

**THRUSSINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**  
**WORKING PARTY NOTES #35**  
**MEETING 7.00 March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018, VM house**

Present: Working Group:

Candy Newby                      Mark Thistlethwaite    Verity Munden                      Paul Wilcox

Apologies: W Johnson N Stanyard

Circulation: Above, T Prior, N Hainsworth, D Young, J Poland, Jo Gregory (UI), and interested residents

Meeting held to discuss queries from examiner, Mr J Slater:

**Questions for Thrustrington Parish Council**

*4. Are there maps of areas at risk from surface water flooding within the Parish Area, perhaps produced by the County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority? If there are, can I be sent a copy. My concern is to have clarity for an applicant and the planning authority as to which planning applications would be expected to produce a Flood Risk Assessment at application registration stage. In terms of riparian flooding I can rely upon the Environment Agency's Flood Maps and indeed saw localised flooding from the River Wreake for myself.*

CBC have a strategic flood risk assessment document available at <https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/sfra> (see appendix F for Surface Water Flooding).

Thrustrington is covered on page 17.

There is also the EA site reference <https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/summary/464903/315781>

There is also a LCC preliminary flood risk assessment document - attached.

*5. How would an applicant or a decision maker, know what constitutes "best practice design and construction techniques" as required by Policy E1? Can the Parish Council point me to any particular document or standard? Is drainage and biodiversity a land use as referred to in Policy E1 or features that a development should have regard to?*

The documents we would refer to are NPPF s99 and Charnwood's "Leading in Design" document – attached.

Considering the second sentence perhaps we could have worded this better in the Plan – The wording in E1 "Furthermore, development which introduces multiple land uses such as drainage, biodiversity and recreation will be supported." Would perhaps read better if it read "Any application

for development should reference how it affects drainage, biodiversity and recreation.” Suggesting that those that consider such effects will be supported.

*6. Is it the intention that every planning application submitted in the Parish should be accompanied by a landscape plan or just those sites and proposals that affect trees and hedgerows- (and vegetation?). I imagine these will be for green field site developments.*

No – not every application would require a landscape plan. Currently CBC decide if one is required.

We would like any development that affects green corridors to have a landscape plan and all green field developments. Suggest wording in Plan “Any development proposal must demonstrate through a comprehensive landscape plan how existing hedgerows, trees and vegetation have been retained and protected.” Could be enhanced to read that “Any development proposal that impacts existing hedgerows, trees and vegetation must have a landscape plan that shows how they have been retained and protected.”

*7. Is every planning application submitted in the parish expected to demonstrate how they have “respected and reinforced historic landscape features and patterns” e.g. house extensions, ancillary building , infill housing?*

No – only those that affect such features. Suggest wording be enhanced from “All new developments must demonstrate how they have respected and reinforced historic landscape features and patterns.” to “Developments that affect the key views listed below must demonstrate how they have respected and reinforced historic landscape features and patterns.

*8. Is there a reason why Aspiration E4a – Protecting the Church skyline is proposed as a community aspiration and is not proposed as a development plan policy?*

No – we agree.

*9. How would Policy B2 consider the reuse of rural buildings which fall outside of the settlement boundary? Agricultural buildings do not fall in the NPPF’s definition of previously developed land. My issue is to check conformity of the policy with national policy for rural enterprises. Which areas are considered to be public open space – is it different to LGS? Which “narrow or weak roads or bridges” are covered by the last bullet point and are they subject to weight restrictions?*

We think we have worded this wrong but would accept advice. Perhaps “Small scale or rural developments which create new employment uses, will be supported where they are small scale and located on appropriate sites within the settlement boundary or on previously developed sites elsewhere within the Parish.” To “Small scale or rural developments which create new employment uses, will be supported where they are small scale and located on appropriate sites within the settlement boundary or on former agricultural or commercial sites elsewhere within the Parish.”

We have used the terms Local Green Space and Public Open space and not been consistent. We meant to say local green space here. They tend to be equivalent in the village.

All roads subject to 7.5 ton limit.

Narrow road is "Old Gate Road" as it is largely single track.

The main bridge between Rearsby and Thrussington is single track but it's load capacity has not been assessed by Highways. Our aspiration is to protect this bridge.

*10. Can you clarify in Policy H1 whether proposals will be expected to meet just one of the criteria or all of them?*

All the criteria unless there is reason legally why we cannot apply all criteria.

*11. I note the reference to starter homes in Policy H2 – is the intention to limit the occupation initially to only young people or is it as the supporting text indicates promoting homes which are "more suitable for those wishing to purchase their first home". Equally is it the intention that the bungalows be restricted the elderly?*

No - Not our intention to limit but to provide opportunity for those groups specifically. This was one of the results from the village consultation.

Yes to second sentence.

No to third sentence.

*12. Can you list the recreational facilities to be protected by Policy L2? – does it include the caravan site?*

Basically the only facility in the Parish is the caravan site unless footpaths and national cycle route can be counted. We think pubs and shops etc come under community assets.

*13. Am I correct the highway improvements shown in the Appendix and referred to in the second paragraph of Policy T2 have now been implemented? What other public realm improvements are anticipated, beyond the gateway features on the approach to the village?*

Work started on these during the formation of the Plan. None are yet completely implemented.

1 Hoby Road constriction has been constructed and is under review and has some areas of concern. Highways are due to visit and discuss how it can be improved after Easter. Possibly a hump in addition.

2 White lines at Regent Street/Seagrave Road junction have been painted incorrectly. This is to be reviewed at same time as above with an extension to be discussed at putting lines around the shop and perhaps in future yellow lines.

3 The next area of concern is approach to village from Seagrave Road – options to be discussed.

4 A46 junction. With proposed LCFC (Leicester City Football Club) facility this junction being discussed with neighbouring PC's, our MP and LCFC.

5 School is developing a travel plan.

6 We then will look at other approaches to the village.

M Thistlethwaite 21/3/2018

*035 NP responses to examiner 19 March 2018.docx*