Hallaton Neighbourhood Plan Examination
Questions of clarification from the Examiner to the Parish Council and HDC

Qualifying Body response in red

Having completed my initial review of the Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan), I would be grateful if both Councils could kindly assist me as appropriate in answering the following questions which either relate to matters of fact or are areas in which I seek clarification or further information. Please do not send or direct me to evidence that is not already publicly available.

1. Please could HDC clarify their comment on page 35 of the representations document in relation to page 21 of the Plan and indicate what, if any, modification might be needed? For HDC to respond to

2. Please could HDC confirm the up to date minimum housing number Hallaton is expected to plan for in the Plan period (taking into account completions and commitments etc.)? HDC

3. Please could I be updated on any planning applications or appeals on the three proposed site allocations subject of Policy HBE 3. HDC

4. Please could I be provided with a map which shows all the housing sites assessed? Completed and submitted, numbers on sites correlate to SSAs on https://www.leicestershirecommunities.org.uk/np/hallatonnp.html

5. Please provide me with the planning history of the site referred to in a representation as "Site at North End/Hunts Lane" We presume HDC will provide this but will send to be sure ….. the latest application (January 2020) was when the owners submitted an application to build 3 large houses. The application was refused. Hallaton Parish Council strongly objected to this application for reasons of its impact on the rural character of this part of the village and impact on three proposed local green spaces in close proximity to it (Walnut's Paddock, Hunt's Lane and the allotments). HDC agreed with the Parish Council on all these points in their rejection notice, which I have attached in case it is of interest.

6. Policy HBE 6 appears to require market housing should be available for people with a local connection; is this the intention? The policy should say 'affordable home ownership and rental housing' rather than 'market and affordable housing.

7. Policy ENV 1 – Appendix 8 indicates the history for Hacluit's Pond and North End Village Green is included. I cannot find it. If this has already been published, please send me a copy. This is the note that should be attached.

Hacluit's Pond & Hallaton's Horse Fairs

Hacluit's Pond is named after John Hacluit, circa 1350; who was lord of the Hacluit's Manor of Hallaton.

700 years ago the pond was used for watering the stock and washing the carts. By the mid 1500s the famous Hallaton Horse fairs had moved, by Royal Order, up from the High Street, to what is now called North End, and was then called "Horse Fair". This wide and long straight street was set out specifically for use as a Horse Fair, where the horses could be paraded, trotted, walked

and bought and sold. Hacluit's Pond served the vital purpose of providing water for the many horses. The Horse Fairs in Hallaton died out in mid Victorian times and the pond reverted to its everyday use as a cart wash.

The white rails around the pond are a relatively recent addition, with the present road diverting around the pond. Before the rails, the road track ran straight through the pond, with its firm base, so that the farmers and carters might wash their carts and wagons and for the wooden wheels, which had dried out and shrunk, be allowed to soak and swell and thereby fit tightly against the metal outer rim.

The ingenious Victorians put the pond to an extra use by building a series of brick pipes, channels, gates and sluices all throughout the village, so that in the case of fire, water from Hacluit's Pond could be diverted and used to put out the fire. That ingenious system of pipes still exists and forms part of our storm water drainage system. In living memory, the pond when frozen, was used by the villagers for ice skating and ice hockey matches.

The pond has therefore been used for at least 500 years and probably 650-700 years; starting life as a natural spring fed pond.

John Morison March 2018

8. Policy ENV 2 identifies a large number of sites across two Figures, 7.1 and 7.2. The policy relies on Appendix 7 which I find hard to interpret does it help to alter the heading of column 1 on Appendix 7. At present it reads " 260.75=26" . Change this to read "Numbered Fields". and does not appear to distinguish between the hierarchy of sites outlined in the NPPF the narrative on p.33 is intended to do this. Some of the sites are already protected As in the narrative; the intention is to record all sites of historical and natural significance (already designated and those identified during the inventory survey which add local detail) in the Plan area for completeness and to aid the decision-making process for HDC Planners. In addition, on both figures there are various areas with numbers but which are not coloured in these are the inventoried fields whose boundaries are sites of environmental significance (or which are adjacent to sites ditto which are themselves not separately numbered in the inventory) to provide a text/inventory/map cross-reference. Please provide a map or maps this is what figures 7.1 and 7.2 are intended to show of the sites subject of the policy and point me in the direction of the evidence to support their identification this is the environmental inventory, Appendix 7 and a way forward for this policy. Does this address the issues raised?

9. Policy ENV 3 – please provide a copy or link to the documents referred to at the bottom of page 35 of the Plan i.e. Local Green Space, Open Spaces Strategy and Provision for Open Space, Sport and Recreation (2015 – 2016). What status do these documents have? They are supporting evidence for the Local Plan

http://www.harborough.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/1764/provision_for_open_space_sport_and_recreation_2015_final_v13_webpdf.pdf

http://www.harborough.gov.uk/directory_record/729/gr5_open_spaces_strategy_2016_to_2021

http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/1213/gr2_local_green_space_community_and_landowner_consultation_2014_and_2015

10. Policy ENV 4 seeks to identify non-designated heritage assets. These are described in Appendix 10, but please explain how these they were identified and what selection criteria were used.
The non-designated heritage assets identification and selection process and criteria followed the Historic England advice note 7 on Local Heritage Listing. The identification process followed the flow chart on page 7 of that document and the criteria that was taken into account is as described on page 9 of the design note.

11. Policy ENV 5 seeks to identify a number of areas of ridge and furrow as non-designated heritage assets. Please explain what selection criteria were used. Should all the areas identified in Figure 11.4 should be identified in the policy or only the highest quality areas perhaps? All surviving areas of R&F are mapped - their quality identified and described in the key to the map. The four levels of significance are identified to help those determining planning applications to apply the appropriate level of 'significance' when an application is being considered. R&F is a rapidly diminishing resource and the policy requires determinations to balance the benefit of development with the significance of the R&F.

12. Policy ENV 6 identifies notable trees shown in Appendix 11. Please explain how the trees were identified and what the selection criteria are. 'Notable trees' is a recognised concept but one without a precise definition (e.g. age, girth) – local residents, including past and present tree wardens, applied their knowledge to identify the most significant locally. Additional trees were also added as a result of comments made under Regulation 14 Consultation (this accounts for the discrepancy noted below). Is it necessary to identify those located in the Conservation Area or already with Tree Preservation Orders on them? What additional benefit would be had from their inclusion in this policy? If none can be identified, please send me a revised list of trees The trees are there in the interests of completeness and to identify important trees irrespective of additional protection provided. Additionally, some hedges are identified in the Appendix; should these be retained in this policy? These are notable trees within the hedges listed Finally, please clarify the number of trees; the policy indicates 49 but the appendix details more (including 59 and 60 which do not appear to be on Figure 12 in the Plan?). The discrepancy relates to the additional trees added as a result of feedback from Regulation 14 Consultation. Policy ENV6 should read 60 not 49. Unfortunately this was not updated in the Submission version. Figure 12 on page 45 of the NP is the correct map and directly correlates with Appendix 11.

13. Policy ENV 7 includes an area identified as a Local Green Space in Policy ENV 1. I see a potential conflict here; please explain why there is no conflict and/or indicate which policy would it be best for Hare Pie Bank be in? Hare Pie Bank should be in the LGS policy ENV1 because of its local importance. We understand the potential conflict between policies ENV1 and ENV7 and would support the removal of Hare Pie Bank from Policy ENV7. It is a very special field with great local importance

14. Policy ENV 10 is quite specific in some of its requirements. Please point me in the direction of the explanation for the requirements if already published. These emerged through the deliberations of the environmental theme group and are identified to meet best practice requirements as stated in the policy itself. By saying 'should' rather than 'must' it is recognised that not all development will be able to meet these expectations, but the policy expects applications to address these issues where practical.

15. Policy ENV 11 refers to views; are these the same views identified in Policy ENV 9 or is the reference general? It is a general reference.

16. Please could HDC confirm their local requirements in relation to planning applications in respect of design and access statements or similar documents. HDC

17. Please could HDC confirm the number of representations received at Regulation 16 stage? HDC

18. Appendix 5 is the Design Guide. I consider a number of changes are needed to ensure it meets the basic conditions. This is because it is an important document in relation to Policy HBE 1, but it includes a number of statements and policy requirements which should be deleted as the document is not policy. Please could I be provided with a word document version of it to enable me to make track changes so I can then forward it to you. This is then likely to require a short period of further consultation (depending on my intended modifications) to allow all parties to make any comments. Design Guide provided previously in word version.

19. Finally, I confirm that the Parish Council has been given an opportunity to comment on all or any of the representations made at Regulation 16 stage. Please could any comments the Parish Council wish to make are sent to me by the date in this note and questions of clarification. Responses to Reg 16 comments submitted to HDC on 13 October.

It may be the case that on receipt of your anticipated assistance on these matters that I may need to ask for further clarification or that further queries will occur as the examination progresses. These queries are raised without prejudice to the outcome of the examination.

Please note that this list of clarification questions is a public document and that your answers will also be in the public domain. Both my questions and your responses should be placed on the Councils' websites as appropriate.

Noted. We will place this document on the NP website. Please get back in touch if further clarification is required.

With many thanks,

Ann Skippers MRTPI
Independent Examiner
29 September 2020