

Ashby de la Zouch Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation on Draft Neighbourhood Plan

13th October to 24th November

55 responses received:

- 35 respondents were residents
- 10 respondents were developers/landowners
- 3 respondents were community interest groups
- 7 respondents were statutory consultees

Section/ Policy	Summary of comments	Response
General	Comments on structure and numbering.	Structure of the document has been revised.
General comments	Production of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) should be delayed until the Local Plan is in place.	Disagree with this approach as it is unclear when the Local Plan will be adopted.
General comments	The NP should include a Renewable Energy Strategy.	There is no requirement for NP's to consider this.
1.2 (NP Area)	Map is too small.	Will be enlarged in supporting documentation.
1.3 (How NP fits in to the Planning System)	Has a Strategic Environmental Assessment been produced?	Requesting a screening opinion for North West Leicestershire District Council (NWLDC).
1.4 (What the NP will cover)	Inconsistency in definition of timeframe from section and front page.	Amended so consistency in new draft NP.
1.5 (How the plan has been prepared)	Description of Focus Groups needs altering.	Amended.
2 (About Ashby de la Zouch)	Description of Ashby needs strengthening and census data to state just for NP area.	Amended to provide a stronger description of Ashby and surrounding countryside.
3 (What the Plan is trying to achieve)	Suggestions re wording of the key issues and inclusion of traffic management issues. However some issues suggested e.g. health and social care not added as go beyond remit of a NP.	Amended and included reference to traffic management.
3.2 (The vision)	Vision needs to include reference to surrounding countryside, as just refers to the town. Praise for the vision as it stands.	Amended to include the wider countryside.
4.1 (Towards a sustainable	Need to refer to NWLDC as Local Planning Authority and	Amended.

Ashby)	Leicestershire County Council (LCC).	
4.1.1 (Introduction)	More detail on issues affecting the town and a better description of the town required.	Agree there needs to be more local detail but this has been added throughout the document rather than in this section. The description of the town has been amended.
4.1.2 (A presumption in favour of sustainable development)	<p>Comments regarding the definition.</p> <p>Request to address issues around farmland and water supplies.</p> <p>Greater explanation on what is meant by sustainable development and suggested changes to some of the wording</p> <p>Support recognition of need for sustainable development.</p>	<p>Retain current definition as matches the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>The NP addresses levels of development without detailing specific industry requirements. Water supply is addressed through individual planning applications.</p> <p>Plan amended to be clearer about what the NP can influence in planning terms.</p>
4.1.4 (Limits to Development)	<p>Concern that Limits to development includes a number of parks and open spaces.</p> <p>Need to show employment land within the Limits to Development.</p> <p>Limits to Development different to those in the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>No Limits should be put forward as</p>	<p>Development is only permitted where it complies with other policies in the NP.</p> <p>Map amended to show employment land.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan was at an early stage when this document was produced. The Limits to Development have been amended to reflect recent planning decisions and confirmation from NLWDC that the Limits to Development for Ashby will not be changing in the next draft of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Disagree as the NP seeks</p>

	<p>can be a mechanism to preclude sustainable growth opportunities.</p> <p>The A42 should be treated as the Limits to Development on the south eastern side of the town.</p>	<p>to control development, which is a legitimate concern for the NP, as long as housing allocation targets are met.</p> <p>The revised Limits to Development are the same as in the emerging Local Plan. During consultation there was no significant support (except from developers) to increase housing numbers beyond those set out in the Emerging Local Plan.</p>
4.1.5 (Development outside the built up area).	<p>Request for an area of separation between the town and other villages.</p> <p>Questioned the use of the word 'approved in exceptional circumstances'.</p>	<p>Reference to areas of separation between the town and villages has been added.</p> <p>Language changed to 'supported in exceptional circumstances'.</p>
4.1.6 (Design)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to land instability needs adding. • Use word 'Statement' rather than 'Design Statement'. • Comments on this section and policy needing to be stronger, too vague as currently written. With a desire to avoid large scale development of a 'standard' design. Wanting new developments to reflect the character and historic context of the plan area. • Concern at reference to an 'architectural review' and use of Design and Access Statements and what this means in practice. 	<p>This section has been significantly altered to take on board many of the comments made.</p> <p>Reference to an architectural review and Design and Access Statements have been removed.</p>
4.1.7 (Brownfield Sites)	<p>Question how many of these exist in the town and whether they should be identified. Overall support for the policy.</p> <p>Oppose an approach that prioritises the use of brownfield sites over other development.</p>	<p>Not felt necessary to identify individual sites. Agree there are very few at the current time.</p> <p>If a brownfield site is not available then alternative sites will be considered.</p> <p>There is also some qualifying of the statement</p>

		on prioritising brownfield sites.
4.2 (Housing)	Conflicts with draft Local Plan around housing numbers.	The Draft Local Plan was subject to initial consultation at the same time the NP consultation was taking place. As, following the NWLDC consultation, it is now clear that the housing numbers allocated for Ashby in the Local Plan will not be changing figures within the NP have been amended accordingly.
4.2.1& 4.2. (Housing & Sustainable Housing Growth)	Section too long and could merge policies H1 and H2. Question comments on Ashby being the focus of new house building, some agreeing and some disagreeing.	Those policies have been merged and a new policy regarding a masterplan for the Money Hill area has been introduced.
4.2.2 (Sustainable Housing Growth)	Comments on different housing allocation than within the draft Local Plan. A need to include outcome of current planning appeals when they are known. Concerns about impact on infrastructure of further housing growth and question the need for additional houses. Questions around the figures used in the Local Plan allocations. Whether they are too great or too small. Some drafting comments on distribution of housing across the district.	See 4.2 above and revision of housing allocation within the new draft NP. The NP needs to be in conformity with the emerging Local Plan so the current housing numbers of 1750 need including. This number will also incorporate the dwellings recently approved on appeal. Issues regarding this allocation in the Local Plan cannot be dealt with in the NP. However it is noted in the text that the growth ambitions of the residents are not significant and residents are concerned at the level of new development. Greater detail on Infrastructure priorities has been given under Developer Contributions.

		Significant redrafting of this section has taken place.
4.2.2 (Sustainable Housing Growth)	Query claims regarding loss of open space.	Open countryside, including public footpaths have been developed on in recent years, thus reducing the public's access to open countryside.
4.2.2 (Sustainable Housing Growth)	Potential impact on A42 J13 if Money Hill is approved.	We understand that an agreement has been reached concerning the upgrading of the A42 J13 to deal with impact of additional houses on Money Hill.
4.2.2 (Sustainable Housing Growth)	Issues that need considering for development sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coal mining activity • Flood risk 	Flood risk has been built in to the revised NP. Coal mining still needs building in.
4.2.3 (Housing Mix)	Question appropriateness of defining housing mix and affordable housing within a Neighbourhood Plan. Commenting that this should only be dealt with at a strategic level in by the Local Planning Authority.	Disagree Neighbourhood Planning is able to set levels at variance with District wide ratios to meet local need.
4.2.3 (Housing Mix)	Different views on whether the proposed housing mix is accurate. Some people support the proposals others suggest a different housing mix.	The Neighbourhood Plan replicates the housing mix set out in the emerging Local Plan and figures remain unchanged.
4.2.4 (Affordable Housing)	Different views on whether the affordable housing percentage is viable. Comments on the number of bedrooms required and concerns that people with carers will need 2 bedroom properties, rather than 1 bedroom.	The affordable housing target has been changed to 30% rather than 40%. The number of 1 bedroom properties reduced from 50% to 40%.
4.2.5 (Promoting self-build)	The timescales relating to self build plots are seen as too strict and could be counter productive, in discouraging rather than promoting self build. Concerns about feasibility of restricting the purchase of self build plots to local people.	The policy has been redrafted to remove timescales for completing the building. Encouraging the self build option for local people was felt to be important so is retained.
4.3 (Employment	Employment allocations focussed	Comments noted.

and Economic Growth)	on maintaining the status quo rather than encouraging growth. With reference to inclusion of new employment site at Money Hill. Other people felt there are enough business parks in the town.	
4.3 (Employment and Economic Growth)	Request a policy for protection of existing employment sites. Need to show existing employment sites.	This is already in the NP. Map on Proposed Limits to Development revised to show employment areas.
4.3 (Employment and Economic Growth)	Employment allocations in the Local Plan need reflecting in the Neighbourhood Plan.	There are no new allocations of employment land, as this is left to the Local Plan.
4.3.2 (Existing Employment Land and Buildings)	Need to strengthen description of employment in the town and protect existing employment sites. Representations that the Ashby Gateway site should be excluded from Ashby Business Park and the associated restrictions on the type of development permitted in that area.	Text has been amended to provide more detail on employment in the town and to offer protection to existing employment sites. Town Councillors disagree with excluding Ashby Gateway from Ashby Business Park. The text has been altered to be more explicit about the types of employment permitted in specific areas. This is in line with the Local Plan.
4.3.4 (Connecting local people to the new job opportunities)	The obligations placed on developers are seen as unacceptable.	Comments noted.
4.4 (Town Centre)	Negative impact of out of town retail developments.	Cannot tackle what has already happened but seeking to influence development in the future by restricting retail development outside the Primary Shopping Centre.
4.4 (Town Centre)	Want impact of new development on traffic congestion in the town centre mentioning.	Suggestion has been actioned within the transport section.
4.4 (Town Centre)	Lack of drop kerbs hinder access to events held on Market Street.	Could possibly refer to disabled access in Policy TC1 on Town Centre Uses.

4.4 (Town Centre)	No reference to vibrant night life.	Added reference to night life.
4.4 (Town Centre)	Propose pedestrianisation of Market Street.	This is a matter for LCC not the Neighbourhood Plan.
4.4.2 (Town Centre attractiveness)	Criticism of the retail mix within the town centre.	This is not a matter the Neighbourhood Plan can influence, as change of use from one type of retail to another is not controlled by planning.
4.4.2 (Town Centre attractiveness)	Concern that the wording of this section fitting with the NPPF and needing to be clearer about what it is aiming to achieve.	This section has been redrafted.
4.4.3 (Primary Shopping area)	As written the text is too onerous and NWLDC will not be able to enforce the requirements. Concern that focus on A1 uses may be too restrictive.	This section has been redrafted, but still makes it clear retail uses are supported.
4.4.4 (Shop Fronts)	Need to be frontages rather than just the shop front. Wording around internally illuminated signs not in line with NWLDC policy.	Text amended to frontages. Clarification regarding internally illuminated signs has been provided by NWLDC and the text amended accordingly. Internally illuminated signs have been moved to the policy on legible Ashby.
4.4.5 (Residential development in town centre)	Residential development in town centre welcomed, but concerns around car parking. Environment Agency concerns around flood risk and access and egress to properties in times of flood.	Comments noted.
4.4.6 (Tourism)	Reference to the National Forest needs adding and as written it is too restrictive as only focuses on the Town Centre. Need to protect existing tourism assets e.g. the Royal Hotel.	Reference to the National Forest has been added. The scope of the policy has been extended to cover the NP Area. Reference to not supporting the loss of tourism facilities has been added.
4.4.6 (Tourism)	Additional tourism facilities need to be supported by adequate car	NWLDC review of car parking will need to

	parking, including coach parking.	consider this.
4.4.7 (Legible Signage)	Confusion over the purpose of this policy and whether it just refers to the town centre and tourism facilities or should be the town as a whole. Need for a corporate image.	This section has been redrafted to include reference to the visual character of the town centre, swan neck external lighting and internal illumination on signs. Separating out a policy on signage from a community action to create a legible signage strategy for the town as a whole.
4.5 (Transport)	LCC is working with NWLDC to look at the impact of growth on the transport infrastructure system. Welcome support for the opening of the railway line through Ashby and comments on the lack of public transport and poor road links with Burton, Derby.	LCC work on transport infrastructure welcomed. NP unable to directly influence public transport provision.
4.5 (Transport)	Concerns not enough emphasis is given to the impact of new development on traffic in Ashby.	Reference to the impact of new development on traffic in the town has been added to the transport section.
4.5 (Transport)	Disagreement with claim that the plan area is relatively well served by transport opportunities or footpaths.	Reference to being well served has been removed. Text also edited in policy 4.5.5 on Promoting walking and cycling.
4.5 (Transport)	Respondent promoting idea of a one way system in Ashby.	This is a matter for LCC not the Neighbourhood Plan.
4.5 (Transport)	Highways England welcomed policies aimed at reducing impacts of development on the road network and commented on impact of development on A42 J13.	Comments were noted and the understanding is that improvements to A42 J13 are already being planned.
4.5.2 (Development in most accessible locations)	Concerns that 'sustainable and accessible locations' is not defined.	The policy has been redrafted to state what is meant by sustainable development in transport terms.
4.5.7 (Public transport)	Comments on poor public transport links in the town.	Policy to encourage improvements in public transport becomes a community action rather than a policy, as not a planning issue.

4.5.8 (Car Parking)	There is an urgent need to address the shortage of car parking in the town centre. Dissatisfaction at the charges made for car parking.	NWLDC are responsible for car parking in the town and for the charging strategy. The Town Council has asked for a review of car parking to be conducted and this is being arranged by NWLDC. This is now referred to in the policy. The policy has been redrafted to include reference to encouraging proposals that improve car parking.
4.6 (Education, Leisure and Wellbeing)	No mention is made of health facilities and need to refer to schools under pressure	A new section on important community facilities refer to schools and health facilities being under pressure.
4.6.2 (Important Local Green Spaces)	General support for the policy and there is a need to list the Local Green Spaces, with suggested spaces mentioned. A map showing the spaces should be included.	A list and map has been added and assessments have been produced in most cases.
4.6.2 (Important Local Green Spaces)	The list of Local Green Spaces should include land at Willesley Lane.	The land has been assessed and does not meet the criteria of a Local Green Space as it is a tract of open land.
4.6.2 (Important Local Green Spaces)	Protection needs to be wider than just the designated Local Green Spaces.	A new policy on protecting open spaces has been added.
4.6.2 (Important Local Green Spaces)	One objection to inclusion of the Bath Grounds as a Local Green Space. Also strong support for their inclusion.	The area meets the criteria for a Local Green Space so is included.
4.6.3 (Open space in new housing development)	Policy conflicts with NPPF and may lead to viability issues.	Policy redrafted to reflect District Council planning policy.
4.6.4 (Allotments)	Concerns regarding viability of expectations for allotments relating to developments of five or more homes.	Policy adjusted to state developments of fifty or more homes.
4.6.5 (Biodiversity)	Need to clarify what the policy on biodiversity wants to achieve and to acknowledge new development can be used to enhance biodiversity.	Policy redrafted to give greater clarity and to comment on opportunities to enhance biodiversity.

4.6.6 (Trees and hedges)	This section needs strengthening with greater emphasis to Ashby being at the heart of the National Forest and to allow some flexibility in how trees are dealt with by developers, to allow for wider benefits.	Increased references to the National Forest. With text suggested by the National Forest Company added. Policy redrafted to provide greater detail on what the plan wants to achieve and on the need to enhance the National Forest.
4.6.6 (Trees and hedges)	Need to identify and survey all the trees and hedgerows of value in the NP area.	Not feasible.
4.6.7 (Historic Buildings and Structures)	A need to differentiate between listed buildings and other buildings that are locally important.	Separate policies for Listed Buildings and Buildings and Structures of Local Heritage Interest have been produced. Including a list of the latter.
4.6.8 (Conservation Area)	The Conservation Area has not been reviewed for some years.	A request for an immediate review of the Conservation Area appraisal has been added.
4.6.9 (Archaeological Sites)	Defining the Alert Zone as coterminous with the Conservation Area is too restrictive. Reference needs to be given to the County Council's role recording archaeological sites.	This policy has been redrafted to remove the reference to the Alert Zone and to refer instead to the records kept by LCC.
4.6.10 (Important community facilities)	There is a need to list facilities that are important to the community. There is some disputing whether the existing facilities can be described as 'a good range' and whether these will be adequate as the population grows. The policy tries to embrace new facilities and loss of facilities together, this is confusing.	A list of community facilities has been included. Separate policies have been written for protecting existing facilities and providing new facilities. The policy on new facilities encourages a growth in facilities as need increases.
4.6.12 (Provision of a new Arts/Community Centre)	Different views are expressed on whether this is required.	The Focus Group who developed the NP were keen for this to be included, as there was no predominant view in the consultation it has been retained.
4.6.13 (Education)	Dispute claim there is a shortfall in places in local schools at the current time.	The policy has been amended to be more specific in stating that

	Some dispute as to whether education falls in to the remit of a NP.	development proposals must demonstrate there is sufficient educational provision for additional demand the development creates. Putting in additional funding where there is a negative impact on educational provision.
4.7 (Developer contributions)	Welcome intention to prioritise contribution requests. Need to consult on list when more detail provided.	Pre-submission consultation will permit this.
4.8 (Monitoring and Review)	Comments on timescales for review and on whether a review is necessary.	The NP needs reviewing on a regular basis.

Karen Edwards
Deputy Town Clerk
20/5/16