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1. Background

a) Project Brief

Arnesby Parish Council organised an open event at the Village Hall in the Parish on 3 June 2017 (10:00 am – 1:00 pm) to share the emerging policies with those who live and work in the parish.

The aim of this event was to seek comments on the emerging policies – including the proposed location for residential development; Local Green Space and environment; community facilities; design; transport and business.

b) Publicity

The drop-in event was promoted in a variety of ways:

- Leaflets and posters were produced promoting the event and these were dropped off at every household and placed on noticeboards.
- Members of the Parish Council spoke to villagers to inform them of the event.
c) List of attendees

A list of attendees is available separately. A total of 57 people attended the event and many comments were made about the emerging policies.

2. Format of Each Event

a) Process on the day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign in</th>
<th>Members of the Advisory Committee welcomed attendees on arrival and asked them to complete a contact sheet to record attendance. Arrangements for the Open Event were explained.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>The first displays introduced Neighbourhood Planning and described the process that had been undertaken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consultation on key issues | A series of display boards were spread across the room, each of which focussed on the emerging policies within the draft Neighbourhood Plan:  
  - Vision  
  - Housing – location, mix and design.  
  - Environment – Local Green Space and other environmental protections  
  - Transport  
  - Businesses and Employment  
  - Community Facilities  
  
Having read the displays, attendees were asked to indicate their support for the policy and to comment on each policy using post-it notes and to place them on flip-chart paper alongside each display. |
b) Display Boards
3. Consultation findings

People were asked whether they supported the draft Neighbourhood Plan policies and were invited to make further comment:

Do you support this VISION?

YES responses: 26 in total  
No: 1 response

Housing

Do you support development on this site?

YES: 14  No: 15

Comments:

• Makes sense in that it solves the problem whilst protecting the open areas within the village that would have to be considered otherwise
• I can appreciate the idea of building on this site, but think it is too dense and the mix is not right. Starter homes will not sell to the people they are aimed at.

• Development of over 10 units should result in community funding for local facilities.

• This seems a good mix of housing – shame the field is opposite the village boundary. It appears to be a good location otherwise. Suggest single storey on east side of site.

• This will prevent other sites being put forward for development – possibly larger sites.

• This site provides the mix of housing the village says it wants.

• It’s good that a children’s play area is included.

• The developer should invest in a children’s play area or a new community centre to be built on a suitable site in the village – also develop a footpath to gated road on Lutterworth Rd.

• We have tried for 35 years to locate a children’s play area – no landowners will release space.

• Concerned that a playground won’t materialise unless it is located within the proposed development site.

• Choosing one site to develop is a much better idea than putting up housing in a hotch-potch manner throughout the village. This way allows for proper planning and putting up suitable houses.

• Approve if this goes ahead as in the plans and doesn’t change once planning approved. Also it MUST stop all attempts to infill land and “garden grab”.

• This will allow community benefit gains through planning you won’t get with smaller sites.

• The only reason people want to build extra houses is to make money. No need to extend the boundary.

• Too many houses crammed into one area.

• Only one more house on one owner’s land.

• There should be no more infilling. More houses means more cars. There are not pavements all around the village. Most people walk in the road. Green spaces are as important as houses.

• I personally think an 11 house development is too big and isn’t in line with the style, size and density of the village. Happy for the site to be developed but on a smaller scale.

• South Close: Ruby Cottage and New Row Cottage ought to be within the red line. The boundary to Rose Cottage is the obvious location for the line.
• Sets a dangerous precedent to extend village out into further countryside. Too many houses in a small area = “estate” like feel
• Why have you only displayed photos of the “old” houses? These are not representative of the village as a whole!
• One site is enough! Will 11 properties satisfy MDC?
• You have ignored the consultation where 78% opposed all housing in one area. The requirement until 2031 was 5 houses
• 78% opposed new houses not to be built in one area, so why has it been decided to be one area!
• Can we look to better utilise developer contributions? Get a lump sum for Parish development?

Summary of comments – although support for the site was mixed, people acknowledged the benefits of infrastructure that development would bring, and recognised that development on this site would help to protect other more sensitive large sites elsewhere in the village.

Do you support these Policies?

HOUSING MIX:
Yes: 17  No: 6

Comments:
• The fact that over 61% of all households have 2 or more bedrooms spare shows that we have a population that is ageing and younger families are priced out
• More 2-bedroom starter homes required with gardens. All planning applications recently are 3-4 bedroom detached with garage(s), i.e. maximise income for developers
• No more 4 or 5 bedroom homes – we are already above the average for HDC

COUNTRYSIDE:
Yes: 20  No: 2

Comments:
• Let’s see locals who want to develop a site come forward now so that the village can approve each one rather than have a developer involved. A housing estate is out of sync with the village
• Keeping open countryside is very important for maintaining character as a small village

**DESIGN:**

Yes: 22  No: 1

Comments:

• Let’s not lose any more hedges within the village. No to gated areas. Don’t be afraid of modern design. Encourage use of farm materials. Beware of “twee”!
• Design of recent new build houses in village is not of any architectural merit or character, ie new bungalow on Mill Hill Rd does not match existing properties or complement them in an individual style
• Special attention to flooding
• Flooding. Careful planning needed – I flood already on a regular basis
• Arnesby’s housing is eclectic. Your photos give a biased impression of it being a village of “olde world” cottages

**WINDFALL SITES:**

Yes: 18  No: 8

Comments:

• Money only for the developers and those who benefit from the developers
• Extending the village outwards leads to loss of small village character
• No. All current applications of this nature do not meet the policy requirements, ie they change the nature and character of the village. They also provide no benefit for residents, only developers. Therefore why approve windfall?
• Windfall sites should be more controlled – open spaces within the village are important and should not be built on
• Phasing of building should not be used as an excuse to delay building
• Yes, providing housing mix applies, ie small family homes or 2 bed accom.
• Environmental needs and sustainability are of great importance – am glad these are included in the NP

**BIODIVERSITY:**

Yes: 17  No: 0
Comments:

- Site 090 already had all the natural trees/shrubs/hedges cut away by the owner! So where is the wildlife?

**WILDLIFE:**

Yes: 18   No: 0

Comments:

- We have a good wildlife mix in Arnesby – it’s very important we do everything possible in the NP to protect these species
- The plot in Oak Lane abutting Briar Cottage and Ruckyard Cottage is full of wildlife and should be retained as such. Leics CC Environmental Dept supported this idea as a “wildlife corridor”

**LOCAL GREEN SPACES:**

Yes: 13   No: 4

Comments:

- Why are village greens not shown as local green spaces but a hedged orchard in private ownership is? What about 155 – will this be protected?
- Paddock rear of Sunnydene (155) should be protected as open space in the village centre

**OTHER SITES:**

Yes: 9   No: 4

Comments:

- 168 is not open and should not be developed as such – does not fulfil the green space criteria and is not open!

**IMPORTANT OPEN SPACES:**

Yes: 14   No: 3

Comments:

- Site 155! Match map to list! (OSSR). Triangle at N end of Shoulder of Mutton green should be added to OSSR
• Why are IS1 and IS2 even inside the village boundary? Why is 166 not designated – it’s the village gardens!

VIEWS:
Yes: 21  No: 0
No comments

LOCAL LIST:
Yes: 21  No: 0
Comments:
• House to south of Long Acre – is this the old Adult school?

FLOODING:
Yes: 25  No: 0
No comments

RIDGE and FURROW:
Yes: 22  No: 2
Comments:
• Home Farmhouse is not 3 Robert Hall Rd
• Ridge and Furrow - is the plan to stop ploughing?

TRANSPORT:
Yes: 14  No: 2
Comments:
• Yes to improved paths to Shearsby and P. Magna. Can we have more footpaths in village, eg St Peters Rd and Paddocks – Reynards Farm
• Propose footpath to the gated road – this is a popular walking route
• Yes. Footpath networks need to be improved where possible
• The village playing field is an arrangement between the village hall committee and the landowner – not the school
• Agree with new footpath north side of Lutterworth Rd to Peatling Magna. People often use cars to the gated road
• Tarmacing the footpath is a waste of money – why not build a bridge to the Falkland Islands!
• Footpath needed from L’worth Rd to gated road to encourage walking and safety!
• A push!!! For a service so that the elderly and young have a better transport facility – reducing cars too

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT:

Yes: 19  No: 0

Comments:
• Traffic calming on main road essential – possibly gates at entrances to village?
• Yes. There is already too much on street parking in the village
• On street parking is becoming dangerous. St Peters and school area especially
• Yes – but I don’t like the idea of yellow lines. More parking might be a good idea – eg gridded parking on verge opposite the chapel/pub
• Not keen on double yellow lines either, but parking on pavements and parking blocking roads is a problem that needs addressing!
• Do not agree with yellow lines or one way system in Arnesby
• Prefer no yellow lines...would possibly be ignored as who is monitoring?
• Who enforces yellow lines? Already rules/laws in place which are ignored eg school zig zag lines, parking at junctions, pavement parking
• Grass verges/greens need to be protected against car/van parking damaging them
• Future planning should include at least 3 parking spaces per house

COMMUNITY FACILITIES:

Yes: 15  No: 0

Comments:
• We don’t have a care home for the elderly
• Where is the care home? Not operational!
• Loss of free school bus service to Leysland school from Arnesby and for residents of the village, except if your address is on the Lutterworth Rd. This needs addressing for current and future children
• If community transport was increased it would not be used as proven in past. What good is a bus shelter without a bus service!
• Could we have “link” bus, say 2/3 daily to Wigston/Husbands Bosworth and to connect with other services (now existing)

NEW and ENHANCED FACILITIES:

Yes: 12   No: 0

Comments:

• Yes we support the new and enhanced facilities, particularly for children and younger people and those that protect the environment
• I support the continued development of the school and facilities, which includes use of village hall. This needs to be included in any enhanced facilities

EMPLOYMENT:

Yes: 12   No: 0

Comments:

Need more affordable housing

NEW EMPLOYMENT:

Yes: 12   No: 1

No comments

HOMEWORKING:

Yes: 14   No: 0

No comments
TOURISM:
Yes: 14   No: 0
Comments:
  • Facilities – loo/cafe plus parking

FARM DIVERSIFICATION:
Yes: 15   No: 0
No comments

BROADBAND:
Yes: 18   No: 0
Comments:
  • Still slow!!

SUMMARY
The consultation event was a great success with lively discussions and overwhelming support for the draft policies.

These comments will now be taken into account alongside other comments as the Neighbourhood Plan is finalised.