Introduction.

As the Proposed Submission Harborough Local Plan (July 2017) states ‘The full objectively assessed housing need for the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA is 4,829 dwellings per annum between 2011 and 2031 (96,580 total) and for Harborough District is 532 dwellings per annum between 2011 and 2031 (HEDNA), giving a total plan requirement across the 20-year plan period of 10,640 dwellings’.

The draft Local Plan incorporates a 20% buffer and therefore makes provision for 12,800 dwellings from 2011 to 2031. Of this, 8,150 dwellings have already been built or committed (through the granting of planning permission, or through allocation in neighbourhood plans) leaving a residual requirement of 4,650 dwellings up to 2031.

The Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2017) establishes a hierarchy of settlements to help to determine the most appropriate locations for development.

On the basis of this hierarchy, Arnesby is classified as an ‘Other Village or Rural Settlement’ which the draft Local Plan describes as ‘the least sustainable locations for growth and are covered by housing in the countryside policy. New housing will be limited to small sites to meet a locally identified need (either through a housing needs survey or neighbourhood plan), housing to meet the needs of a rural worker, isolated homes in the countryside in accordance with NPPF paragraph 55, and replacement dwellings’.

The Arnesby Parish housing needs report (August 2016) identified a higher than average propensity of people aged over 50 living in the Parish. It also identified evidence that the population is ageing and in line with national trends the local population is likely to get older as average life expectancy continues to rise.

The report recognised that home ownership is very high and that there is a high share of detached housing and under-occupied dwellings particularly those with 4 or more bedrooms. Evidence was demonstrated of a small number of new build residential sales occurring in the parish with 11 new build house sales registered between 1995 and 2015 and of these all were detached dwellings.

The high level of under-occupancy suggests a need for smaller homes of one to two bedrooms which would be suitable for residents needing to downsize, small families and those entering the housing market.

For these reasons, the Neighbourhood Planning Group made the decision to look at potential development sites in the Parish to promote residential development within Arnesby and to shape appropriate housing growth in the Parish through the lifetime of the Neighbourhood Plan.
Process towards identifying an appropriate site

All stakeholders were initially contacted with information about the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and invited to an Open Event on 1 October 2016. Over 70 people attended and the analysis of that event is available in the supporting information. The comments received confirmed the desire for smaller homes and for the retention of the Limits to Development.

A questionnaire was distributed to all households in the autumn of 2016, with 74 returns.

Responses generally to the question ‘What sort of housing do you think the village needs?’ demonstrate an understanding of the need to provide some additional housing.

Respondents acknowledged that there is a real issue for people, especially the young, in getting onto the property ladder. Consequently, the sort of housing most people felt the village needs is affordable 1 and 2 bed homes. The perceived need for 2 to 3-bedroom housing very probably comes from the same thought process.

Bungalows and retirement housing were also popular options, showing a desire for older people to be able to remain in the Parish as their circumstances and physical needs change.

Two Housing Theme Group meetings were used to shape the identification of appropriate sites within the Parish, building on the community views expressed through consultation and the housing needs report.

The first, on 2 March 2017, considered the principles expressed by the community in helping to shape development. These were:

1. The north side of Lutterworth Road was to be protected, partly as a response to the environment group’s consideration that it was an important area for views from the village and views towards the village when approaching from the north and partly due to the traffic volumes which already are present and will increase with further development.

2. The areas of gardens etc. between the exiting housing fronting St Peters Road and backing to the A5199 should not be developed, in order to maintain separation from the Main Road and the Village and to avoid potential wholesale development of each rear garden on the road frontage. Policy H3 in the Neighbourhood Plan includes provision to avoid a reduction in garden space.

3. The paddock at the south side of the village off St Peters Road and adjacent to Elms Farm and the two other properties flanking it, should remain protected open space in the centre of the village in order to avoid the centre of the village becoming over-developed with little or no open space.

4. The original Limits to Development should not be increased to avoid spread of the village and acknowledging the lack of basic services and infrastructure which would normally be required to service new housing development.

5. Infilling should only be allowed where the principles which were set down in the Windfall Policy (H3) can be met.

The Housing Theme Group reviewed the available land for development in the built-up area within the limits to development by studying a large map of the village.
It was apparent that the only site suitable to deliver the dwellings required for the Parish was a site along Lutterworth Road. All other sites would only deliver very small-scale development and are covered by Local Plan policy GD4 ‘New Housing in the Countryside’ which identifies sites of no more than 4 as being potential development opportunities.

Between that meeting and the following Housing Theme Group meeting on 30 March 2017, discussions took place with the land owner and an acceptable housing mix agreed.

The land is shown as follows:
The meeting agreed the allocation of around 11 dwellings at this location.

This resulted in the revision of the Limits to Development:
The proposed allocation was put to the community at the subsequent open event held on 3 June 2017.

The result was mixed. 14 people supported the development whilst 15 were opposed.

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.

Given the lack of clarity over the way forward, it was agreed that the whole of the Parish would be surveyed specifically on the issue of housing (See appendix 1 – Housing Survey Analysis).

The Housing Survey results were considered by the Housing Theme Group at its meeting on 4.1.18 (see appendix 2 – Housing Theme Group meeting 4.1.18) and it was agreed to reduce the size of the development from 11 dwellings down to 7.

The revised numbers were discussed with the land owner and agreement was reached that this level of development was acceptable.

The draft Neighbourhood Plan was amended in line with the recommendations of the Housing Theme Group meeting. The revised Neighbourhood Plan was approved by the Parish Council at its meeting on 23 January 2018 and submitted for pre-submission consultation.
Appendix 1 – Housing Survey Analysis.

Arnesby
Neighbourhood Plan

Housing Survey Analysis
Introduction

The Parish of Arnesby is in the process of developing their Neighbourhood Plan.

An important part of this inclusive process is, of course, obtaining the views and aspirations of the community.

In addition to an earlier community questionnaire, the Parish has sought further, more detailed views through a housing questionnaire.

The questionnaire, containing 9 questions, took place during November 2017. It was available to complete electronically and as a paper copy. The level of response from the community was good, there being 135 responses. This represents a return from over 46% of the adult population of 292.

This demonstrates the level of commitment to the Neighbourhood Plan by the small community and, in turn, adds strength to the validity of the collected views expressed.

Population data taken from 2011 Census
The Neighbourhood Plan will only be approved by the Planning Inspector if it allows for some new homes in Arnesby between now and 2031 (13 years) to meet housing need. Harborough’s draft Local Plan currently suggests 5-7 homes will be adequate in that period, but earlier drafts indicated up to 30 homes could be built in the village over the next 13 years. In the past 4 decades, over 40 houses have been built in the village. Arnesby has changed and will continue to change for social and economic reasons.

Q1 How many new houses do you think should be built in Arnesby over the next 13 years?

No respondent to the questionnaire supported no new houses during the lifetime of the plan, indicating a clear understanding that some additional housing is necessary in Arnesby to meet the wider housing needs of the District. The most popular answer is 5 (26%) indicating a strong desire for the minimum number that would be acceptable to the District Council.

However, 47% of respondents selected between 10 and 20 new houses, strongly implying an acceptance of a growth rate for Arnesby equivalent to or greater than the historic growth rate of the past four decades.
LIMITS ON DEVELOPMENT
Harborough District Council is preparing a new Local Plan for approval in 2018. Under that plan the existing "red line" (shown on the front cover) limiting development around Arnesby will disappear. This red line is the settlement boundary and everything outside it is countryside, which has a different planning status. Its removal will open up the risk of speculative planning applications around the village boundaries which could be successful if Harborough District Council is not meeting its housing target.

A Neighbourhood Plan can reinstate that red line and this will then be local planning policy up to 2031, adopted as part of the Local Plan. The Parish Council would then have the power to formally object to applications which breached the Neighbourhood Plan policies, including development outside the red line.

Q2  Do you agree that the red line is necessary?

An overwhelming 90% of those responding, (112 People), feel that the red line is necessary.
Q3 Do you think the red line should be expanded to allow new homes on the edge of the village? (this may be necessary to justify the Neighbourhood Plan which must allow for some new housing)

![Pie chart showing 44% support and 56% opposition.]

This question brought about less consensus in the opinions of respondents. 56% do not support expanding the red line even when told that this may be necessary to justify the Neighbourhood Plan, which must allow for some new housing.

47 thoughtful comments were received which appear in the appendix. They included concern about just how far the red line would be extended; requests for greater control over developments; belief by some that there is too much infill now; belief by others that there is space for more infill; also concern that a single group of new houses could lead to an ‘us and them’ situation.
**INFILL**

"Infill" development is where new homes are built on land inside the village boundary on vacant plots, gardens or other open spaces. All of the development over the past 40 years has been infill or has replaced farm and industrial buildings. There are now fewer open spaces in the village.

Q4 Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should place restrictions on infill development to preserve open spaces in the village?

![Pie chart showing responses to Q4]

More than two thirds of those responding felt that there should be some restrictions on infill development to preserve open spaces in the village. This implies some additional work to explore and establish the exact nature of these restrictions.

36 comments appear in the appendix which demonstrate a clear acceptance of change but a genuine concern for the future of Arnesby, its character, its open spaces, its relationship with wildlife and the surrounding countryside.
Q5 What kind of homes would you like to see built in Arnesby? (Tick as many as you like)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/3 bed family homes for sale at market value</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starter homes for young singles\couples\families</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungalows for older people to buy or rent</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5 bed homes at market value</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared-ownership (part rent/part buy) for single people/couples/young families</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A care home/sheltered scheme, providing supported housing for older people,</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(usually 16 or more residents to be economically viable)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes with work space, (home office, studios, small workshops)</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-build (building, or contracting the building of, an individual home for</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one-self on an approved site).</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market rent homes for single people/couples/young families</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-market rented homes for single people/couples/young families</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is greatest support for smaller homes, perhaps showing that the housing needs of young people are in the minds of a large number of respondents. There is also strong support for bungalows for older people. There is much more limited support for rented accommodation.

18 comments appear in the appendix that reveal a diversity of opinion. Some support developments that will bring a greater demographic mix into the community. Others support greater restriction to protect house values and avoid attracting people who do not have their own car, given the limited availability of public transport.
Q6 Do you have a family member or employee who is or will be looking for affordable housing for sale or rent in Arnesby because they cannot afford full market prices?

In most cases, respondents don’t have relatives or employees seeking affordable housing, although 9% do.

The following additional comments were made:
- With no public transport or shops, Arnesby is unsuitable for such housing, which is being provided in Countesthorpe, Fleckney and Wigston.
- I do know young families that would like to live in Arnesby but cannot afford current prices in Arnesby. They have children attending the school, so they drive in. School traffic has increased considerably in the last couple of years. If housing was accessible to this group of people it may reduce traffic issues.
- My son and his partner would love to live here but can’t afford the property here.
- I do not want affordable homes within the village, it would ruin the quaint little village we live, we moved to this village to get away from this style of housing.
- How do we know what the market value is after years of restrictions that have inflated prices?
- Plenty of affordable homes are being built locally elsewhere i.e. Fleckney/Kibworth x2
- Arnesby has been and will continue to be a dormitory village where people come to live because of its attractiveness and peaceful atmosphere. Even if young people could afford a house here, can they afford the running costs, primarily the necessity of 1 or 2 cars in order to get to their place of business? People who can afford the running costs usually require something bigger than a starter home.
- ‘No’ does not mean that there is no need for continuity to maintain the social and economic success of the village in the future.
PLANNING GAIN

"Planning Gain" is negotiated with developers to provide some benefits to the community in exchange for planning consent. This planning gain can take many forms including cash, traffic calming, play areas etc. It also covers the provision of affordable housing for shared-ownership or sub-market rent. However, it only applies on sites where 11 or more homes are being built. There is no planning gain on smaller sites or infill development.

The Neighbourhood Plan proposes that a site for exactly 11 new houses be included in the plan on the edge of the village (shown on the following page). This will include affordable housing for young people and bungalows for older people for sale or rent at less than market prices. The proposed site is on the Lutterworth Road in the open space opposite the sheltered scheme. This is within the existing red line but currently designated as important open land.

It is possible for the Neighbourhood Plan to identify sites for fewer than 10 homes, including the one on the Lutterworth Road. This would however mean that there would be no "planning gain" so no obligation on the developer to provide affordable homes or any other formal community benefit (though the small increase in population could be useful for the school and the Little India).

Q7 Bearing in mind responses to earlier questions, do you agree the Neighbourhood Plan should identify a single site for more than 10 homes on the edge of the village?

The majority of those responding (54%) think that a single site on the edge of the village should not be selected for development. Just 43% support the proposal.

38 comments (which appear in the appendix) illustrate the strength and diversity of opinion.
Q8 Should the Neighbourhood Plan identify smaller sites without any ‘planning gain’ as an alternative?

A majority of respondents (51%) support the identification of smaller sites for development even though this will not result in any planning gain.

Q.9 How strongly do you feel about including a single site for more than 10 homes in the Neighbourhood Plan? Would you vote against the plan for this reason?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to this question suggest that the proposal to include a large development site as part of the Neighbourhood Plan would jeopardise the Plan being supported at referendum.

Nineteen comments appear in the appendix. These represent a strong feeling against the proposal to development of a single large site within the Neighbourhood Plan.
Appendix

Q.3 Do you think the red line should be expanded to allow new homes on the edge of the village?

47 Comments

☐ But only to a limited extent.
☐ It all depends how far they intend to expand the red line.
☐ There appears to be more than one site on both sides of the Lutterworth Road for the future.
☐ I agree with the new houses. Perhaps then we could get public transport.
☐ If the boundary is not extended the village will become dormant and lifeless.
☐ Yes we should have some control (over) what can be built.
☐ We feel there should be some control over the development.
☐ There is too much infill in the village now - needs to expand.
☐ Yes, there is insufficient room now for more infilling.
☐ I would prefer to see the line expanded slightly rather than infill or 'wind fall' sites being built on, as I feel these are more of a risk to the character and amenity of the village. Any new homes on the edge of the village should also have to provide land for village amenities such as a playground.
☐ No more infill in the village.
☐ Unnecessary! Just meet the 5-7 target and keep the village as a village!
☐ There should be a degree of flexibility with the red line. Taking into account the ongoing need for housing nationally.
☐ There should be no red line - if there has to be, it should be much wider than the one propose.
☐ Historically the village covered a larger area, though the centre was less densely developed. Too much infill will make the village look like a suburb. We need more homes to revitalise the village, but on the outskirts.
☐ No need to build in countryside. Lots of development sites already within Arnesby village if planning were allowed for these.
☐ Preferably limited to obvious infill opportunities
☐ But only to a very limited extent to allow for some new housing.
☐ Move it by the minimum needed to allow slow growth over year’s post 2031
☐ The red line should only be extended by enough to provide the housing necessary according to the NP.
☐ Don’t want the village any bigger, leave it as it is.
☐ We feel there is enough land available within the red line for future development.
☐ There is planning permission in place for a few developments around
the village, and we will be able to find more areas within the village to build the 5 homes.

- With current planning permission already in place for several developments around the village, we can easily find a few more plots for 5 homes.

- Where would the building stop?
- The red line is not the village boundary it should contain houses that are clearly within the village.

- Individual applications should be considered on merit, not approved or disapproved simply because of a red line on a map. This red line falls inside the existing village and many domestic dwellings such as The Laurels, Manor Farm and the Manse are outside it, yet are clearly within the village, thus cannot be used to represent the village boundary let alone inhibit building outside of it.

- With current new homes already granted (3 opposite the village hall) I’m sure 3 more within the village can be found.

- As long as it is a small, well-considered and clearly demarked expansion and set within the NP.

- Plenty of space to accommodate 5 (7 max that is required) within infill sites in the village. We already have 3 planned on the infill (open space) site opposite the school/village hall, so only 2 in theory more required over the next 13 years! So why the need for these 11 homes!

- The open space/countryside should be protected and is the reason people live/move here!

- Building within the village would impact the traditional character of the village. A single block of multiple houses would create a "them and us" situation so therefore allowing individual projects within an extension of the current boundary would provide better cohesion.

- If it were to expand where would it go? We feel that the proposed new development is already "stuck on the edge" of the village, and if the red line is expanded those living on the edge of the village will have no say in houses being built next to them. Is there not an opportunity to expand to the other side of the A5199 and propose this as a development area?

- The red line could be extended to the north of the Lutterworth Road to include the farm buildings and green spaces in between existing dwellings.

- An area between the Windmill and the main road on the Leicester side of the village could be considered for future development, leaving the existing village untouched.

- But not too wide.

- Once the red line expands it will set a precedent for future expanding of the line and the village will continue to grow and become a town. If we stick to our guns now hopefully this will keep development to a minimum

- My estimate of 6 house includes 3 houses Mill Hill Rd (Freer) 3 houses Lutterworth Rd.
The expansion should be minimal and sympathetic.

The expansion of the red line to include more land to the north of the Lutterworth Road to towards the A5199 would bring in the farmyards that may be an area of potential development for small business units or housing, both of which I would support.

The extension should be limited to the proposed site and matching restraint placed upon windfall development within the red line area.

Expanding or getting rid of red line will mean losing control over development. While accepting some new builds will be required I think it is important to retain as much control over what and where as possible.

This would depend on where it is to be expanded.

It is better to expand the village rather than continue with infill

Within reason to allow for small development and to keep green spaces within the village.

But only if necessary otherwise my answer would be no.

Q.4 Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should place restrictions on infill development to preserve open spaces in the village?

36 Comments

- Lots open space left to build on ain’t there.
- Any development should retain the character of the village. Therefore it should be suitable for the next 30 years, sympathetically designed, and allow for 3 parking spaces per home (at least).
- Fill in all the open spaces and it will begin to look like a council estate - we need the open spaces.
- Need some green spaces around village.
- Restrictions but not complete ban.
- There should be some open spaces.
- We feel there should be some open spaces left in the village.
- There is no space left for infill. All recent applications of this type have seriously threatened the character of the village and the amenity for residents.
- Usual NIMBY and selfish approach of the parish council - most of you live in new houses but you want to stop other people doing the same.
- As long as the properties built are in keeping, i.e. 4/5 bed and single plots.
- There should be no restrictions. People should be able to build on their land without prejudice.
- Open space gives Arnesby its character.
- I think it would be detrimental to the village if all the open spaces were allowed to be built on and disappeared.
- We need open spaces within the village...even new estates allow for
open spaces within the plans so we should keep ours. They are important for wildlife and our own mental health and wellbeing.

- As many as possible of the existing open spaces in the village should be preserved.
- We need open spaces otherwise it's just like a big housing estate not a village.
- But not at the expense of allowing larger developments on the outskirts of the village.
- That is better left to the planners. No houses can be built on the village greens, which are the important factor.
- Infill development should be allowed subject to normal planning laws. The open character of the village is defined by the village greens, not by fenced and hedged gardens.
- No, but within reason and based on government target of 5-7 till 2031, so 3 only required, based on current build approvals.
- I'm not against all infill development, as I think the village should have some additional housing, but I am against garden gobbling and development, which seriously encroaches on neighbouring properties.
- As previously stated we only need to find two more sites for single property development to meet the 5 required over the next 13 years.
- It's already getting heavily built on and anymore lose of open space in the village would impact on its charm and character and would make it feel more like a gold fish bowl.
- The few "open spaces" within the village are currently not used for anything. The land opposite the school will be built on. The only other real open space is the paddock behind Sunnydene and the orchard on mill hill road. These could be used for infill.
- Although my answer is to the question is yes, applications should be taken on their merits.
- I agree that some infill might be acceptable, but it is important that open spaces within the village are maintained.
- Plenty of green space around the village and I think it is important to keep the boundary so infill is necessary.
- A bit late now as the main open space (opposite the Village Hall) is now lost to us. All the more reason for not turning Arnesby into a housing estate.
- The rise in ‘garden grabbing’ needs to be curtailed.
- Infill should be limited to avoid the development of all open space within the village and the risk of unsuitable properties built on inappropriate sites.
- Each site should be judged on its own merits and its effect on the
village as a whole.

- It would make the centre of the village too dense with too much infill.
- But the restrictions should only be limited to protecting open / green spaces.
- It is important to keep the village atmosphere.

Q.5 What kind of homes would you like to see built in Arnesby? (Tick as many as you like)

18 comments

- None of the others are appropriate for the village.
- There is already a potential care home but this has now closed. There is no space for a 16 plus residents home, which would require parking for visitors/staff, emergency vehicles.
- Yes, starter homes - and help regarding mortgages for young families.
- We feel there should be some open spaces left in the village.
- Houses for families and for living, not stopping development and creating a dead village as Arnesby is turning into now.
- Arnesby was a working village with farms and factories. We need to bring employment back into the village by facilitating home working and small businesses - otherwise we are just a dormitory.
- Planning policy in Arnesby is ridiculously restrictive. All these types of new housing are needed.
- Smaller property to be able to downsize and stay within the community.
- Having this style of homes will keep the market value of homes within Arnesby up.
- There needs to be a mix of housing. Shared ownership/below market rent may well not be appropriate in village with no public transport simply because it is not a sustainable model - people on low incomes need better access to employment than Arnesby can provide.
- Would ensure the current look of the village is maintained.
- This would then be in keeping and maintain market values for current residents.
- As a property owner I do not wish for the value of my property to be impacted with lesser valued homes being introduced. I would want desirable designed/larger homes to maintain market values.
- Almost 50% of the village is made up of the retired. We need more young people.
- The mews cottages are examples of cheaper houses already existing in the village and the bungalows on the Lutterworth Road are provision for the elderly already existing.
- There are already bungalows for older people and the Mews Cottages suitable for singles/older people/small families. Arnesby is not really a suitable village for singles - lack of
work/transport/entertainment/parking space.
- There are no amenities and no public transport to Arnesby. You need a car. Low income families often cannot afford a car and the added fuel costs driving back and forth to amenities means it doesn't make sense to build affordable housing here. Older people are isolated in the village due to no shops or public transport.
- A combination would probably be most suitable. Without knowing what type of property is being sought after it is difficult to say.

Q.7 Bearing in mind responses to earlier questions, do you agree the Neighbourhood Plan should identify a single site for more than 10 homes on the edge of the village?

38 comments

- It would completely spoil the character of the village and there is no planning gain, which would benefit Arnesby.
- The proposed site should be for affordable homes, not large executive detached homes.
- "Yes" - provided that eleven only are built and within the RED area only. Unhappy with the principle of "Planning gain" which can lead to bribery and corruption, big advantages to developers but detrimental to the community concerned in the long term.
- Not happy about the plan site, but it would be ok if it stops filling in open spaces with in the rest of the village.
- It appears to be the logical site.
- The school is bursting at the seams and so consideration should be given to building a new school. Otherwise we shall lose control of the village hall.
- Difficult to find a site on edge of village.
- Yes I think a 'gain' is crucial and we must make sure any development supports future sustainability of the village. Having been to planning meeting many villages are having developments of a lot more than 11 homes 'thrust' upon them in the absence of a Neighbourhood Plan and the lack of Harborough being able to demonstrate a five year supply. I would much prefer a well thought out smaller development than the risk of a larger more detrimental development or detrimental infill.
- The area identified is not important open space, and is not used by most villagers
  - Don’t trust the motives of the parish council on this - bet you already have someone lined up to do this!
- 5-7 should be identified as per the requirement and infill sites only!
  And of single development of 4/5 bed in keeping with the village i.e. maintain its look and appeal and market value!
- Should have multiple sites and be considered on case by case.
Need more flexibility in multiple sites on a case by case basis. If land is owned by potential builders they should be allowed to build on it.

Yes, we want some planning gain to benefit the village. Otherwise the only winners are the developers.

The parish council is trying to hoodwink us by this Neighbourhood Plan into approving a deal that it is a stitch up with developer friends of yours that won’t provide for proper planning and development in Arnesby going forward.

I thought we were already meeting the quota of houses being built over the next ten years, albeit due to in-fill. I would be concerned about the amount of traffic being created on a single site at the edge of the village, which is already a ‘fast road’ for speeding.

A single site for more than 10 homes would spoil the character of the village. A smaller number on the same single site would be more appropriate for Arnesby.

It is difficult at this stage to understand what a yes or no actually means for the future. Until final building plans are submitted and agreed we won’t know what we are actually getting.

If a private landowner wants to build houses for family members, the Parish Council should not refuse an application on the grounds that the land could be better utilised.

I feel you are trying to scare the villagers in to excepting this by the tone you have worded it, this seems more for the benefit of receiving cash in your pockets than the benefit of the village, we moved to the village because of how it is now, we don’t want you spoiling this picturesque village and turning it into another Kibworth or Fleckney. We moved here with our young family knowing there were no parks etc., and with the erection of a park would allow the younger generation to have a gathering place, which would then bring anti social behaviour to the village, which we don’t currently have.

Get the impression this is being pushed by the parish council with scare mongering tactics and the real drive is for the parish council to receive the cash gain! A plan with smaller plots can be achieved and the planning gains are not needed in the village, the village works well now and will continue to and resident’s moved here for the way it looks now!

I don’t agree with infill so this is the alternative.

Developers never keep to their deal and amenities are rarely provided in full.

Only if the site be used for the building of affordable small 2-3 bed homes for sale or rent and bungalows for over 55’s. Any market sale houses should also be 3-4 bed size maximum.

The neighbourhood plan proposed 11 homes that was against all the responses to the original consultation and approved by only one of the working groups assigned to the neighbourhood plan. Hence the second consultation, is there an alternative proposal? What is being proposed is some form of bribe but we have no idea what that is. If a
developer buys the site any neighbourhood plan will never be implemented. Why would a village like Arnesby build affordable homes there are no transport links or facilities within a 5 miles of the village. Would you expect the volunteers already living in Arnesby to help out newer residents? Or would we prefer new residents that would bring more help and fund raising ideas into the village. Every new house built in the village has an environmental impact not just on the site, but on the amount of CO2 emissions and traffic produced just to commute for work and shopping trips.

- A qualified yes bearing in mind the lack of work and transport. Bungalow/sheltered accommodation or the elderly should be supported.
- For reasons already explained.
- I would prefer, however, that more of them were affordable or bungalows than the number currently suggested by the NP.
- It makes for a much better planned approach to providing the new homes in one location and stops insensitive over development of gardens on a piecemeal basis. It important to get some community gain if possible.
- As per previous comments, this isn’t required due to current schemes and the need to find only two more single builds to meet local authorities requirements.
- Only as a last resort but not 11 homes and not affordable! 7 max and of 4 bed + size.
- Other than a footpath linking Arnesby to the gated road to Peatling. We feel there is no real benefit other than cash in the village account that would benefit the village.
- A development of the suggested size would be out of keeping with the previous and current development in the village. Arnesby is lucky that it is contained in an envelope with a variety of housing styles and periods. This style should be perpetuated in future developments. To place a densely concentrated development at the entrance to the village will be like putting a piece of suburban development in a country village.
- I can see the benefit of the proposed site for 11 homes and the Planning Gain this would bring. It is also close to a similar development of old peoples’ bungalows with larger individual houses nearby, so there is some sort of precedent. I would prefer there to be fewer than 11 new homes on that site, but would go along with this proposal. However, I wouldn’t want the approval of one site for 11 homes to be seen as encouragement for further applications for similar size developments in other areas inside or just outside the village boundary.
- There seems to be no choice in the matter. We either allow the 11 homes with affordable housing or we lose the red line. Lose/Lose as far as I’m concerned.
- This will enable the village to determine the nature of the housing and
some community benefits, which may arise as a result.

- Putting all the new population on the outskirts, outside the main village would be a disaster for the village community. It would not help build up the village atmosphere. It would increase the population, traffic, road safety and social demands at an unnatural and unsustainable rate. The temptation of the planning gain money should not be the reason this site is chosen and our village is sold out in this way.
- Expand the red line outside of the existing area.

Q.8 Should the Neighbourhood Plan identify smaller sites without any ‘planning gain’ as an alternative?

19 comments

- In the village.
- Could be interesting just to see how many sites there are.
- If we are to develop 20 homes as I think we need more than one site. Bear in mind more than new 40 homes built over last few decades. An extra 20 homes is minimal in meeting housing need and offers opportunities to improve the village.
- This should be the main drive of the plan, as it keeps the village in keeping and how the people who live/moved here came for those reasons. The planning gains were not here before and the village works well and this method would ensure the character/look of the village is kept.
- Or maybe use the proposed site for a lower number of houses. The council’s proposal is for 5-7 homes. There is currently huge amount of building in the area on green belt land around the towns and villages nearby do we have to expand every single village at the expense of agriculture and environment and quality of life of residents in the area.
- As well as but not as an alternative.
- This will keep the beauty and charm of the village and maintain its character, without impacting on its current residents.
- One area of properly planned homes is better than piecemeal development.
- Only two more required! And plenty of plots available. We moved with a family knowing what the village was like, and do not feel we need affordable homes or park area. This would only add to the current traffic/parking issue at school pick up time, as parents would take there children to the park after school thus leaving vehicles parked across the village centre!
- Much better option but again not affordable due to previous responses given.
- ‘Planning gain’ has been used as a carrot to encourage acceptance
of the proposed development to the extent that other, more important priorities have been ignored. The priority should be to plan for developments which will a) fulfill the planning needs of the village in terms of numbers (ref. Harborough Planning guidelines) b) enhance the appearance of the entrance to the village and c) provide housing that is both desirable and marketable.

Would it be an alternative, or in addition? That site is most likely going to be offered for sale at some point in the future, in which case it will (most likely) be built on anyway!

This would be preferable.

If there is a lack of agreement to the single site mentioned in Q7.

Of course - for reasons stated above.

I don't believe any planning gain will be worthwhile on a small number of houses.

Q.9 How strongly do you feel about including a single site for more than 10 homes in the Neighbourhood Plan? Would you vote against the plan for this reason?

19 comments

- I feel very strongly that an estate of 11 houses would spoil the character of the village.
- Good luck in your dealings with HDC.
- Should have the single site and multiple other sites - the reluctance to build is unnecessary in a village that already has very varied housing and needs to enter the real world where many more houses are required for an expanding population.
- The single site should no restrict building elsewhere.
- It’s a stitch up for the local planning committee and your developer friends at the expense of all the planning approvals that are really needed that you block every time.
- My vote would depend on the planned gain that comes with the development.
- Depends on the actual plans submitted.
- I think they should all be in one place on the Lutterworth Road.
- I do feel strongly about including a single site for more than 10 homes in the plan but would not vote against the plan for this reason. We need to try and keep it as a village.
- As far as we are concerned a development of more than 10 houses in a single site would be far too big for the size of the village.
- Depends on the site and proposals.
- More than 10 on a single site is not in keeping with the makeup of the current village. Having seen housing developments elsewhere they become overpowering to the remaining place and usually never get any ‘gain’ whether that is a play area, shop, post office or pub etc.
• I feel strongly against the proposal as developers have a very bad reputation for doing as they please once initial planning is recommended. Neighbourhood plans have been overturned all over the country. The current government is relaxing the rules on green belt land and due to relax even more. Giving the red light to a greater amount of houses than currently required may well result in consequences that will negatively impact the village.
• 10 or 20 would be fine 200 would not.
• As for the reasons already stated. We don’t need affordable houses. These are not in keeping and would impact on the village’s charm/character and on the property value of existing homes in the village.
• As long as the red line is maintained.
• If all avenues have been explored and this is the only option then a site of 11 homes is fair enough, although selling the site to builder who may go back to planning for more houses is always a possibility.
• I wouldn’t vote against it as long as it is for just 11 homes. If however, we ended up with, say, 25 new homes in the village, then I would be very unhappy, because that would change the whole nature of the village.
• I am very grateful for all the hard work that has gone into the plan and would like a plan in place however not the affordable housing. The 10 home plan does not sit well with me so I would have to vote against the plan.
Arnesby Neighbourhood Plan

Housing Theme Group

Notes from meeting 4th January 2018 in the Baptist Chapel

Present: Bruce Kerr, David Johnson, Liz Middleton, Stella Elliott, Terry Cane, Liz Stretton
Also in Attendance: Derek Doran (Your Locale), Mike Ward, Beryl Came, Anne Mawby
Apologies: Steph Walkinshaw, Elizabeth Bass

Purpose

BK introduced the meeting which had been called to discuss the outcome of the latest survey. Discussion at a Joint Theme Group meeting a couple of months ago pointed out that the HTG idea of a single site with 11 new houses was at odds with feedback from the original consultation which showed a significant number of parishioners did not favour single site development of this size. The survey was carried out to establish if views had changed during preparation of the policies for the NP. The survey, with a high response rate of 135 returns, showed that the village was evenly divided on the issue but there was clearly not enough support for the proposal to risk going to a referendum ballot.

Members of other theme groups had been invited to this meeting to consider what changes, if any were to be made to the draft housing policy following the survey.

A decision was needed tonight as the draft Neighbourhood plan is to be considered by the Parish Council on the 23rd January prior to pre-submission consultation with statutory consultees. The timetable is now fairly tight to get the draft plan to Harborough District Council so they can approve the draft for formal wider consultation.

Site Update

DJ has met the owner of the proposed site on the Lutterworth Road. He is amenable to the idea of developing fewer homes and providing some of the site for community use. His intention is to submit a planning application soon for 7 homes – 5 larger detached family homes and 2 smaller semi-detached houses. All the houses will be for either his family or market sale.

Discussion

DJ pointed out that there are no other sites considered suitable for development near the village boundary. Development to the North was not favoured as it impeded on the views highlighted as important features elsewhere in the NP, and risked opening up larger scale development. Sites to
the East and South were not suitable because of access issues and again the risk of opening up larger scale development. The Lutterworth Road site was the only one the HTG had identified as suitable.

The group felt that a smaller development that 11 homes was needed even though half the survey respondents had indicated support for 8 or more homes. The other half of the survey respondents are not in favour of that number of homes, with many of them saying they felt strongly enough on the issue to vote against the NP at the referendum. Support for affordable housing is not as strong as expected and S106 planning gain is not considered to be important. In addition we don’t know how those who did not respond to the survey are likely to vote.

There was some concern that Harborough could seek a larger number of homes on the site and that this might push the development up to 15 homes. DD considered this to be unlikely despite HDC reportedly stating that an infill site in the village could\should be developed for 4 new homes rather than one. The owner is not obligated to develop the site at all and can choose not to do so if his application if challenged. If the draft NP supported a smaller development HDC would accept this as a policy.

The revised proposal does not conform to the HTG’s intention to support smaller homes in preference to larger “executive” housing. The group agreed that there was an acceptable compromise in allowing this mix on this site. They did however ask DJ to speak again to the owner to find out if the smaller homes could be bungalows. ACTION: DJ

The group also accepted that the size of the development meant there could be no S106 planning gain or a requirement to produce affordable homes. And that there was no control or influence over the tenure of the new homes, which presumably will be sold on the open market where not used by family members. Some of the homes may end up being rented but they will not be social housing.

The only community benefit would be part of the site being reserved for community use. The Parish Council will presumably take ownership of that part of the site and be responsible for its maintenance. The PC has not yet met to decide what that plot could be used for, or if it is wiling to make the financial commitment, and there is some doubt if the site is suitable for use as a play area, the only idea so far suggested. DJ will attempt to identify which specific part of the site can be reserved for community use and how it can be accessed. Ideally the plot should be as close as possible to existing houses on Lutterworth Road. DJ will also consider if any conditions should be applied, such as a timescale on making use of the site. ACTION: DJ

Other potential planning gain mentioned in the current draft will now have to be pursued separately. This includes extending the footpath and traffic calming along Lutterworth Road.

The design criteria given in the draft NP will still apply. And the criteria will also still include retention of existing boundary walls and hedges.

Derek will update the draft housing policy to reflect the changes agreed at this meeting in time for the Parish Council meeting on the 23rd January. ACTION: DD