



Hinckley & Bosworth  
Borough Council

## **Stoke Golding Neighbourhood Plan Review**

### **Recommended modifications and HBBC's proposed response (Part of the Regulation 18 Decision Statement)**

**9 May 2024**

As outlined in the Regulation 18 Decision Statement, Regulation 18 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires the Local Planning Authority to outline what action to take in response to the recommendations the Independent Examiner made in their report. Dr Louise Brooke-Smith issued her report on 9 April 2024.

Below is Table 1, which outlines all the modifications listed in the Examiner's report, the Local Planning Authority's response to each, and the associated action, as required. Table 2 outlines the minor recommendations from the annex of the Examiner's report.

**Table 1: Examiner’s proposed modifications and HBBC’s proposed response**

Modification Ref.	Page & Paragraph Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner’s Report - explanation	Examiner’s recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
1	Various	<p>National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was issued in 2012 and was revised in 2018, 2019, 2021 and September 2023. I note that the NP review has had regard to those changes, but not the most recent version of the NPPF which was issued in December 2023. This most recent version of the NPPF presents changes to the requirements of providing land for future housing needs. However, the general policy relating to Neighbourhood Plans remains in place as does the overall approach endorsing sustainable development.</p> <p>I understand that the submission version of the NP review was prepared reflecting the Sept 2023 version of the NPPF. The more recently updated version of the NPPF was issued during the regulation 16 consultation period.</p> <p>The QB / LPA have the option to reconfirm the text at the beginning of the NP and within the Basic Conditions Statement that salient NPPF paragraph references are to the September 2023 version of that document but acknowledge that the document has been updated – or – they could undertake a review and update any changed paragraph references to the December 2023 version of the NPPF.</p> <p>I consider that for the avoidance of any doubt in the mind of any user of the NP, the most recent version of the NPPF (Dec 2023) should be referenced in the Basic Conditions Statement and any explanatory text through the NP document.</p> <p>I do not believe that the changes presented in the Dec 2023 version of the NPPF change any of the critical elements that are reflected in the proposed policies of the NP review, but moreover enhance it.</p>	<p><b>Recommended modification 1</b></p> <p>Update all references to the NPPF to the most recent version: December 2023. Ensure any quotations reflect this version of the NPPF</p>	<p>Agree with Examiner’s recommendation.</p> <p>All reference to the NPPF should be cross checked to ensure they reflect the December 2023 publication. As there were two updates to the NPPF in 2023, the date used should be December 2023 so it is clear to users that this version of the NPPF has been used as the basis for the Stoke Golding Neighbourhood Plan Review.</p> <p>Amend paragraphs:</p> <p>Amend paragraph 1.8</p> <p>The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was updated on <del>5 September</del> <b>20 December</b> 2023 and sets out the government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.</p>
2	Basic Conditions Statement	<p>I have reviewed the Basic Conditions Statement (BCS) (2023) and find it to be a comprehensive and well-written document. As noted earlier in my report, I consider that it needs to be updated in terms of references to specific paragraphs from the most recent version of the NPPF, namely that published in December 2023.</p>	<p><b>Recommended modification 2</b></p> <p>Update all references to the NPPF to the most recent version: December 2023. Ensure any quotations reflect this version of the NPPF.</p>	<p>Agree with Examiner’s recommendation.</p> <p>All references to the NPPF should be cross checked to ensure they reflect the December 2023 publication. As there were two updates to the NPPF in 2023, the date used should be December 2023 so it is clear to users that this version of the NPPF has been used.</p>
3	Page 13: Paragraph 4.11,	<p>I advise that the most up to date position regarding housing need and supply is included within the text of the NP Review and at para 4.11 of the submission NP document, and reference therefore made to the acceptance by the Borough Council of the Statement of Common Ground, but reticence with regard to the HENA.</p>	<p><b>Recommended modification 3</b></p> <p>Amend paragraph 4.11 to reflect the current position between Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and the Statement of Common Ground.</p>	<p>Agree with Examiner’s recommendation</p> <p>Since the Stoke Golding Neighbourhood Plan Review was submitted the Borough Council the situation has changed in relation to the Statement of Common Ground with Leicester and Leicestershire Authorities and therefore this paragraph should be amended to reflect this position.</p> <p><b>Amend Paragraph 4.11 to:</b></p> <p>4.11 The Leicester and Leicestershire Housing &amp; Economic Needs Assessments (HENA) sets out a proposed distribution of the unmet housing and employment need from Leicester City across the Leicestershire authorities. A Statement of Common Ground</p>

Modification Ref.	Page & Paragraph Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report - explanation	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
				<p>between the Leicestershire partners reflecting this proposed distribution has been prepared. <del>However, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council does not agree with part of the methodology that would see the Borough providing an additional 187 dwellings per annum.</del> <u>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council became a signatory of the Leicester and Leicestershire Statement of Common Ground at a Full Council Meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2024. The Borough Council has signed up to the figure of 102 dwellings per annum of Leicester City's unmet need. However, the Borough Council maintains an objection to the final part of the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment (HENA) Housing Distribution Paper which considers deliverability (including housing stock growth) and the apportionment of the additional 85 dwellings per annum of Leicester's unmet housing need.</u></p>
4	Page 13: Paragraphs 4.10 and 4.12	I advise that the most up to date position regarding housing need and supply is included within the text of the NP Review and at para 4.11 of the submission NP document, and reference therefore made to the acceptance by the Borough Council of the Statement of Common Ground, but reticence with regard to the HENA.	<p><b>Recommended modification 4</b></p> <p>Amend Paragraph 4.12 to reflect the current housing requirement</p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's Recommendation, since the submission of the Neighbourhood Plan the affordability ratio has been updated which has resulted in a change to the Borough Council's housing requirement.</p> <p>The most up to date housing figures are as follows:</p> <p>Standard Method: 9,093 (2020-2041) 433 dwellings per annum</p> <p>Standard Method + 102 dpa: 11,235 (2020-41) 535 dwellings per annum</p> <p>Standard Method + 187 dpa: 13,020 (2020-41) 620 dwellings per annum</p> <p>Paragraph 4.12 refers to the figure of 659 dwellings per annum which was based on the Standard Method plus 187 dwellings per annum Leicester City's Unmet need. The figure of 659 dwellings per annum should be replaced with <u>620 dwellings per annum.</u></p> <p><b>Amend paragraph 4.10 to:</b></p> <p>4.10 Based on this standard method, the minimum figure for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council is <del>468</del> <u>433</u> dwellings per annum.</p> <p><b>Amend paragraph 4.12 and footnote 3 to:</b></p> <p>4.12 If the Borough requirement was increased to <del>659</del> <u>620</u><sup>3</sup> dwellings per annum, based on its share Stoke Golding's new housing requirement would be <del>11.2</del> <u>10.5</u> dwellings per annum or <del>235</del> <u>221</u> dwellings for the period 2020 and 2041.</p>

Modification Ref.	Page & Paragraph Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report - explanation	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
				Footnote 3  <sup>3</sup> Based on a standard method requirement of 472 <b>620</b> dwellings per annum <del>(since reduced to 468)</del> plus 187 dwellings per annum representing the Borough's apportionment of Leicester City's unmet housing needs
5	Paragraph 1.8	Para 1.8 – Reflecting my earlier comments on the various versions of the NPPF, it would be appropriate to EITHER add reference in this paragraph, that the September 2023 version of the NPPF has been used throughout the NP review – OR – this paragraph is updated to refer to the most recent version of the NPPF and the Basic Conditions Statement is amended accordingly.  I repeat that while I am happy with either approach, my preference would be for the BCS and NP Review to refer to the most recent version of the NPPF.	<b>Recommended modification 5</b>  As per modification 1 and 2: Update all references to the NPPF to the most recent version: December 2023. Ensure any quotations reflect this version of the NPPF	Agree with Examiner's recommendation.  <b>NDP and Basic Conditions Statement</b>  All reference to the NPPF should be cross checked to ensure they reflect the December 2023 publication. As there were two updates to the NPPF in 2023, the date used should be December 2023 so it is clear to users that this version of the NPPF has been used as the basis for the Stoke Golding Neighbourhood Plan Review.
6	Paragraph 1.14	Para 1.14 – it would be helpful to include the date of adoption of the Site Allocations and Development Management Document.	<b>Recommended modification 6</b>  Include date of adoption of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD.	Agree with Examiner's recommendation.  <b>Insert (2016)</b>  Insert (2016) following Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD.
7	Various	In terms of style, I find the document easy to use and would anticipate any reader or decision maker to be able to navigate policies and supporting text without undue difficulty. However, to assist further,  I suggest that the various maps, illustrations, figures and tables should be listed at the front of the document, following the list of contents.	<b>Recommended modification 7</b>  Various maps, illustrations, figures and tables should be listed at the front of the document, following the list of contents.	Agree with Examiner's recommendation.  <b>Contents page</b>  Insert list of table and figures in the contents section of the document.
8	Page 17 & 18  Policy SG3: Mulberry Farm, High Street	I note that the allocation of land at Mulberry Farm was the result of a previous site selection process and community engagement, which was endorsed by the Examiner assessing the initial NP. I see no reason to defer from this but do concur with the LPAs Reg16 submission that while encouragement is given at (3) to the retention of brick buildings on site, this is incongruous with point (11) which refers to a cleared site.  I advise that (11) is rewritten as follows;  'Any contamination present shall be safely remediated prior to the commencement of any development.'  I also consider that point (7) should be clarified. Given the Plan's emphasis on the enhancement of biodiversity, and given the location of the site, I presume that should the extant hedge need to be replaced, this is by another boundary of vegetation.  My suggestion is the LPA / QB consider the redrafting of (7) as follows;	<b>Recommended modification 8</b>  Amend text within criteria 7 and 11 to:  7) The hedge along the western boundary of the site shall be retained or replaced with another boundary of suitable vegetation.  11) Any contamination present shall be safely remediated prior to the commencement of any development.	Agree with Examiner's recommendation.  <b>Amend Policy SG3: Mulberry Farm, High Street</b>  Amend Criteria 7 to read:  7. The hedge along the western boundary of the site shall be retained or replaced <b>with another boundary of suitable vegetation.</b>  Amend Criteria 11 to read:  11. <del>The site shall be cleared, and a</del> Any contamination present <b>shall be</b> safely remediated prior to the commencement of any development;

Modification Ref.	Page & Paragraph Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report - explanation	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
		<p>The hedge along the western boundary of the site shall be retained or replaced with another boundary of suitable vegetation.</p> <p>Further to these modifications, I find Policy SG3 compliant.</p>		
9	<p>Page 19</p> <p>Table under paragraph 4.23</p>	<p>The explanatory text accompanying this policy is clear and sets the context well. However, the table at para 4.23 should be titled, the source information noted and dated, and a figure number added.</p> <p>The resulting policy makes reference to a specific Housing and Economic Needs Assessment but also acknowledges that more up to date evidence may emerge in the future that will be taken into account by any decision maker. I find this a sensible way forward which reflects the needs of the area and responds to the concerns of the local community, as indicated through the plan preparation process.</p> <p>Accordingly, subject to adding an appropriate title, source and date for the table at para 4.23, I find Policy SG5 compliant.</p>	<p><b>Recommended Modification 9</b></p> <p>Insert an appropriate title, source and date for the table at paragraph 4.23</p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation:</p> <p><b>Include Title, Source and Date to table under paragraph 4.23. A table number should also be included as per Modification 7.</b></p>
10	<p>Page 22</p> <p>Paragraph 4.37</p> <p>Policy SG6: Affordable Housing</p>	<p>The explanatory section accompanying this policy addresses self and custom-built units, affordable housing, and housing commitments. At paragraph 4.37 reference is made to 'large private-sector developments' but there is no explanation of what constitutes 'large'. Clarification should be included here, rather than relying on a reference to '10 or more homes' in the main policy.</p> <p>Furthermore, an explanation needs to be given to justify the percentage figures included in the main policy. It is unclear why a 40% affordable provision is cited, and no justification or reference given to the 56% and 19% split. Additional explanation should be included within the accompanying explanatory text.</p> <p>Only with these modifications, do I find Policy SG5 compliant.</p>	<p><b>Recommended Modification 10</b></p> <p>Amend Paragraph 4.37:</p> <p>Clarification should be included here [para 4.37], rather than relying on a reference to '10 or more homes' in the main policy.</p> <p>Add additional paragraph to supporting text:</p> <p>An explanation needs to be given to justify the percentage figures included in the main policy. It is unclear why a 40% affordable provision is cited, and no justification or reference given to the 56% and 19% split. Additional explanation should be included within the accompanying explanatory text</p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation, insert in brackets 10 or more dwellings or the site area is 0.5 hectares or more. This definition reflects the definition contained in the Glossary of the NPPF for major development.</p> <p><b>Amend paragraph 4.37:</b></p> <p>On large private-sector developments <b>(10 or more dwellings or the site area is 0.5 hectares or more)</b>, 40% of dwellings should be affordable. Of the 190 dwellings planned at Roseway, Wykin Lane and Stoke Fields farm, 76 will be affordable. The allocated housing site will also be expected to contribute fully to affordable housing provision.</p> <p><b>Insert additional paragraph to the supporting text to Policy SG6: Affordable Housing:</b></p> <p>An explanation needs to be included in this new paragraph to include the reasoning behind the figures contained within policy SG6. Specifically, the 40% affordable housing figure and the 56% affordable homes for rent and 19% affordable home ownership.</p>
11	<p>Page 27</p> <p>Policy SG8: Areas of Separation</p>	<p>I note that, to improve clarity, the QB have suggested potential changes. In light of this I advise that the second sentence of the policy is modified as follows;</p> <p><i>'Development which adversely affects the open character of this areas or the character and setting of Dadlington or Stoke Golding will not be supported.'</i></p>	<p><b>Recommended Modification 11</b></p> <p>Amend second sentence of policy to:</p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p><b>Delete the second sentence of the policy and replace with the following text:</b></p>

Modification Ref.	Page & Paragraph Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report - explanation	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
		Further to this modification, I find Policy SG8 compliant	'Development which adversely affects the open character of this areas or the character and setting of Dadlington or Stoke Golding will not be supported.'	Development which adversely affects the open character of this areas or the character and setting of Dadlington or Stoke Golding will not be supported.
12	Page 35 Policy SG13: Trees and hedgerows	<p>This policy presents an understandable degree of protection of trees and hedgerows. However, its basic premise reiterates legislation already in place. Furthermore, the reference to a 5m buffer between extant hedgerows and any new developments appears arbitrary. I have not been presented with any clear justification for this requirement, which may impede future development which otherwise would be acceptable.</p> <p>No specific hedgerows or ancient trees have been identified and the policy appears to be a 'catch all' approach.</p> <p>I find Policy SG13 duplicates extant legislation and guidance and offer little specific additional guidance to any user of the NP.</p> <p>Accordingly, I see little benefit of including Policy SG13 and it should be omitted.</p>	<p><b>Recommended Modification 12</b></p> <p>Policy SG13 should be deleted.</p>	<p>Agree, with Examiner's recommendation. Policy SG13 reiterates legislation and a lack of justification has been provided for the 5 metre buffer between extant hedgerows and new developments.</p> <p><b>Delete policy SG13 &amp; Objectives met.</b></p> <p>The supporting text can be retained as it sets out what is important to the community and provides contextual information for Stoke Golding. This supporting text can be moved to above Policy SG12 which contains policy relating to trees and hedgerows in criteria 1-4.</p>
13	Pages 37 & 38 Policy SG14: Renewable Energy	<p>I note that this policy is accompanied by Map 8 which illustrates 2 solar farms within the NP area. Work undertaken on behalf of the Borough Council in 2014 by consultants commissioned to identify parts of the Borough suitable for solar photovoltaic proposals, is acknowledged in the revised NP. A proportion of respondents to the 2017 Questionnaire supported their development within the NP area. However, a larger proportion did not support wind turbines.</p> <p>I note that Policy SG14 reflects this stance and provides support for ground mounted solar photovoltaic farms on brownfield or non-agricultural land provided visual impact and biodiversity matters are addressed.</p> <p>While I accept that the accompanying first 4 bullet points are acceptable and justifiable, my concern lies with the 5th point which requires the removal of installation when they are no longer in use. Some solar farms change hands and can lie dormant for periods of time. It would be impractical to require their dismantlement if they are to be reused by different operators.</p> <p>I suggest that (5) is redrafted as follows;</p> <p>The infrastructure is removed when there is written confirmation that the operation is no longer in use or has the ability to be in use, and the land is fully restored to provide an improvement in landscape quality.</p>	<p><b>Recommended Modification 13</b></p> <p>Amend criteria 5 of Policy SG14 to:</p> <p>'The infrastructure is removed when there is written confirmation that the operation is no longer in use or has the ability to be in use, and the land is fully restored to provide an improvement in landscape quality'.</p>	<p>Agree with the Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p><b>Amend criteria 5 to:</b></p> <p>5. The <del>installations are</del> <b>infrastructure is</b> removed when <b>there is written confirmation that the operation is</b> <del>they are</del> no longer in use, <b>or has the ability to be in use</b>, and the land is fully restored to provide a net improvement in landscape quality.</p>

Modification Ref.	Page & Paragraph Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report - explanation	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
		Only with this modification, do I find Policy SG14 compliant.		
14	Page 51& 52 Policy SG16: Design	<p>As with other policies, the accompanying explanatory text sets an appropriate context for this policy which reflects the SPD for the Borough. The policy helpfully presents design guidance to appropriately reflect the area. I consider that the criteria set out for any user of the Plan is generally clear. However, my concern lies with criterion (6) and the phrase 'distinctive character'. This seems to run counter to the guidance in criterion (1) and presents a mixed message to any user of the NP or decision maker.</p> <p>I advise that criterion (6) is modified to read;</p> <p>'As appropriate to the scale of development, create a place with a locally inspired character and;..... '</p> <p>Accompanying criterion 6, (ii) appears to be missing two verbs. It should read;</p> <p>'Respect local building styles by ensuring that buildings are of modest size (maximum of two storeys) and are simple in plan and elevation.....'</p> <p>With these modifications I find Policy SG16 compliant.</p>	<p><b>Recommended Modification 14</b></p> <p>Amend criteria 6 of Policy SG16 to:</p> <p>'As appropriate to the scale of development, create a place with a locally inspired character and;'</p> <p>Amend criteria 6 (ii) of Policy SG16 to:</p> <p>'Respect local building styles by ensuring that buildings are of modest size (maximum of two storeys) and are simple in plan and elevation.....'</p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation to provide clarity.</p> <p><b>Amend criteria 6 opening sentence:</b></p> <p>6. As appropriate to the scale of development, create a place with a locally inspired <del>or otherwise distinctive</del> character and:</p> <p><b>Amend criteria 6 (ii) to:</b></p> <p>ii) Respect local building styles by ensuring that buildings <u>are</u> of modest size (maximum of two storeys), <u>and</u> simple in plan and elevation. Buildings should be red brick with dark blue plain clay roof tiles or Welsh slates. Chimneys should be prominent;</p>
15	Page 53 & 54 Policy SG17: Local Green Spaces Map 12	<p>I am content with Site A proposed as LGS. However, I have concern with Sites B and C. In the first instance I find these sites relatively large compared to the built-up area of Stoke Golding. Secondly, site B lies within the proposed area of separation and hence would be subject to Policy SG8. Multiple designations of land are not encouraged, as it presents confusion.</p> <p>As land lying within an area of separation and on the assumption Policy SG8 remains within the NP, Sites B would be afforded considerable protection from inappropriate development.</p> <p><b>I therefore consider its additional designation as a LGS would be superfluous and unnecessary.</b></p> <p>I have concerns over the extent of Site C and while I note the evidence presented in favour of its designation. I do not find this compelling. The land is in two private ownerships. The owners have been approached, with one party strongly objecting to the proposed designation. While a public footpath existed historically, this is no longer the case. Little if any substantiated biodiversity or ecological evidence has been presented and while the site is close to heritage assets and indeed a small element lies within a statutory conservation area, little specific heritage value has been presented. Furthermore, a suggestion that it is the possible location of ridge and furrow is not reflected at Map 11.</p> <p>The case for designation appears to simply rely on the land's proximity to the settlement and the fact that it 'frames' a view of Stoke Golding.</p>	<p><b>Recommended Modification 15</b></p> <p>Site B and C should not be designated as Local Green Space.</p>	<p>Agree with the Examiner's recommendation. The Borough Council raised concerns regarding the multiple designations on an area B and agree with the Examiner's finding for Area C.</p> <p><b>Amend Policy SG17 to exclude site B and site C</b></p> <p>The Plan designates the following parcels of land as local green spaces:</p> <p>A. The Zion Baptist Church Allotments</p> <p><del>B. Land to the south of Stoke Road</del></p> <p><del>C. Land to the south of Station Road</del></p> <p>Development proposals within the designated local green spaces will only be supported in very special circumstances.</p> <p><b>Amend Map 12 to exclude sites B and C</b></p>

Modification Ref.	Page & Paragraph Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report - explanation	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
		<p>On the assumption that Policy SG7 (protection of countryside) will be included within the NP, should it proceed, there will be protection against inappropriate development.</p> <p>While I accept that the land in question has been the subject of assessment via a toolkit, <b>I do not accept that a sufficiently robust case has emerged. Given this and reflecting Policy SG7, I do not support the designation of Site C as LGS.</b></p> <p><b>Accordingly I am happy to endorse the designation of Site A, but Site B and C should not be designated as Local Green Space.</b></p> <p><b>Only with this modification, do I find Policy SG17 compliant.</b></p>		

**Table 2: Local Planning Authority recommended modification**

Modification Ref.	LPA's recommended modification	Local Planning Authority's explanation
16	Title Page: Amend Submission Plan to 'Made' also include and month and year for the date the Plan was made i.e May 2024	To reflect the latest stage of the Plan.
17	<p>Page i:</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph - Amend the introductory text to the Plan to remove reference to this version being the draft version, this paragraph needs to refer to the 'made' plan.</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> Paragraph – Paragraph needs to be amended to reflect that this is now a 'made' plan.</p> <p>4<sup>th</sup> Paragraph – Paragraph needs to be amended to reflect that this is now a 'made' plan.</p>	To reflect the latest stage of the Plan.
18	Page ii, iii and iv: Amend contents page to reflect changes made to the plan	To reflect the latest amended version of the Plan.
19	<p>Page 5 Next Steps paragraphs 1.25 to 1.28</p> <p><b>Next Steps</b></p> <p>1.25 The draft revised Stoke Golding Neighbourhood Development Plan <del>will now be</del> <b>was</b> submitted to Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council <del>for publication</del> and a <del>further</del> six-week public consultation <b>took place from Wednesday, 8 November 2023 to Wednesday, 20 December 2023</b> <del>will take place</del> before it is <b>was</b> sent to an Independent Examiner.</p> <p>1.26 <del>Material modifications which do not change the nature of the first Plan require examination but not a referendum. Material modifications which do change the nature of the first Plan require examination and a referendum.</del> <b>The Examination into the Neighbourhood Plan took place between February and April 2024. The Examiner found that subject to modifications contained</b></p>	To reflect the latest stage of the Plan.



Modification Ref.	LPA's recommended modification	Local Planning Authority's explanation
	<p><b><u>within the Examiner's Report the Neighbourhood Plan could proceed to be 'made' without needing to hold a referendum. The Plan was 'made' by the Borough Council in May 2024.</u></b></p> <p>1.27 <del>When the revised</del> <b>The 'made'</b> Stoke Golding Neighbourhood Development Plan <b>Review</b> is adopted, it will replace the current version of the <b>Stoke Golding</b> Neighbourhood Plan <b>(2022)</b> and forms part of the Statutory Development Plan for Stoke Golding Parish. Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council will continue to be responsible for determining most planning applications (mineral and waste planning applications are determined by the County Council). Therefore, in Stoke Golding Neighbourhood Area the policies in the <del>revised</del> Neighbourhood Development Plan <b>Review (2024)</b> will continue to form the basis of those decisions along with the adopted Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan and any other material considerations.</p> <p>1.28 The Neighbourhood Plan should be read as a whole (including its footnotes and annexes). Decision makers should apply all the policies that are relevant to the application that is being determined.</p>	
20	<p>Page 14, paragraph 4.13</p> <p><del>Reforms to National Planning Policy</del> <b><u>Levelling Up and Regeneration Act (2023)</u></b></p> <p>4.14 On <b><u>26 October 2023 The Levelling Up and Regeneration Act became law</u></b> <del>22 December 2022</del> the Department for Levelling Up, Housing &amp; Communities issued consultation on its proposed approach to updating the National Planning Policy Framework. This included <b><u>includes a framework for a raft of future changes to the planning system which many will require secondary legislation and new planning policy before they can take effect.</u></b> <del>changes to make clear how housing figures should be derived and applied. It follows that, as the Neighbourhood Plan Review progresses, the housing requirement may change</del></p>	To reflect latest national policy position.
21	<p>Page 26 Policy SG7 Countryside</p> <p>Amend criteria 7 to refer to Policy SG13</p> <p>7. Renewable energy in accordance with Policy <b><u>SG13 14.</u></b></p>	Policy SG13 has been deleted as a result of the Examiner's Report, this is a consequential renumbering of the policy.
22	<p>Page 33 Para 5.31 and 5.32</p> <p>5.31 Biodiversity net gain is an approach which aims to leave the natural environment in a measurably better state than beforehand. Biodiversity Net Gain <b><u>was included</u></b> <del>is proposed</del> in the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan and mandated as a condition of planning permission in the <del>2019</del> Environment <b><u>Act 2021</u></b> Bill. <b><u>Unless exempt</u></b> Biodiversity Net Gain requires a 10% increase in biodiversity after development, compared to the level of biodiversity prior to the development taking place. The National Planning Policy Framework <del>includes compulsory</del> <b><u>also sets out the principle of</u></b> Biodiversity Net Gain.</p> <p>5.32 <del>Interim guidance for assessing areas and features of strategic biodiversity importance in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland has been prepared to support biodiversity net gain metrics.</del> <b><u>Biodiversity Net Gain is required under the statutory framework and the minimum information which must be submitted is set out in The Town and Country Planning (Development</u></b></p>	Mandatory biodiversity net gain came into effect in February 2024 for major development and April 2024 for small sites. A lot of information was published by the Government in relation to the implementation of BNG after the NDP had been submitted to the Borough Council. The changes proposed in paragraphs 5.31 and 5.32 reflect the latest procedural position in relation to the consideration of planning applications and BNG. Change has been proposed so the information within the NDP is up to date.

Modification Ref.	LPA's recommended modification	Local Planning Authority's explanation
	<u>Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and listed in the National Planning Practice Guidance on Biodiversity Net Gain.</u>	
23	Page 37 Policy SG14 Amend Policy number to SG13 Policy <del>SG13 14</del> : Renewable Energy	Policy SG13 has been deleted as a result of the Examiner's Report, this is a consequential renumbering of the policy.
24	Page 49 Policy SG15 Amend Policy number to SG14 Policy <del>SG14 15</del> : Non-designated Heritage Assets	Policy SG13 has been deleted as a result of the Examiner's Report, this is a consequential renumbering of the policy.
25	Page 51 Policy SG16 Amend Policy number to SG15 Policy <del>SG15 16</del> : Design	Policy SG13 has been deleted as a result of the Examiner's Report, this is a consequential renumbering of the policy.
26	Page 53 Policy SG17 Amend Policy number to SG16 Policy <del>SG16 17</del> : Local Green Spaces	Policy SG13 has been deleted as a result of the Examiner's Report, this is a consequential renumbering of the policy.
27	Page 55 Policy SG18 Amend Policy number to SG17 Policy <del>SG17 18</del> : Community Services and Facilities	Policy SG13 has been deleted as a result of the Examiner's Report, this is a consequential renumbering of the policy.
28	Page 58 Policy SG19 Amend Policy number to SG18 Policy <del>SG18 19</del> : Commercial, business and services uses in the Village Centre	Policy SG13 has been deleted as a result of the Examiner's Report, this is a consequential renumbering of the policy.
29	Page 62 Policy SG20 Amend Policy number to SG19 Policy <del>SG19 20</del> : Infrastructure	Policy SG13 has been deleted as a result of the Examiner's Report, this is a consequential renumbering of the policy.
30	Page 66 Policy SG21 Amend Policy number to SG20 Policy <del>SG20 21</del> : Tourism	Policy SG13 has been deleted as a result of the Examiner's Report, this is a consequential renumbering of the policy.

Modification Ref.	LPA's recommended modification	Local Planning Authority's explanation
31	Page 67 Policy SG22 Amend Policy number to SG21 Policy SG <del>21</del> 22: Willow Park Industrial Estate	Policy SG13 has been deleted as a result of the Examiner's Report, this is a consequential renumbering of the policy.
32	Page 68 Policy SG23 Amend Policy number to SG22 Policy SG <del>22</del> 23: Business Conversion of Rural Buildings	Policy SG13 has been deleted as a result of the Examiner's Report, this is a consequential renumbering of the policy.