

Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement Addendum

Response Received by Planit X on behalf of the Earl of Rutland

A response received by Planit X (Colin Wilkinson) on 28th September on behalf of the Earl of Rutland was missed in error from the Regulation 14 responses. Planit X responded on behalf of four other clients, Belvoir Estates, AJM Norris and Sons, Midland Skip Hire, Midlands Feeds and S and P Industrial, the Taylor Family and Rectory Land Ltd.

Most of the points raised in the comment on behalf of the Earl of Rutland were raised in the four other Planit X responses and considered in the Consultation Statement at https://bottesfordparishneighbourhoodplan.org.uk/images/CS_v1aa.pdf.

Table 1 lists the headings in the Earl of Rutland representation that have already been considered as part of one or more of the other Planit X responses.

Table 1 Comments raised in the Earl of Rutland’s response that were also in the other Planit X responses and considered

Planit X response	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group comment
Planit X comment Policy 1 - restricts development within Bottesford village envelope to 10 dwellings which appears to contradict Local Plan allocation BOT 1	The same point was raised in the representation on Rectory Land. This point was addressed and the NP amended and another clause added to Policy 1 - see Consultation Statement page 30.
Planit X comment Policies 8 and 9 - qualifying bodies should not set additional local technical standards	The same point was made in the representation on Rectory Land and was addressed see Consultation Statement page 31
Planit X comment on mix of housing types evidence and narrative before the policy needs clarifying	The same point was made in the representation on Rectory Land. This point was addressed and the NP amended see Consultation Statement page 32
Planit X comment on self build and custom building - the same point was made in the representation on Rectory Land and Belvoir Estates	Point considered and responded to see Consultation Statement page 32 and page 34

Planit X comments not addressed in the consultation statement relate to Policy 15 BOT 1 Land to rear of Daybell’s Farm. There are two matters, one relates to whether the policy is flexible enough to allow new development to reflect neighbouring layout and the other relates to facts about the site ownership and the work in preparing planning applications for BOT 1. Table two sets out the two matters and provides a NPSG comment.

Table 2 Comments raised in the Earl of Rutland’s response that were not in other responses

<p>Planit X object to criteria 15 (2) b,c,d,e which ‘take an <i>over prescriptive approach to design issues and do not take account of local context. The rigid application of design requirements can lead to incongruous development. For example the site has a strong relationship with the existing granary close development which has an Open Plan appearance the site also lies close to the village centre where densities are higher.</i>’</p> <p>In the submission NP criteria 15 (2) e only was amended slightly no amendments were made to b, c, or d. Criteria 15 (2) e in the Presubmission Draft was as follows</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">‘to the rear, a boundary treatment in the form of hedges or low walls/fences that allows for a soft transition to the open countryside reflecting the site’s location within the Area of Separation;...’</p> <p>Policy 15 as submitted is set out below (showing the amendment to 15 (2) e)</p> <p>Policy 15 Development of BOT 1 Land to rear of Daybell’s Farm and 18 Grantham Road</p> <p>1. Planning permission will be granted for residential development in accordance with MBC Local Plan Policy C1 (A) on the site shown on Map 2 where the proposals combine to provide a scheme for comprehensive development of the whole of BOT 1.</p>
--

2. **Proposals should also demonstrate a high design quality as defined in Neighbourhood Plan Policy 8 (1). This means;**
 1. **a) homes of mixed styles, types and tenures (market and affordable) with the potential for custom builds;**
 2. **b) a design, density and layout that reinforces the local rural character in accordance with the Bottesford Parish Design Code 2020; and**
 3. **c) the use of materials and a narrow colour palette that compliments the surrounding area; and**
 4. **d) to the front, boundary treatment of low walls or hedges that create private space to allow for the planting of native trees and shrubs;**
 5. **e) where plot boundaries run to the south, west or east of BOT 1, a boundary treatment in the form of hedges or low walls/fences that allows for a soft transition to the open countryside reflecting the site's location within the Area of Separation; and**

In response to Planit X's comments on behalf of the Earl of Rutland the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group contend that the Design Code does not set out rigid requirements rather it sets out guidelines '*The aim of this document is to ensure that future developments add positively to the local character and enhance local distinctiveness by creating good quality developments, thriving communities, and prosperous places to live.*' (Design Code page 34) '*The Design Guidelines will be a valuable tool in securing context-driven, high-quality development in Bottesford Parish.*' Design Code page 78. The Design Code is clear that there are a mixture of house types and styles in Bottesford and Policy 15 (2) b,c,d,e as set out above does support development that draws on the surrounding character.

Planit X state that the site ownership statement is incorrect. The NP says BOT 1 is owned by two land owners but Planit X advise it is owned by more than two. Planit X also disagrees with the statement in the NP '*The current schemes have been prepared in isolation and the community consider that they show no regard for the opportunity to see the site as a whole*' saying there has been liaison between site owners and that some technical evaluations have used the same consultants . A list is provided;

Indicative layout and design and access statement prepared by HSSP

Extended phase 1 Habitat Survey including protected species prepared by Curious Ecologists

Flood Risk Assessment prepared by RAB consultants

Both these details as set out in the Neighbourhood Plan were provided based on local understanding, but it is accepted by the Steering Group that where this information is factually incorrect then the Neighbourhood Plan should be amended.

Conclusion

The following amendments would have been made to the Plan had the response been addressed during reg 14. 'BOT 1 is owned by more than two landowners, and some technical reports relating to design and layout, habitat survey and flood risk have been prepared jointly.'

Other comments raised in Planit X's response on behalf of the Earl of Rutland were either the same comments as were raised in other Planit X responses, and were considered comprehensively or, would not have resulted in an amendment to the Submission Plan.

Helen Metcalfe 25.1.21.