to the NK NP Draft 3, I request clarification on certain aspects of Section 7.2.2 Housing allocation, page 3 of the Plan. Two items detailed in the proposal are relevant.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area in question relates to land earmarked for potential development south of Station Road and back of Elmcroft Road • The potential provision of 36-40 new homes on the designated are. <p>By the interpolation of both factors it can be fairly concluded that the ratification of the area for potential development is in excess of what is required for 36-40 units. The area at some 4.5 hectares (11 acres), with a maximum of 40 units equates to 3.6 units per acre. Realistically the area could accommodate in excess of 100 units on a density ration of at least 10 per acre which is somewhat closer to an applied development norm. (A comparison of recent village schemes endorses this conclusion).</p> <p>Therefore, in the event that the said 4.5 hectares is proposed and accepted by Harborough District Council , deregulating green belt control, what provisions or condition would prevent the construction of additional units over and above the 36-40 whether now or at a later date?</p>	<p>The site in question is not Green Belt.</p> <p>Maximum housing numbers per site will be specified to prevent uncontrolled increases over time.</p>	<p>be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.</p>
35	7.2.2	NK3	35 - Resident	<p>On the premise that the 4.5 hectares is limited to 36-40 units, by condition, I would conjecture that there would be little incentive for a developer to purchase the total area and provide the community facilities detailed.</p> <p>If, however, the underlying intention of the proposal is to enable a progressive expansion of the number of units over 36-40 and the release of 4.5 hectares of green belt land would endorse this opinion then the proposal is a misrepresentation of intent.</p>	<p>Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.</p> <p>The site in question is not Green Belt.</p> <p>Maximum housing numbers per site will be specified to prevent</p>	<p>The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.</p>

					uncontrolled increases over time.	
35	7.2.2	NK3	35 - Resident	<p>The only way to alleviate any misgivings of the community in this connection is to consider a detailed plan/ scheme submitted to the councillors (or commissioned by the council) identifying the location of the 36-40 units on the site together with area accesses etc; in short, a detailed representation of the items set out on Policy NK3 Housing Allocation.</p> <p>I conclude that as matters stand the proposal anticipates a growth of homes beyond 36-40 units with no limit and no contingency that the 36-40 units may actually exceed local need.</p> <p>Contemporary or current information may clarify this position.</p>	<p>More detailed design proposals will be considered as part of the finalisation of the NP</p> <p>Maximum housing numbers per site will be specified to prevent uncontrolled increases over time.</p>	<p>The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.</p>
36	7.2.2	NK3	36 – Residents	<p>We moved to North Kilworth five months ago to be in a rural community. The size and character of North Kilworth suited us perfectly.</p> <p>We appreciate it is necessary to build more homes and North Kilworth should not be exempt from this. We also recognise to remain an active village supporting a school, pub, post office and garage/ shop some growth is necessary. However a development of up to 100 new homes is not conducive to a village of this size and character. Please consider the views of existing residents of North Kilworth and the Development Plan and limit any development to fewer than 15 homes.</p>	<p>Noted. The NP cannot promote fewer houses than in the Local Plan. The location of housing is to be determined through consultation.</p>	<p>The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.</p>
37	7.2.2	NK3	37 - Resident	<p>I am writing to object to the large proposed development on Station Road, North Kilworth on a green belt. I understand historical parts of the</p>	<p>Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the</p>	<p>The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an</p>

				village were to be preserved. Why must all new development be all in one place, ruining the aspect we now have. It will add to pollution and congestion which is already a very busy road. Most of these properties will have two cars or more. When something happens on the A14 or M1 its horrendous. The new Marina will also add to the traffic and I'm sure if Manor Fields is extended this will also add to the congestion of heavy lorries.	preferred housing site, including the spreading of development across more than one site.	extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
38	7.2.2	NK3	38 - Residents	As with many of us who reside on Elmcroft Road and Elmcroft Close, I cannot reiterate how upset, unhappy and obviously concerned we are that with no consultation, plans to build all 31 of the estimated minimum required housing provision have been drawn up for this one site. Not to mention that it may be used for upwards of 36-40 houses.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
38	7.2.2	NK3	38 - Residents	As like many of us residents we the above object to these plans. One reason being the area, as highlighted on the proposals map for the possible housing development, is in fact a large area of green belt land of which you would agree, is fundamentally important, and in line with the North Kilworth Plan 'Such spaces should not be compromised'.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site. The land in question is not Green Belt.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
38	7.2.2	NK3	38 - Residents	Traffic and further congestion through our already busy village. As 7.7.1 Traffic Management states 'Demand for travel needs to be balanced with reducing congestion and other negative effects such as safety' etc we truly believe a development	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site, including the spreading of	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to

				of up to 40 houses is of course going to increase traffic and have a huge impact on safety.	development across more than one site.	be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
38	7.2.2	NK3	38 - Residents	As someone who for many years, regularly spends time walking around this village and locality with a very young child, it could be said safety is already an issue. Lack of adequate paths, enough room for single use or pushchair/ wheelchair friendly and speeding vehicles the humble pedestrian does not fair well.	Noted	None
38	7.2.2	NK3	38 - Residents	I also feel that although an inevitable increase of houses in North Kilworth is likely, having the facilities we all require needs to be considered, for example a doctors surgery used by many parishes, full to capacity, and a very weak public transport system to say the least.	Noted	None
38	7.2.2	NK3	38 - Residents	Living in Elmcroft we do enjoy the open space here and we all hope that if the NP does indeed allow it's village people a voice on how our community grows and develops, perhaps a compromise can be made, where a sense of space here on the edge of our village is maintained for all, including future new builds.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
40	7.2.2	NK3	40 - Anonymous	I wish to register my opposition to the dumping of houses in 'one spot' next to Elmcroft Road in North Kilworth. Despoiling open views and without consulting the residents of that street and totally against the Local Plan consultation which we took part in. I know this letter will be ignored as local democracy has been now been ignored – but we will fight this.	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the

						requirement within the draft Local Plan.
41	7.2.2	NK3	41 - Resident	I have lived in Elmcroft Road with my family for over 10 years. We bought the house in the knowledge that we were moving to the outskirts of a small village with beautiful, protected open countryside to the East of us. Harborough District Council confirmed that there were no plans to develop the land onto which we look out on. Now, it appears that proposals are underway to blight our open views of the countryside by constructing a full scale housing estate on this land, spread over two fields, a development that will undoubtedly change the whole dynamics of the village and what I used to be. The proposal is nothing short of urban sprawl. The land that has been earmarked (approximately 3.6 hectares) is capable of sustaining around 90 houses, not the 36-40 which are mentioned in the plan, and there is every chance that this could become a reality if this proposal goes ahead.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site. Development on any site will be restricted to limit new housing to meet the numbers required.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
41	7.2.2	NK3	41 - Resident	North Kilworth will lose its identity as small, rural village which is inconceivable and must not be allowed to happen, hence why us villagers must act quickly to educate those in support of the proposal and not only protect the residents of Elmcroft Road, but the village as a whole.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
41	7.2.2	NK3	41 - Resident	It is my opinion that the proposals are badly thought out. There has been no direct consultation with the residents of Elmcroft Road and this last minute inclusion of the land in the 3 rd draft of the	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to

				Parish Plan is nothing short of preposterous. <u>I would like to strongly object to the proposal to develop the land South of Station Road for the following reasons:</u>		Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
41	7.2.2	NK3	41 - Resident	The proposal is not supported by the majority of villagers: As a petition is currently being circulated, I can now say with some certainty that this proposal is NOT supported by the majority of the village. If the Parish Council had undertaken a full and direct consultation with the village on the amendments to the Plan they would have found this out for themselves without any doubt. I along with my neighbours have basically determined this in a very short space of time hence proving how little effort has been made to consult on the new proposal thus far.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
41	7.2.2	NK3	41 - Resident	There was no vote – previous votes are irrelevant and unrepresentative. I am aware of a vote that took place in March 2015 following an open consultation at the Village Hall. This vote was in favour of any proposed village development to take place on land adjacent to the Sports Club on South Kilworth Road. The vote consisted of a maximum of 27 people according to the consultation results, with 36 attendees. 17 of the attendees were in the age range 65-74 (47%). I personally do not think that this vote was representative of the village in number or age range. I am not aware of any vote taking place since? Certainly not one that the residents of Elmcroft Road were aware of and able to participate in.	The Open Event was open to all from the Parish and the results reflected what happened on the day. However, further consultation involving a higher percentage of villagers has subsequently been undertaken following a well-attended public meeting.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
41	7.2.2	NK3	41 - Resident	Up to 90/100 houses NOT 36-40: The two fields proposed are approximately 3.6-4 hectares. The	The NP will seek to restrict the amount of	The identification of a preferred site has

				average density for housing construction in England at the present time is 25 houses per hectare. The fields are therefore easily capable of supporting 90-100 houses. Although the Parish Council may well only be looking at 30-40 houses, due to the size of the land being submitted for development, we the villagers will have little control over the 'number' of houses if and when permission is granted. A large housing estate is indeed what we will end up with if this land continues to be put up for development.	development in line with District-wide requirements.	been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
41	7.2.2	NK3	41 - Resident	We have to be extremely careful that we do not allow increased air pollution from traffic in North Kilworth as it would be an extremely negative situation for all concerned. The work and cost of having an AQMA declared is not conducive to village life. In short, the increase in congestion that will be encouraged goes directly against NK22.	Noted	None
41	7.2.2	NK3	41 - Resident	Contaminated Land (Part II of the Environmental Protection Act 1990). The land proposed is agricultural. In order to develop such land a full Risk based contaminated land assessment will be necessary to satisfy Harborough District Council that the land is not contaminated with pesticides, insecticides and other chemicals used in farming practices.	Detailed assessments will be undertaken by developers on any land allocated for housing. An initial sieve by Harborough DC has indicated that it is suitable for development.	None
41	7.2.2	NK3	41 - Resident	In addition, you will be aware of the recent barn fire on Cranmer Lane which affected residents on Elmcroft Road quite significantly. The shed roofs are asbestos. I am not sure if anyone has yet reported the fire to Harborough District Council however this land for the foreseeable future is now blighted. The land where I am told a playground is now proposed in now contaminated with remnants of asbestos and other contaminants that would	Noted.	None

				have been produced during the fire. Of course the land could be remediated, but this would be at a massive cost likely to be in the region of thousands of pounds before the land can be verified as being fit for use.		
41	7.2.2	NK3	41 - Resident	Better locations were identified for proposed housing: I believe that the site proposed near the Sports Club off South Kilworth Road would have been ideal. It would not directly affect any residents and access is not onto a busy road. There are no aquifers that would be compromised, views to be spoilt and historic sites to be ruined. When and why did this site suddenly stop being the favoured site for development?	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site. The South Kilworth Road site stopped being the preferred site once the Station Road site was deemed deliverable by Harborough DC.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
41	7.2.2	NK3	41- Resident	Development on land to the South of Station Road is NOT what the village wants. It will form a Housing estate capable of supporting up to 90-100 houses, increasing the size of the village by almost a third. The village is not capable of supporting such an increase in housing and this should NOT be allowed to happen.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site. The NP will seek to restrict the amount of development in line with District-wide requirements.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
41	7.2.2	NK3	41 – Resident	For the reasons given above, I therefore ask that the Parish Council amend the Parish Plan with immediate effect prior to further consultation with Harborough District Council, to remove Land to the South of Station Road from the Parish Plan.	Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the

						requirement within the draft Local Plan.
42	7.2.2	NK3	42 - Resident	As a resident of Elmcroft Road I have attended consultation over the past year or so with regard to the Development Plan of North Kilworth. At no stage was there any mention of building houses upon the fields to the rear of our property (land off Station Road). I am sure, therefore, you can imagine my shock and dismay that at almost five to midnight in the consultation process, a proposal is being made that ALL the extra housing for the village is to be located on this one site. Thirty/ Forty plus houses would take away all the views enjoyed by residents in Elmcroft Road, leaving them looking out on a housing estate and this is extremely unfair that the whole housing allocation should be at the rear of Elmcroft Road residents.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
42	7.2.2	NK3	42 - Resident	This choice of location is also against the statement in the Development Plan on Page 19 which states a need to 'protect important views'. It is also against the need to protect our 'historical environment' as stated on page 20 in the Plan as the field in question off Station Road is a prime example of a 'ridge and furrow' field created through the Enclosures Act in the eighteenth century. Poor villagers would in the past have had a strip of land to farm and this site and location in our village history deserves to be protected and preserved, as I am sure local Historical and Archaeology Societies, when consulted, will agree. There are also residents in Elmcroft Road who have lived here for over 50years with their views of the countryside unimpeded and who are extremely upset with this proposal.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.

42	7.2.2	NK3	42 - Resident	It is the timing of these proposals which raises suspicion – coming so late in the day. Combined within the proposals is the talk of extending the ‘Bogs’ area with a children’s playground and access along a bridleway. It leads one to speculate that a ‘behind the scenes’ deal has/ is being worked out with the owner of the land and the Millennium Committee, leaving the residents of Elmcroft Road out of the equation and bearing the brunt of these proposals.	No deal has been done. The change came about because the status of the site in the Harborough DC SHLAA changed from not-developable to deliverable in November 2015.	None
42	7.2.2	NK3	42 - Resident	I wish to oppose the present proposals and encourage the Parish Council to reconsider its plans. I am very much aware of the need in our country to provide more housing and especially affordable housing. May I, therefore suggested alternatives which I (and maybe other residents in Elmcroft Road would find more acceptable): Firstly, that the allocation of 30+ / 40+ houses needs to be spread around the whole village with other sites considered as on the South Kilworth Road. At the rear of Elmcroft Road a build of say, 10-12 houses could follow the design of developments at Rose Dale and on the Gandy’s site along the main road and in an L shape design away from homes on Elmcroft Road residents. This would then preserve the outlook of these residents in Elmcroft Road and still contribute to the building of new homes in the village.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
42	7.2.2	NK3	42 - Resident	This development could include a children’s playground in a much healthier location than that provided by extending the ‘Bogs’ where a damp and boggy setting is not conducive to young people’s health needs. This play area could still be linked by pathway to the village centre.	Noted.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC

						in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
42	7.2.2	NK3	42 - Resident	Can I re-emphasise that the people in Elmcroft Road are NOT happy by what is being proposed so late in the consultation process, and I urge Councillors, who are elected by us residents, to give serious consideration to our concerns and look at various alternatives such as those detailed above.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
42	7.2.2	NK3	42 - Resident	My absolute amazement at the volume and strength of opposition to the proposals in the Housing Section 7.2.2 concerning the proposed 'Estate' on two fields at the back of Elmcroft Road. The volume of letters submitted in opposition, the number of people signing the Petitions illustrate the strength of the village saying a huge NO to these suggestions and giving a clear message to the Steering Group and Parish Council that such a development is NOT what is wanted. The Parish Council have a duty to listen to their opinions and look to other options.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
42	7.2.2	NK3	42 - Resident	The total lack of consideration as to the effect that these proposals would have upon the environment of residents in this area such as their loss of views, loss of historical sites, increase of traffic. Residents who have lived here for years and those only for a few years are united in opposition and are absolutely horrified at the prospect of such a possible housing estate being built.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.

42	7.2.2	NK3	42 - Resident	The unnecessary allocation of TWO fields for this build, and the volume of building of 30 to 40 houses with no maximum number of houses giving concern that many more could be built in the future.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site. Housing numbers will be controlled through the NP	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
42	7.2.2	NK3	42 - Resident	The lateness of the specific proposals not known since December 15 th 2015 and the lack of any public meetings upon these late and specific proposals.	A public meeting has subsequently been held and further consultation as a result.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
42	7.2.2	NK3	42 - Resident	Can I suggest a new way forward that the majority can be happy with: The Parish Council should continue the idea of 'small builds' such as Rose Dale, Millennium Close and the new Greencacres, using two sites: the land off Station Road for 10 to 15 homes, and secondly, the same number of houses on land off South Kilworth Road. This will get us close to the required number of new homes and maintain the character of the village – not destroying it with a big estate. By following the idea of two small builds, lots of people will be able to accept this and it will avoid the extremely bad feelings that such a large estate proposed has already engendered.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site. This included the spreading of the required housing across more than one site ...	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.

42	7.2.2	NK3	42 - Resident	That the building of new homes in the village should NOT be connected to the development of the Millennium Bogs. The Millennium Bogs should be a separate project.	Noted. It is felt, however, that the connection from any new housing development to the Bogs would be of benefit to the Parish.	
43	7.2.2	NK3	43 – Harbourough Mail	Villagers in North Kilworth have started a petition against a proposal for 36 to 40 homes on open land to the east of the village. Objectors say the proposed development site would ‘blight views over open countryside’ that the residents of Elmcroft Road, Station Road and Rosedale in the village have enjoyed for years. A petition against the scheme was due to be placed in the Howkins Esso Garage in the village. A spokesman for North Kilworth Parish Council said the site was only a possible development site for the future, and all feedback from villagers was welcome.	Noted	None
44	7.2.2	NK3	44 – Rob Kilsby Partnership	We are instructed to act on behalf of the land owners, and would wish to inform the Parish Council that we are in the process of preparing an OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION for the Housing Scheme for submission to the District Council. The site is a preferred site by the District Council and was, until recently, preferred by the Parish Council.	Noted	None
44	7.2.2	NK3	44 – Rob Kilsby Partnership	Our Client’s site, designated A/NK/HSG/03 in Harbourough Council’s Strategic Housing Land Assessment, which forms part of Harbourough Council’s Core Strategy, is considered suitable under such Strategy.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the

						requirement within the draft Local Plan.
44	7.2.2	NK3	44 – Rob Kilsby Partnership	However, the Site that North Kilworth Parish Council now seems to prefer, designated A/NK/HSG/06 in SHLAA and forming part of the Core Strategy, is considered not currently suitable for residential development , due to the Highway Authority indicating that access from the A4304 is unlikely to be acceptable (although considered available in terms of the SHLAA)	This assessment was updated in November 2015 at which point the site was assessed as having suitable access and being developable.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
44	7.2.2	NK3	44 – Rob Kilsby Partnership	We would also like to point out that your ‘now preferred’ Site is, according to the Environment Agency Plans, at Risk of Flooding from Surface Water, which is also possibly makes the site unsuitable.	The site is currently classed as being developable by Harborough DC. Environment Agency comments will be taken into account as necessary.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
44	7.2.2	NK3	44 – Rob Kilsby Partnership	Furthermore, our Proposal will include a Car park for the school (situated on what is now the Menage) which will allow the School opposite to expand its buildings for additional pupil intake, benefitting both the School and the village enormously. We therefore seek the Parish Council’s Member’s agreement to incorporate our client’s land in this Third Draft of the NP.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
41	General	NK3	41 - Resident	Lack of consultation with residents: In short, the residents of Elmcroft Road knew nothing about the inclusion of the land to the South of Station Road	Noted.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an

				<p>as a No. 1 site for proposed development within the Parish Plan until a minority of residents informed them on 25 February 2016. You might find that this date coincides with you starting to receive a barrage of objections from residents. Though residents were aware of past meetings to discuss the parish Plan, at no time has any consultation been undertaken to discuss the change in direction that suddenly puts the land to the South of Station Road as the No. 1 location to construct a large Housing estate on – a Housing estate that would conveniently ensure that all of the villages Housing allocation requirements are met in one fell swoop.</p>	<p>Consultation was undertaken in relation to the location of this site although not to the extent finally incorporated into the draft NP as a result of a SHLAA re-assessment by Harborough DC.</p> <p>Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.</p>	<p>extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.</p>
41	General	NK3	41 - Resident	<p>In short, the 3rd draft for the Parish Plan contradicts several of the policies set out in the plan itself: NK16, NK17, NK18, NK19, NK21, NK22 and NK27. There are also a number of additional issues which I have highlighted which the Parish have clearly not considered.</p> <p>There has been a distinct lack of consultation on the new amended plan which appears to have been rushed through at the last minute and it shows.</p>	<p>Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.</p>	<p>The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.</p>
41	General	NK3	41 - Resident	<p>What is even more frustrating is that this plan seems to have materialised from nowhere. My understanding, and that of other residents on Elmcroft Road was that this site was not being considered for development; that there were other sites being considered.</p> <p>I contacted Planning Policy at HDC last week and asked them what is going on; how did this come to be and what processes have been followed.</p> <p>I received a response from Lesley Aspinall who confirmed that it was not the decision of HDC and</p>	<p>The NP has been in progress for over 2 years and during this time a range of consultation exercises have been undertaken including a questionnaire and several open events. People who live in the Parish have had a range of</p>	<p>The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.</p>

				<p>that I would need to speak with the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.</p> <p>As I am not exactly sure who forms the Steering Group, I have contacted yourselves (Parish Council) in the hope that you can please shed some light on the situation for me.</p> <p>I don't believe that many residents along the street actually know what is being proposed at the moment so it might come to be that there will be a lot more residents other than myself asking questions.</p>	opportunities to become involved.	
24	7.2.3	NK4	24 – HD Council	<p>Re: Limits to developments – given that the site opposite is a proposed allocation would there not be a case for including the development to the north of the A4304 (which included Rose Dale) within the limits to development. Limits to development generally reflect the footprint of a village.</p>	The Limits to Development will be redrawn to reflect the final allocation of sites.	Redrawing of the Limits to development.
23	7.2.4		23 - Resident	<p>The land identified for house building falls outside the boundary of the Settlement Area. The questions thus posed are 'Is this boundary line of any significance, and is it to be redrawn to include the site of the additional homes?'</p>	Yes. The Limits to Development will be redrawn to reflect the final allocation of sites.	Redrawing of the Limits to development.
23	7.2.4	NK5	23 - Resident	<p>In Section 7.2.4 Policy NK5, the Proposals Map referred to in the text is Figure 4, not Figure 3. Additionally Figure 4 does not clearly show the Settlement boundary referred to in Policy NK5.</p>	The proposed amendment will be made.	Change to Figure number and reinforcing of boundary.
23	7.2.4	NK5	23 - Resident	<p>If national or district planning policies allow farmland to be used for house building in this way then it would seem to be at odds with the Policy NK5 stating '<i>that there will be a strong presumption against new housing and other forms of development</i>' elsewhere.</p>	Noted. The Limits to Development will be redrawn to reflect the final allocation of sites.	Redrawing of the Limits to development.

23	7.2.4	NK5	23 - Resident	Signage – Policy NK5 states that ' <i>signs should be small in scale, sympathetic in design, limited in number.</i> ' What is the number and how is that arrived at and controlled?	The extent of signage is to be considered on a case by case basis.	None.
31	7.2.4	NK5	31 - NKSG	NK5 contradicts NK28 on page 56 section c). It might be better not to be too specific about putting a pedestrian crossing opposite the garage (where it is not really needed) when it would be better placed (in terms of use and traffic calming) on the hill between the affordable homes and Rosedale.	This has been reconsidered as part of the reconsideration of the housing sites.	The approach to development and developer contributions have been determined through further consultation.
23	7.2.5		23 - Resident	Section 7.2.5 para. 2 line 3 refers to ' <i>District and National averages</i> '. When drawing comparison the actual figures used and their source should be quoted for completeness.	Percentages give a better idea of proportions. Source to be identified.	2011 Census to be added.
24	7.2.5		24 – HD Council	Page 30 para 1: last sentence should be 'two bedroomed'.	Noted. Amendment to be made	Text changed to 'two bedroomed'.
23	7.2.6		23 - Resident	Section 7.2.6 para. 2 line 4 when drawing comparison the actual figures used and their source should be quoted for completeness	The actual figures can be included here.	Addition of actual figures.
6	7.3		Historic England	We consider that the planning and conservation team at HDC are best placed to assist you in the development of your NP and, in particular, how the strategy might address the area's heritage assets. Consequently we do not consider there is a need for English Heritage to be involved in the development of the strategy for your area.	Noted	None.
10	7.3		10 - Resident	Building and design – innovation in design must be allowed rather than constrained. Sustainability, energy efficiency and modern design to enable less environmental impact must be allowed.	Noted	None
6	7.3.1		Historic England	It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as the local Civic Society or local historic groups in the production of your NP. English Heritage has produced a number of	Noted	None

				documents which your community might find helpful in helping to identify what it is about your area which makes it distinctive and how you might go about ensuring that the character of the area is retained. These can be found at: http://www.helm.org.uk/place-and-placemaking/communities/neighbourhood-planning		
23	7.3.1		23 - Resident	The included Design Statement could be enlarged to cover the installation of additional thermal insulation to existing properties, in particular to the outside of these. This could result in a substantial alteration to the identity of these buildings. A statement acknowledging the dilemmas presented by this activity would be useful.	Covered in NK10 which requires development to incorporate the highest standards of sustainable design and construction techniques.	None
23	7.3.1		23 - Resident	New Build homes can be built using newer methods of construction yielding benefits in fit and finish and habitability of the finished product. A reduction in build time and attendant debris and disruption could also be achieved. Novel designs and materials could augment the visual amenity of the village and parish. Uniformity of features, shapes and material finishes should be avoided in developments of two or more houses.	Introduce policy on modern design/methods?	Policy on modern design methods to be incorporated.
23	7.3.1		23 - Resident	High Speed Broadband is now an urgent requirement for every home and business in the parish. Despite the recent uplift in speeds the service is already inadequate for some, let alone those who are too far away from 'the box' to benefit. New build homes should be built with fibre ducts installed as part of the infrastructure, so avoiding the costly and disruptive installation at a later time.	Policy on Broadband?	Introduce policy on requiring broadband within new developments.
24	7.3.1		24 – HD Council	Page 33, para 1: refers to 11 Listed Buildings whereas page 9 refers to over 20.	Amendment to be made	Page 9 is changed to identify 11 Listed Buildings.

31	7.3.1		31 - NKSG	The Conservation Area map on page 35 needs double checking – is it certain that Wheelwright Close is in it?	The map is as provided by Harborough DC	None
24	7.3.1	Figure 2	24 – HD Council	Ensure conservation area map includes copyright.	Map to be changed	Copyright to be added.
24	7.3.1	NK9	24 – HD Council	Policy NK9 refers to principles in the NK VDS, it's not clear if these differentiate between the Conservation Area (CA) and parts of built up areas that lie outside the Conservation Area, but if they do it's worth noting that in the mitigation and enhancement measures outlined (page 37) in the Harborough Local Plan Options Consultation Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report (Sept 2015) it suggests that it would be beneficial to apply the design principles that apply to the CA where development is adjacent to the CA to help ensure a controlled transition between the CA and new development. The council will be taking the SA recommendations into consideration as it progresses with the preparation of the new Local Plan.	Amendment to be made	Reference to 'design principles that apply within the CA to be applied to development adjacent to CA' to be added in.
23	7.3.2		23 - Resident	Energy conservation is a major consideration given that many premises are heated by fossil fuel, a costly commodity with a cost to the environment. New buildings, including affordable homes could be specified to higher levels of heat retention as exemplars. An energy/ power generation venture would also be worthwhile having in the parish.	NK10 addresses issues of energy efficiency	None
24	7.3.2	NK10	24 – HD Council	Would it be worth including a specific climate change/ energy policy? Policy NK 10 – given the mention of the community interest company for energy, it would be helpful to have a policy relating to renewable energy, in particular if there are identified sites for any new projects. It would also be useful to see a policy relating to reduction of	Agreed. text to be added on climate change	Policy to be added.

				emissions, particularly as these have been identified as high.		
27	7.3.2	NK10	27 – Natural England	We welcome the intention to make an important contribution to mitigating and adapting to climate change by shaping new and existing development in ways that reduce carbon emissions and dependency. To that end, we welcome Policy NK10: Sustainable Development to encourage the use of sustainable design, drainage and construction techniques and practices.	Noted	None
27	7.3.3	NK11	27 – Natural England	We welcome Policy NK11: Design Quality requiring development proposals that will affect an identified non-designated building or structure of local historical or architectural interest or its setting to conserve and enhance the character, integrity and setting of that building or structure.	Noted	None
5	7.4		Leicestershire County Council	We welcome a policy within the NP recognising the contribution of employment and the economy to the sustainability and vitality of the village.	Noted	None
5	7.4.1		Leicestershire County Council	“This includes the rural parts of the Parish where the plan is sympathetic to the conversion of redundant barns and agricultural buildings for employment uses, and resists their conversion into other uses including homes.” I appreciate and support the intentions behind this statement; to retain local employment buildings in employment uses, but am concerned that the last part of the sentence reads negatively and may not be viewed as positive planning required by the NPPF. I suggest that the final part of the sentence could be deleted or perhaps this could be incorporated into policy NK4 on Windfall sites as an additional bullet along the lines of “Does not result in an unacceptable loss of employment land/ employment buildings worthy of retention...’	Agreed - amendment to be made	Text to be amended as proposed

5	7.4.1	NK13	Leicestershire County Council	The policy would read more positively if the two paragraphs were swapped round; beginning with the broader principles before dealing with the caveat.	Agreed	Text to be amended as proposed
5	7.4.1	NK13	Leicestershire County Council	Suggested amendment to text “.. demonstrated that it will not generate unacceptable impacts (including noise, fumes, smell and vehicular movements); they respect and are compatible with the local character and surrounding uses and where appropriate protect residential amenity.”	Agreed	Text to be amended as proposed
10	7.4.1	NK13	10 - Resident	Employment – With any development it has to now come with other opportunities that will enable employment in the area – such as retail space or office/ workshop opportunities. Without such opportunities the village simply becomes an ever increasing commuter village.	Noted	None
24	7.4.1	NK13	24 – HD Council	Policy NK13 – suggest adding ‘.. is not viable <u>for employment uses</u> ’, and has been..’	Agreed	Text to be amended as proposed
5	7.5		Leicestershire County Council	We welcome the consideration of community facilities in the NP. It is a positive feature of the Plan that community facilities are recognised and valued and that the Plan seeks to protect and retain existing facilities. Community facilities provide a venue for social, recreational and educational activity and a place where people can meet and access local services. Perhaps support for the development of new facilities could be considered.	Agreed	Support for new community facilities to be added.
5	7.5.2	NK15	Leicestershire County Council	It is positive that the Plan highlights Assets of Community Value but I suggest that the working of policy NK15 is reconsidered as I don’t think that a NP can be so emphatic as to stipulate that adverse development ‘will not be permitted’.	Will remove the phrase “or have a significant adverse effect on ...	Text to be re-written as indicated.
6	7.6		Historic England	You may also find advice in “Planning for the Environment at the Neighbourhood Level” useful.	Noted	None

				This has been produced by English Heritage, Natural England, the Environment Agency and the Forestry Commission. As well as giving ideas on how you might improve your local environment, it also contains some useful further sources of information. This can be downloaded from: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622 http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf		
27	7.6		27 – Natural England	We very much welcome the inclusion of this section and its content.	Noted	None
39	7.6		39 - Resident	The spring water and aquifer is so vital, I would have hoped for very specific help for protection. How is it that 'Stoney' is a site of ecological importance? I was the first tree warden for this village and the care of and concern for these appear to be limited. HDC gives felling permission too readily. If this NP is a statement of intent for this village, then maybe firmer suggestions could have been given which protects and preserves that which I have identified.	It is considered that the NP provides sufficient protection for this site and other important local environmental sites.	None
24	7.6.1		24 – HD Council	Page 43 – delete 'important'. The NPPF designation is for 'Local Green Space.	Agreed	Text to be amended as proposed
24	7.6.1		24 – HD Council	Page 42 para 4 – delete 'important'. The NPPF designation is for 'Local Green Space'.	Agreed	Text to be amended as proposed
24	7.6.1	NK16	24 – HD Council	Protection of important Local Green Spaces- The justification should be included for designation of these sites. Perhaps this is best placed in the evidence base? Also delete 'important' from title.	Agreed. The justification will be in the supporting information.	Text to be amended as proposed
24	7.6.1	NK16	24 – HD Council	It would be helpful if the individual LGS were identified by number/ name on the proposals map or elsewhere in the document. Hard to tie the LGS name to the specific area at present.	Agreed	Text to be amended as proposed

27	7.6.1	NK16	27 – Natural England	We very much welcome the value given to local greenspace for its own sake and for its economic and social benefits. The provision of natural greenspace is an integral part of the creation of sustainable communities. One important function of Green Infrastructure (GI) is the provision of new opportunities for access to open space. Natural England's 'Standards for accessible natural greenspace' (ANGst) can be used to ensure new and existing housing has appropriate access to nature. More information can be found in Natural England's publication 'Nature Nearby, Accessible Greenspace Guidance' (March 2010). The CABE Space Guidance 'Start with the Park' (2005) outlines the importance of planning around green spaces, with consideration being given to the context of local landscape character and contribution to the wider GI network. The provision of new GI should be considered at an early stage to ensure it is deliverable at the planning stage. We welcome Policy NK16 to protect local greenspace.	Noted	None
24	7.6.2		24 – HD Council	Biodiversity – are the other sites mentioned in this section mapped?	No – mapping to be amended	Amendments to maps to be made
21	7.6.2	NK17	21 – Environment Agency	We are supportive of the text of Policy NK17 Biodiversity and note the references to conserve and enhance. In addition to conserving and enhancing, additional means of protecting Biodiversity is by applying the hierarchy, avoid, mitigate and compensate. Therefore development that may adversely affect a significant site of biodiversity should be avoided. If this is not possible then the effect must be mitigated. If this is also not possible then compensatory works must be undertaken as close to the site as possible.	Agreed – policy to be strengthened	Text to be amended as proposed

				Policy NK17 Biodiversity could be strengthened by having an additional sentence to reflect the above mentioned hierarchy.		
27	7.6.2	NK17	27 – Natural England	We very much welcome the inclusion of this section and its content including Policy NK17 which requires development proposals to conserve and enhance significant features, species and habitats.	Noted	None
27	7.6.2	NK17	27 – Natural England	Meeting housing needs and protecting the natural environment can often seem like conflicting aims. However, when viewed through the prism of sustainable development, it is clear that they are often complementary. The natural environment provides a broad range of ecosystems services such as providing clean air, food and water which have economic and social as well as environmental benefits. Similarly, a coherent green infrastructure network not only provides health benefits to local residents by providing accessible greenspace near to where they live, it also helps the community to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change. Natural England has produced standing advice to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected or Biodiversity Action Plan species. The standing advice also sets out when, following receipt of survey information, further consultation with Natural England should be undertaken – ‘Natural England Standing Advice’.	Noted	None
27	7.6.2	NK17	27 – Natural England	Although there are no nationally or internationally designated nature conservation sites within the parish boundaries, Bosworth Mill Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which is protected by the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981	Noted	Reference to be made within text.

				(as amended), is just outside and could potentially be affected by development in North Kilworth.		
24	7.6.3		24 – HD Council	Important trees – mapping of these trees would be useful.	Noted. We do not feel this is essential.	None
27	7.6.3	NK18	27 – Natural England	We welcome Policy NK18 to protect important trees and hedges.	Noted	None
41	7.6.3	NK18	41 - Resident	Protection of Biodiversity and Important Trees: The line of mature oak trees that divide the two fields mixed with Hawthorn, Blackthorn, Ash and Sycamore provide an essential and important line of trees. They support a diverse and unique plethora of wildlife which I have witnessed first-hand over the past 10 years. The trees support breeding Buzzards, Kestrels, Tawny Owls, Great Spotted and Green Woodpeckers along with the more common species found in the area. Barn Owls are also regularly seen over the fields and other species seen include important declining farmland birds such as Yellowhammer, Linnet, Syklark and Meadow Pipit. From time to time Peregrine, Red Kite and Hobby are seen.	References policy NK18	None.
27	7.6.4	NK19	27 – Natural England	We very much welcome the commitment in Policy NK19 to protect and enhance the distinctive landscape character of North Kilworth. Natural England has identified 159 distinct natural areas of National Character Areas (NCAs) in England. Each is defined by a unique combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural and economic activity. Their boundaries follow natural lines in the landscape rather than administrative boundaries, making them a good decision making framework for the natural environment. North Kilworth falls within NCA94: Leicestershire Vales. Key facts and data for this	Noted	None

				area can be found at the attached website link – http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4900422342934528?map=true&category=587130		
10	7.6.5	NK20	10 - Resident	Views and landscape – the areas and views identified in the community consultation must be adhered to.	Noted	None
27	7.6.5	NK20	27 – Natural England	We also support Policy NK20 to preserve important views and vistas.	Noted	None
41	7.6.5	NK20	41 - Resident	<p>Loss of protected views: Whilst it is appreciated that no one has a legal right to views, the views from Elmcroft Road over the fields to the East are arguably the best views in the village and everything should be done to protect them. Also, to sacrifice these views goes against the very essence of the Parish Plan.</p> <p>The Parish Plan talks about the importance of the views over the Avon Valley to the SE of the village. This view is to the SE of the village! So, why is not considered to be an important and protected view within the plan?</p>	The views were agreed following extensive consultation.	None
6	7.6.6		Historic England	We would advise you to contact the staff at LCC who look after the Historic Environment Record. They should be able to provide details of not only any designated heritage assets but also locally important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may also be available on-line via the Heritage Gateway (www.heritagegateway.org.uk).	Noted	None
23	7.6.6		23 - Resident	No indication of location. This also applies to other buildings or structures referred to in the text and some of those listed in Section 7.6.6. The mud walls, one to the rear of the Tudor Cottages and	Noted	Amendments to be made

				the other on Dag Lane and elsewhere, have not been mentioned under any heading.		
31	7.6.6		31 - NKSG	There is scope to add a map and photo ex the Bath Report below NK21 page 49 or put the current Fig 3 there instead perhaps.	This was considered by then Advisory Committee and no changes are to be made.	None
27	7.6.6	NK21	27 – Natural England	We welcome Policy NK21 to conserve and enhance important archaeological and geological features.	Noted	None
41	7.6.6	NK21	41 - Resident	Loss of historic and architectural features: The fields proposed for development are medieval Ridge and Furrow. Surely these fields should be protected under NK21. Historic maps of the village going back to 1814 show a medieval road that runs behind Elmcroft Road, joining up Cranmer Road and Station Road. Further investigation into this Road should be undertaken to establish exactly where it runs. Development on the fields could potentially damage this historic artefact for good so it is extremely important that this is not ignored. NK21 supports this, as does NK16.	Noted. The SHLAA is expected to identify any important historic features. If there are historic and architectural features confirmed through the submission of a planning application the development will need to take this into account.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
5	7.7		Leicestershire County Council	Those undertaking NP's should be aware that the current conventional bus network is likely to reduce given the pressures on the CC budgets.	Noted	Comment to be added to the text 'The current conventional bus network is likely to reduce given the pressures on the CC budgets'
5	7.7		Leicestershire County Council	It would be useful for this section to provide more information about villagers concerns in respect of road safety issues, citing available evidence as necessary.	Evidence to be added in	Text to be amended as proposed

23	7.7.1		23 - Resident	Road congestion and in the concomitant pollution are significant detractors and are widely experienced in North Kilworth and thus a significant re-imagining of traffic flow through the parish is required. A statement of possible or preferred outcomes could be included.	The policies on traffic are considered suitable for the NP	None
5	7.7.1	NK22	Leicestershire County Council	<p>The Government's NPPF states a strong and clear assumption in favour of planning authorities granting permission for 'sustainable development'; it further states that development should only be refused in transport terms where the impact is identified to be 'severe'. The NPPF provides no definition of 'severe', but planning regulation/ law has always been explicit that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers cannot be required to address existing problems; and • That impacts of a development should be judged on the basis of any differences between a comparison of a future without the development and one with. <p>Where the County Highways Authority (CHA) believes that it could sustain a case at a potential planning appeal, it will continue to advise local planning authorities to consider refusing planning permission on highway grounds. In many cases, however, a developer is able to demonstrate that a site would only result in a further, marginal deterioration in traffic conditions or to provide mitigation to see to ensure that the traffic situation would be no worse than had the development not taken place. In such cases, the CHA has no grounds to advise refusal of an application on highway grounds; indeed it would be exposed to the potential award of costs against it should a</p>	Noted	Text to be re-written to reflect this and policy wording changed to use the word 'severe'.

				planning authority heed that advise and the site subsequently be taken to appeal.		
41	7.7.1	NK22	41 - Resident	Increased traffic and associated Noise and Air Pollution (NK22 Traffic, Parking and Transport): Assuming that 90-100 houses are constructed, it is fair to say that there would be an average of 2 cars per household. This equates to an additional 360-400 vehicle movements per day onto Station Road, within our village envelope to have so many vehicle movements concentrated in one location onto a busy road is unthinkable.	Noted. The sites have been assessed through the SHLAA for their traffic implications.	None
41	7.7.1	NK22	41 - Resident	As well as the fact that the stretch of road is a double bend, the access will be in direct competition with junctions at Elmcroft Road, Rosedale and now Greenacres, with vehicles all trying to negotiate busy traffic. This of course, will be worse on days when the A14 is shut and vehicles are diverted along the A4304 through our village.	Noted. Harborough DC and Leicestershire CC have stated that development of houses on Station Road is acceptable.	None
41	7.7.1	NK22	41 - Resident	This increased traffic is not only a Highways safety issue, it will substantially increase the noise and air pollution in the village. Harborough District Council already monitor Air Quality on the A4304 due to the fact that traffic pollution (Oxides of Nitrogen, NOx) are responsible for Lutterworth Town Centre having been designated an AQMA (Air Quality Management Area) under the Environmental Protection Act 1990.	Noted	None
41	7.7.1	NK22	41 - Resident	The proposal to implement a pedestrian crossing is a great idea for safety, if placed in the centre of the village perhaps, however to place it close to a new estate will be a mistake. Not only will it cause additional congestion, the stopping and starting of vehicles will again increase noise pollution for local residents and air pollution for the whole village.	Noted. To be considered as part of revised housing site locations.	The preferred sites have been determined through further consultation.

41	7.7.1	NK22	41 - Resident	<p>Factors that will exacerbate increased traffic and associated noise and air pollution within the village:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Marina Development – when complete will undoubtedly contribute to increased traffic through the village. b. The expansion of Magna Park – will undoubtedly contribute to increased traffic through the village, including HGV's. The huge DHL building North of Magna Park has just been granted planning permission. There is an outline application for Symmetry Park about to be considered for approval to the South of Coventry Road, Lutterworth (adjacent to Semelab) including several large scale distribution warehouses and there is also a proposal to basically double the size of Magna Park with a huge scale development outlined for the North of the site. c. Land to the East of Lutterworth suggested Strategic Development Area – Land East of Lutterworth 2015 SHLAA Reference: A/LT/MXD/03 – Harborough District Council Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, July 2015 (Site Assessment Companion Guide) has identified the above land as a site for 2,500 houses encompassing the village of Misterton. Again, the implications for the A4304 and surrounding villages including North Kilworth need to be considered and I hope that the Parish Council are already considering how such a proposal might impact upon us. 	Noted	None
----	-------	------	---------------	--	-------	------

5	7.7.2		Leicestershire County Council	Using relevant accident data to differentiate between perceived and actual road safety issues would be useful to include here as this is evidence required to indicate why measures are required.	Noted. The problem has not to date resulted in numerous accidents although the situation causes concern through resultant congestion.	None.
28	7.7.2		28 - Resident	Parking is a particular issue that is a growing concern as the village grows, and the report rightly highlights the problems associated with 'parking on the narrow streets in the village'. Concern is rightly given to the problems of safely crossing the busy main road, but I would like to point out what to me is potentially a more dangerous road traffic situation, specifically the parking on Dag Lane during term time at the beginning and end of the school day! Surely some mention should be made in the report about the need for traffic management in this situation also.	Noted	Text to be amended
5	7.7.2	NK23	Leicestershire County Council	It could be difficult to seek to resist a development proposal on the basis of the shortfall of no parking space, for instance if safe on-street parking were available nearby.	Noted	Will change policy to reference 'severe adverse impact'
27	7.7.3	NK24	27 – Natural England	We welcome the commitment to view development proposals sympathetically if they increase or improve the network of cycleways, footpaths and footpaths as specified in Policy NK24.	Noted	None
21	7.8		21 – Environment Agency	We note that within the text you correctly address the importance of water in line with the comments made in our previous letter dated 2 nd April 2015. We are disappointed that a stand alone policy has not been included in your plan to address water.	Policy on water efficiency to be added	Policy wording to be added to the NP
21	7.8		21 – Environment Agency	Water efficiency is only alluded to in the Harborough Adopted Core Strategy. Water is an unpredictable resource and as part of the Agency's	Policy on water efficiency to be added	Policy wording to be added to the NP under windfall

			<p>objective to further the sustainable use of our water resources we are promoting the adoption of water conservation measures in new developments. Such measures can make a major contribution to conserving existing water supplies.</p> <p>The agency recommends the installation of fittings that minimise water usage such as low, or dual, flush WC's, spray taps and economical shower-heads in bathroom. Power showers are not recommended as they can consume more water than an average bath. Water efficient versions of appliances such as washing machines and dishwashers are also recommended. In the garden consider installing a water butt to provide a natural supply of water for plants.</p> <p>Following the above recommendations will significantly reduce water consumption and associated costs when compared to traditional installations, reducing the cost to the environment and the householder.</p> <p>Note: Severn Trent is an area of moderate water stress as shown in the Environment Agency Water Stressed Areas Classification (2013). As such, the Building Regulations standard for 125 l/p/d is the usual water efficiency standard to use in planning policies.</p> <p>We would appreciate it if you could include a Policy that addressed the need for water conservation.</p> <p>Maybe you could consider having a policy either in this section "Water Management and Aquifer" or alternatively within Section 7.3.2 Design:</p>		<p>requirements and in the specific requirements for the allocated sites.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				Sustainable Development – Policy NK10. Policy NK10 does mention sustainable drainage but you could also bring in water efficiency.		
27	7.8.1	NK25	27 – Natural England	We support policies NK25 & NK26 which promote sustainable drainage systems to minimise surface water run-off.	Noted	None
21	7.8.1	NK26	21 – Environment Agency	Since April 15 th 2016 the Lead Flooding Authority (LCC) has taken over responsibility for approving surface water disposal from sites with an area of 1ha or more. The reference to the Environment Agency within the policy should be deleted and replaced by 'the Lead Local Flood Authority'.	Noted	Text to be amended as proposed
8	7.8.2		8 – Resident	Fig 3 as shown is extremely difficult to interpret as it fails to highlight the detail of the village and how the Drift deposits impact on the aquifer forming our unique springs. I believe that more detail is required enabling residents to understand what the possible effects could be of poorly designed drainage for both surface and foul water.	Noted	A larger version of the map will be available on submission of the final document
21	7.8.2		21 – Environment Agency	Within the section on Acquifer I think it is important to mention that the area to the north west of the village is a source protection zone. It is also important to stress the need for the Aquifer to be free from pollution as a polluted water source is of no value.	Agreed	Text to be amended as proposed
21	7.8.2		21 – Environment Agency	The majority of the village is underlain by aquifer. Redevelopment of any site within the village whose previous use could have had a contaminative use will provide the potential for the remobilisation of contaminants into the aquifer.	Noted	None
31	7.8.2		31 - NKSG	Similarly the aquifer map on page 54 is not what it says. This is in part because it is a copy of a copy from the 2004 document merely showing sub surface geology and not the drainage flow. In the black and white version the road layout is not at all	Maps to be changed as proposed	Map to be amended as proposed. Addition of photograph if available.

				clear and this needs to be clearer for specific streets. It would be better to use 1 or 2 of the Adrian Bath Report maps as figs. 1/4/9 and or 11 (suggested). The section north-south is highly relevant if we face a gravel extraction application in coming years. It might also be useful to include a photo of the run off from the Pincet Lane development. Views on this have strengthened because of the pollution threats from that development and the aquifer issue needs more emphasis. Global climate change is going to get worse with concentrated doses if excessive downpours and this could pose a very real forward flooding risks to the bowl in which the village sits.		
31	7.8.2		31 - NKSG	The Adrian Bath Report also needs referencing in 7.8.2 (page 55) and a copy deposited with the Plan.	Noted	Text to be amended as proposed
21	7.8.2	NK27	21 – Environment Agency	Policy NK27 – Aquifer refers to ‘significant adverse impact’ – I think that this statement could be improved by referring to the avoidance of pollution as well as degradation of water supply. I would question the need to refer to surface water drainage in this Policy, this can be covered in Policy’s NK25 or NK26.	Agreed	Text to be amended as proposed
24	7.8.2	NK27	24 – HD Council	This suggestion should also be reflected in Policy NK27: Policy NK3 final bullet point; suggest deleting ‘to minimise surface water run-off’. This would pick up on the mitigation & enhancement measures recommendations outlined (page 37) in the Harborough Local Plan Options Consultation Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report (Sept 2015) which the council will be taking in to consideration as it progresses with the preparation of the New Local Plan. A copy of this document can be found	Agreed	Text to be amended as proposed

				on the council website here SA and SEA – New Local Plan / Harborough District Council.		
27	7.8.2	NK27	27 – Natural England	We welcome the commitment in Policy NK27 to the effect that development proposals which will have a significant adverse impact on aquifers or on surface water drainage will not be permitted.	Noted	None
41	7.8.2	NK27	41 - Resident	Protection of Aquifer: North Kilworth is built on an Aquifer, it was the reason historically why settlers came to the village. The natural springs that are currently present at the bottom of Elmcroft Road, for all to see, need to be protected. A development of such proportion will undoubtedly affect the natural aquifer and cause all sorts of drainage/ flooding issues to the village. The aquifer needs to be protected. Such a large scale development of 90-100 houses could affect the natural balance of the whole village and the bogs/ millennium green which is of great value/ importance to the village.	Noted, The Aquifer is protected through the NP (NK27)	None
5	7.9	NK28	Leicestershire County Council	Given the scale of the County's predicted population growth and its economic aspirations (and the growth pressures of adjoining areas) further increases in traffic levels across the area are almost inevitable. Due to County Council's budgets being under severe pressure and not having the resources to examine and address each and every traffic related issues in the County. Therefore it is likely that any highway measures would need to be funded from third party funding, such as Section 106 developer contributions.	Noted	None
5	7.9	NK28	Leicestershire County Council	To be eligible for S106 contributions the measures must be required to directly mitigate the impact of development and cannot be used solely to address current problems. In addition, if the measures require future maintenance, which would be paid for from the County Council's funds, the measures	Noted	None

				would also need to be assessed against the County Council's other priorities.		
5	7.9	NK28	Leicestershire County Council	Securing S106 contributions for public transport services will normally focus on larger developments, where there is a more realistic prospect of services being commercially viable (ie operate without any public funding support) once the contributions have stopped.	Noted	None
5	7.9	NK28	Leicestershire County Council	The introduction of traffic Regulation Orders is subject to a consultation process.	Noted	None
5	7.9	NK28	Leicestershire County Council	The principle and the explanatory paragraphs and the policy itself explain the developer contributions/ planning obligations and acknowledges that these are not necessarily payable on every single new development, as it will depend on the impacts of each development and so each case will be judged on its individual merits and impacts. The list of identified neighbourhood infrastructure contained in the policy itself will be considered in the light of compliance with the CIL tests in the CIL Regulations, especially when they would need to be planning obligations made under S106 agreement. Furthermore the examples of neighbourhood infrastructure will also need to ensure they are co-ordinated and link to the Local Planning Authority's development plan/ infrastructure plan (where applicable) and there is no duplication of requirements which already made by service providers.	Noted	None
28	Figure 1		28 - Resident	On page 11, where exactly are the boundaries of the 'Neighbourhood Plan Area'?	Noted. Colour map to be in final NP	None
28	Figure 2		28 - Resident	What on earth am I supposed to make of the map on page 35? What is it trying to tell me?	This is the Conservation area.	Map quality to be enhanced.

8	Figure 4		8 – Resident	The figure 4 map is wrongly referred to as Fig 3.	Noted	Figure to be amended
8	Figure 4		8 – Resident	The Fig 4 Proposals Map incorrectly shows an area shaded as permitted housing development far greater than would be needed for 40 houses and extends into the area I understand to be incorporated into the village Green Space.	Noted. Area to be reduced	Area of map to be reduced
20	Figure 4		20 - Resident	The area described on Fig 4 Proposals Map as Permitted Housing Development (proposed) covers a large area of two fields on what has been designated green belt since before the building of Elmcroft Road.	Noted. Site area to be reduced to reflect the actual proposed development site. The fields are not classified as 'green belt'.	Area of map to be reduced
24	Figure 4		24 – HD Council	Fig 4: include a label and name for housing site, and suggest annotating the map for local greenspace site to make it clearer.	Noted	Map to be amended
28	Figure 4		28 - Resident	Surely the propose 'permitted housing development' only extends to the first two fields back from the road and no further? At least this is my understanding?	Noted. Area to be reduced	Area of map to be reduced
31	Figure 4		31 - NKSG	Similarly Fig 4 map (wrongly referred to as Fig 3 on page 29 box) in Black and White suggests that the diamond shaped plot (ie the Farm Yard which recently caught fire) is zoned the same as the new housing land. Strong representations have been made that this should be coloured in whole or in part (at least the western half) the same as the bogs to reinforce the wording in Policy NK3 (Housing Allocations). This may be due to the fact that Fig 4 is ex Harborough which is in turn ex-Francis Jackson and reflects their wishes for 'rustic' dwellings near the bridleway. This delineation is critical to obviate the Spring Lane end being threatened by housing development when views expressed asked for the farmyard area	Noted. Area to be reduced. Title of map to be amended.	Area of map to be reduced

				to be incorporated in the bogs at one end and a possible play area at the eastern end.		
8	General		8 - Resident	I would like to offer my support and thanks to all of the individuals who have worked so hard to develop this plan which when complete will serve to control the number of new houses built and how the village will evolve in future years, but also I would like to express my disappointment regarding the number of residents who have not taken the trouble to equip themselves with the facts but rather indulge in spreading ill-informed gossip.	Noted	None
9	General		9 – Residents	We would like to commend you and the others involved in the preparation of the NP. It is in general a very good piece of work which all involved have obviously put a tremendous amount of time and energy in to producing and it will shape the future development of North Kilworth up to 2031.	Noted	None
9	General		9 – Residents	We are deeply concerned that in amending a submitted NP at a very late stage to include this allocation and then doing little to inform other parishioners of this amendment the Parish Council could leave itself open to questions regarding its conduct and the transparency of its operations.	The NP was at draft stage when amended and the changes reflected the outcome of the earlier consultation.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.

13	General		13 - Resident	<p>I have spent a great deal of my professional career leading and facilitation large scale public, stakeholder and community consultation involving Parish, District and County Councils in the South of England before moving to North Kilworth in 2014. I was impressed with the initial Village Hall consultation process and the input provided at the early stages of the Parish NP. I was reassured by this, when I made the decision to move to the area, that any further developments in the village would be carried out in small pockets, sensitively integrated to maintain the integrity and character of the existing village housing scheme. It was quite evident from the plans developed that this did not include any larger developments particularly at the Elmcroft Road end of the village. It seems that there has been a last minute, substantive and mutually incompatible change to plans without proper consultation which would apparently invalidate the process so far.</p>	<p>Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.</p>	<p>The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.</p>
13	General		13 - Resident	<p>As you are aware, the government legislation developed from 2010 – 2015 has clearly set out the need to allow people to influence decisions about new and modified buildings and facilities in their area. People now have the right to get actively involved in the development decisions that affect them and the legislation has sought to enable this to take place in a more meaningful way. In this respect, the current move to suddenly add this new proposal to the plan, without a proper open consultation on such a major amendment, could be construed as tendentious and in breach of both the spirit and the letter of the neighbourhood planning regulations and legislation. It has also been proven in other cases to be destructive and</p>	<p>Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.</p>	<p>The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.</p>

				divisive to whole communities to fail to consult effectively and continue to directly involve the people affected. People support what they help to create and to share the responsibility for making these difficult decisions as widely as possible at a local level is not only more productive and sustainable but also accepted best practice.		
13	General		13 - Resident	Please can you set out clearly the timetable for the intended collective consultation steps that will be taken on this matter so that this Draft 3 version of the plan can be properly discussed, developed and agreed with the transparency and local involvement required for it to be legally valid consultation deemed fair to all concerned? Your final draft, in my opinion, <u>should not be submitted to Harborough District Council</u> before there is a clear notification to all stakeholders and residents of the substantive changes to the Draft plan. The draft has evidently not been developed incrementally building on the original inputs and does not properly represent the views of all. Procedurally, a letter posted in the North Kilworth news in February without these major changes being highlighted would be deemed insufficient notification of the change in direction and potentially misleading.	Noted. Future changes will be made known to all residents and further opportunities will be available for comment.	None
16	General		16 – Resident	It does seem strange to me that after all the consultations about the NP over the past few years that this particular proposal for housing 'Fig 4 proposals map' was never mentioned and it seems to have been put forward without any consultation with the people in the village. I would like the parish council to protect the village identity and retain the rural nature of its surroundings and the historic environment.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site. Consultation had previously been carried out in relation to the sites that were available at the time.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the

						requirement within the draft Local Plan.
20	General		20 - Resident	It is with shock and deep concern that after months of consultation and public meetings, when no mention of this proposal was discussed, seemingly in the space of a few weeks, and certainly without any consultation what-so-ever with the residents of Elmcroft Close, plans have been formulated to build all 31 of the estimated minimum required housing provision for North Kilworth (line 6 page 24) on this one site.	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site. Consultation had previously been carried out in relation to the sites that were available at the time.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
20	General		20 - Resident	If the NP is indeed a real tool giving 'local people more control over how their community develops and evolves' Lines 2,3 page 10, then it is a truly democratic asset to the village. Hopefully my fear that the actual power lies in the hands of only a few, will prove to be unwarranted.	Noted	None
23	General		23 - Resident	I thank the members of the Steering Group for their hard work in preparing this document. It will be a valuable resource in the future as a reminder of the combined expectations of those who live in the Parish. Here are some suggestions and observations which may be of use.	Noted	None
23	General		23 - Resident	I outline items which I feel could be mentioned in the plan or receive more prominence. Whilst these are not all relevant in the discussion on land use they are worthwhile considerations in the context of the well-being of residents and the viability of the community. These are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expression of resolve not to allow new development without substantial tangible benefits to the community. A list of these could be added. 	Noted. The NP cannot resist new development without 'substantial tangible benefits' to the community.	None

23	General		23 - Resident	Photographs: Many of the monochrome images in the draft copy are good portrayals of North Kilworth. However, the photograph of the White Lion on page 42 merits a more recent image, preferably one showing an open front door.	Noted.	
23	General		23 - Resident	Figures – The figures, also monochrome in this copy, are difficult to interpret. Colour may render them more readable.	Agreed. Final version to be in colour	None
23	General		23 - Resident	There are two references to possible locations for a pedestrian crossing. If two crossings are envisaged it would be useful to give each one an identity.	Noted. Text to be revised.	Text amended.
23	General		23 - Resident	This is a statutory document of importance to the Parish and thus merits attention to eliminate ambiguities and refine presentation.	Noted	Amendments in line with suggestions in this report to be incorporated.
26	General		26 - Residents	We as a community are disgusted by the lack of consultation and lateness of the 'amended plans' giving persons less than a week to object.	Noted	None
27	General		27 – Natural England	Natural England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the draft. We support the general thrust of the policies and proposals.	Noted	None
28	General		28 - Resident	The maps are worse than unclear, they are confusing and in some cases misleading. I don't know if the final document is to be produced in colour, but it would certainly help in the case of maps and diagrams. For example how can I see the 'Limits to Development' on page 58?	Noted. Colour versions to be produced and available on the website.	None
32	General		32 - leaflet	Already over 40 residents in Elmcroft Road have signed a petition to the Parish Council calling upon them to change their proposals and others in the village have an opportunity to sign a petition at Howkins Garage. Residents are double upset by the lack of consultation on these specific plans and the late arrival of these proposals in an amended	Open meeting held as suggested.	NP amended in line with consultation findings.

				third edition of the Development Plan, giving residents little time to respond. In a supposedly transparent society surely an open meeting on such specific proposals should have been called in order for residents to state their case?		
33	General		33 - Resident	This proposal, it would appear, has been slipped into the plan at the last minute without any prior knowledge of or consultation with the people affected. We live in a democracy not a dictatorship and I can assure you that there is now very strong opposition and possibly bad feeling towards the council – remember you are our elected officials. There appears to be a touch of hypocrisy about the whole affair.	The ordering of preferred sites was an unfortunate consequence of updated SHLAA assessments from Harborough DC. People have had subsequent opportunities to comment which have been utilised!	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
34	General		34 - Resident	Neither can I believe how suddenly these plans have come to light –just before the end of the consultation period. We in Elmcroft Road have not been consulted about this plan, only reading in the February edition of the North Kilworth News that a Draft 3 was now available.	The consultation process is ongoing and community views taken into account. The ordering of preferred sites was an unfortunate consequence of updated SHLAA assessments from Harborough DC. People have had subsequent opportunities to comment which have been utilised!	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.
37	General		37 - Resident	Why have we only just been informed of these plans giving us no time to object.	The consultation process is ongoing	
39	General		39 - Resident	My first reaction to this long awaited plan is that it's in a larger print and easier to see and read, apart from white on black writing. The final Consultation was on March 30 th 2014, today is 22 nd January 2016 – being such a space in between, it's difficult	Noted. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.	The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow

				<p>to know why the delay. Differences include voting for the best position for further houses was on the Lutterworth Road, opposite the garage. This was an endorsement of the first Parish Plan. Why ignore this area? Then we were told the South Kilworth Road, this surely shouldn't have been considered when it was the other side of the road. What the hell is going on? Now it's Station Road with an entrance through the Nature Reserve and that is a concern. I did not know there was a question in January 2015, when was the walkabout 'Effective and Extensive' consultation, I have seem to have missed.</p> <p>No mention of who were on the Committee and their aspirations. Any builders I do believe would be able to work around much of this.</p>		<p>sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.</p>
39	General		39 - Resident	<p>(2 months later) I have been waiting for the promised box in the village hall to post the enclosed. Peter Lawrence repeatedly told me it would be there. Today, still no box, I'm not a customer at Howkin's Garage. Now I learn there's to be 80 houses on the Lutterworth Road. As previously said 'You will be dumped upon' without a NP.</p>	<p>Noted. The delays in providing the box in the location stated is regrettable but other opportunities were available for people to submit their views. Further consultation has taken place in relation to the preferred housing site.</p>	<p>The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the requirement within the draft Local Plan.</p>
42	General		42 - Resident	<p>I fully support and value the vast majority of the North Kilworth Neighbourhood Plan and thank all those who have taken so much time and effort to produce this valuable document. (NOTE objects to housing allocation).</p>	<p>Noted. The housing allocation issue has been determined through further consultation with the community.</p>	<p>The identification of a preferred site has been replaced with an extended Limits to Development to allow sufficient housing to be allocated by HDC in line with the</p>

						requirement within the draft Local Plan.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--