

*Consultation Statement  
Cottesmore  
Neighbourhood Plan  
2014 -2015*

---



# *Consultation Notes Cottesmore Neighbourhood Plan 2014 -2015*

---

The Neighbourhood Plan process was initiated by a Parish councillor in September 2013 with a short discussion followed by a piece inserted in the Cottesmore Parish magazine “The Link” inviting people for a village meeting.

In October some 50 to 60 people attended the meeting where it was agreed that a formal Neighbourhood Plan should be developed. On November 26 a further meeting was held at which around 20 people attended and a formal committee was formed with elected officers.

In December a general discussion was held as to the processes involved and the type of issues that were likely to occur. It was also agreed that the boundary of the Plan should be the Parish boundary, even though this included part of Kendrew Barracks.

In January a detailed discussion was held on the potential issues, the structure of the plan and the way ahead. By this time all minutes of proceeding were published on the CNPG blog (cnpblogspot.com ) and a summary published in “The Link” It was decided that an exhibition would be held in the Spring together with a meeting to discuss potential issues. A number of issue papers were also produced covering topics such as housing, energy, traffic and the environment.



How would you like to see Cottesmore develop in the future? How would you like to have a say in how the roads and traffic, leisure facilities, retail and job opportunities, housing, energy etc. are managed? Do you have a vision for the future of our village?

**Join Us at an open event to find out more and to have your say.**

**Friday 16 May 4.00 – 8.00pm**  
at the Community Centre

**Saturday 17 May 12.30 – 3.00pm**  
in the Village Hall

## **Distribution and collection**

600 questionnaires were distributed in both the village and Kendrew Barracks. 295 have been collected to date. Considering only the village and excluding the barracks that is a response rate of well over 50% which is a very encouraging response.

## **Data analysis**

Approximately 250 of the straightforward yes/no answers have been inputted and a copy distributed to members. Many questionnaires contain comments and show an

impressive interest in the suggestions. Points of interest were that 50 people are self employed which seems quite high and that 54 people would be interested in having an allotment. Better access to the countryside by the provision of more footpaths was also very well supported.

Packs of completed questionnaires containing comments were distributed to all the members attending the meeting for collating question answers.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Consultative Draft 1<sup>st</sup> November 2014**

The consultative draft was sent out to all households giving all residents a 6 week opportunity to comment starting from 1<sup>st</sup> November 2014. The same document was also sent to the Parish Council, RCC neighbouring parishes, and other names supplied by RCC. The plan was also placed on the RCC web site under neighbourhood planning together with the Report of Survey.

An exhibition of the proposals was held on the evening of 31<sup>st</sup> October in the Village Hall and was attended by about 35 people. On the morning of the 1<sup>st</sup> November a meeting was held, again in the Village Hall, where presentations were given, by members of the Neighbourhood Planning Group, on each section, followed by a discussion from the floor.

### **Stick-on notes from the exhibition**

1. Re Traffic Control I believe that a flat raised pad approx.. 10' long is much better than several humps at the entrance to the village. Wouldn't a curved mirror provide sufficient vision up Market Overton (RD) to vehicles coming from the village westward and wanting access to Ashwell or Market Overton.
2. **Support** – development on Rogues Lane-Footpath Rogues Lane to Creswell Drive- Industrial use on land north of Spinney/ Rogues lane at the cemetery – allotments, if there is enough support.
3. **Against** development of land next to football field/ village hall – next to the school – planting trees on road verges : in time you cannot trim hedges, underground services.
4. Woodland Trust will donate 420 trees to communities and schools.
5. Footpath to Exton - Would this be a shared footpath/ cycle path/ bridleway?
6. Please provide a flood map as required by govt. law
7. The best thing for Cottesmore would be a bypass coming off the Oakham Rd across the north of the football field and coming back on to the Exton Rd. Job done
8. Re development by the Community Centre – this would lead to complaints of noise and footballs over their fences.

### **Summary of points made at Meeting 1<sup>st</sup> November 2014**

After the presentations there were a number of comments from the floor mainly covering the suggested extension of the village development envelope, the proposed traffic calming measures, and the footpaths. Little was mentioned on the other topics.

#### **1. Development Envelope**

Concerns were shown as to whether we need any extension at all as this would attract any developers as they would feel that a major objection to development would have been overcome. A suggestion was also made that there was unlikely to be any increase in population and therefore no need to build more houses.

Specific objections were made to the Rogues Lane development by a number of people (which at the time was subject to a planning application). Objections were also made to the development of land south of Main Street next to the sports and social club.

## **2. Traffic and calming measures**

Nearly everyone wanted some form of calming measures as it was felt that the traffic was too fast. However there was no particular support for any one measure. There were however objections to rumble strips outside of any houses (although this was never our intention). Also concern was shown over any measure that would restrict the progress of farm traffic which was said to be essential to the economy of the area.

### **Emails and letters received up to 20<sup>th</sup> November 2014**

As of to date we have not had any replies from neighbouring parishes, although I understand it has been discussed at the Greetham Parish Council, nor from any of the consultees listed by RCC.

We have received two letters and 8 emails from individuals (3 from group members). The matters cover a wide range of issues plus mentioning errors in typing etc.

1. A number of people supported the idea of tree planting but there were differences as to how this should be done.
2. Again much support for footpaths with a number of suggestions for additional paths.
3. On calming measure there was a mixed response although again they did not want any noise near the houses. Some suggestions entailed a change in the law such as higher fines but this was discounted. One wanted chicanes whilst another was against them, Another wanted a roundabout with a one way street on the road from Oakham.
4. On the matter of housing most comments accepted that there was need for some new accommodation, although some restricted this view to the needs of the elderly population. One felt that we should wait and see and take each application as it comes. Another complained that planning permission was given too easily but accepted that more accommodation was needed. It was also said that the school could not cope with increased numbers although this did not seem to be the case in the response we had from the school during the writing of the report. There were no letters or emails suggesting that no development should take place.
5. There was one comment in favour of wind turbines.
6. The emails from group members, all of whom have changed their position since the publication of the document and in varying degrees suggest that no site should be identified or at least those that have should not be included.

7. A number of emails and letters thanked us for the hard work that had gone into the preparation of the plan but wished our proof reading had been more rigorous.

## **2<sup>nd</sup> Consultative Draft 1<sup>st</sup> February 2015**

The second draft had a number of changes reflecting the responses from the first draft and the views of the NPG with the major changes being the exclusion of any identified development sites and the retention of the existing PLD. Other changes included a modification of the traffic calming measures and greater clarification on the protection of open spaces.

On the 27<sup>th</sup> February an exhibition was held with a presentation and discussion on the following day. About 40 people attended both the exhibition and the discussion day. The main discussion was centred upon a proposed footpath from Rouges Lane to the School. This led to a modification of the route as shown in the final document. A presentation by a local landowner was made which garnered support from the audience. There was also some discussion on the traffic calming solutions. (see minutes of meeting below).

A late letter was received from MOD planning consultants who, in essence wanted all the housing policies not to apply to “operational land”. As this would be no different from the current position with regard to MOD land we did not see the necessity but were happy to modify the document by adding a policy COT H9 (see below).

RCC also sent a number of comment primarily related to affordable housing which have been accommodated.

Subsequently nearly all the changes made to the document were aimed at improving clarity or to update the document to changes in policy at the RCC and National level.

1. New forward by John Meera to take into account the status of the document which is past the consultative stage.
2. Have omitted the chairman’s statement as this was no longer necessary as it primarily described the process.
3. Changes to the summary reflect those aspects that have changes in the appropriate section which are mainly housing and to some extent, transport.
4. Section 5 now reads The Consultation Process and Plan Development and shows how the process has evolved and some of the changes as a result of the consultation
5. Section 6 has been expanded to make it clearer for the need to monitor and review the process in conjunction with the RCC; see COT MR1
6. No changes to section 7 but section 8, Aims and Objectives had a change to the second bullet point where the wording was made stronger - *Restrict, except in exceptional circumstances, new development to within Planned Limits of Development,*

7. Section 9 contains a minor change indication to Policy COT E&C2 Landscape, by including a reference to the protection of landscapes in Fig 5
8. *COT TRS 2 – Traffic Signage changed to a proposal as opposed to a policy, therefore in blue! Similarly with the other proposals in this section. TR3 to TR6*
9. The housing section has seen some major changes, many recommended by RCC such an addition to the section on affordable housing- . *We have taken into account the recent changes in national Planning Policy Guidance regarding the threshold development size for affordable housing requirements. Cottesmore is a designated rural area in the meaning of National PPG.*
10. Major change to COT H3– **Affordable Housing (Subject to Emerging National Policy Guidance)**

(i) *A minimum of 35% affordable housing provision will be sought from all development of six or more dwellings, in line with RCC Policy CS11 (Affordable Housing) and SP9 (Affordable Housing).*

(ii) *On all rural exception sites and for other sites of more than 10 dwellings the affordable housing should be provided on site.*

(iii) *On developments of between six and ten dwellings, that are not on rural exception sites an equivalent commuted sum payment should be made towards the provision of affordable housing as a first priority elsewhere within the Cottesmore parish, or if not as a pooled contribution to provide affordable housing located as close as possible.*

Change to COT H8 - *Guidance to Potential Housing Development*

*All future development unless special circumstances can be proved in Cottesmore should be within the Planned Limits of Development*

**11. New policy to accommodate the concerns of the MOD - Policy COT H9 Defence Land**

**Development, within the wire at Kendrew Barracks, is exempt from housing development policies (COT H1, COT H2, COT H6, COT H7 and COT H8) for as long as it remains operational MOD land.**

**12. Changes were made to the footpaths to take in some objections from Creswell Drive and the latest information from the RCC- *Proposal COT F6 - Footpath Proposals***

(i) *Seek a safer route from Rogues Lane to the school in Mill Lane which should A link from Mill Lane to Market Overton and from the junction with the Ashwell Road (see Fig 5)*

(ii) *be prioritised for school children, as an alternative to the busy Main Street*

(iii) *A link should be sought from The Pastures to the National Footpath at Exton, to run from the current footpath running along the south side of the village onto Exton Road and linking to the 'Viking Way' National Trail footpath. (see Fig 5)*

13. Note that there is a new Fig 5 that shows the new footpaths, the protected open spaces and the protected views.

There have been many smaller changes which at most change an emphasis slightly and certainly have improved the meaning or understanding of the document.

## **Main organisations consulted**

All the organisations listed below were sent a hard copy of both the first and second drafts. Responses were somewhat limited with only the MOD making substantive comments, all of which were included in the final version of the document.

1. **Neighbouring Parishes** – Barrow – no response to either first or second consultation document;  
Burley - “ ” “ ” “ ” “ ” “ ” “ ”  
Exton – response to first draft. only;  
Greetham - “ ” “ ” “ ” “ ” “ ”
- 2 **Statutory Bodies** Anglian Water – response to first c.d. only; no comments to make;  
English Heritage – no response to either draft.;  
Environment Agency (Kettering) – response to first draft. only;  
Environment Agency (Lincoln) – no response to either draft.;  
Highways Agency – response to second draft only; no comments to make;  
Homes & Communities Agency (x2) – no response to either draft., by either addressee;  
Natural England – response to first draft. only;  
Severn Trent Water – response to second draftd. only.
- 3 **Local Businesses** Eassons )  
Post Office/Shop )  
Fish & Chip shop )  
Tithe Barn ) No responses from any  
Rocks by Rail )  
Mortimer Engineering )  
Exton Estates )
- 4 **Kendrew Barracks** Response (belated) to second draft.
- 5 **Village School** No response to either draft.;
- 6 **Developers & Agents** Abbey Homes – No written response, but representative attended P.C. meeting;  
Wardle Evans (on behalf of D. Hollis) – no response;  
Andrew Grainger (land off Main Street) – no response during consultation period but did attend meeting

## **Minutes of meeting 28<sup>th</sup> Feb 2015**

### **Summary of comments made at the Consultation Meetings held on February 27th and 28th in the village Hall Cottesmore.**

#### **Transport and Road Safety**

Consider closing one side of "triangle - Ashwell Road/ Market Overton Road, and increasing grassed area of Spinney and footpath.  
(note on pink post it)

The following comments were made verbally at the meeting.



A footpath is needed from Ashwell Road along Market Overton Road and turning at Mill Lane to the school where a pavement exists. Comment made by new comers to the village living on Wenton Close.

Elizabeth Barker, Cresswell Drive strongly opposed the suggestion of providing a footpath from Rogues Lane to Cresswell Drive for school children to avoid walking along the Main Road. Supported by a neighbour, they stated that :- the drive was a play area where children could play out safely. people had lived in the Rookery lighting fires and disturbing people by being picked up for work in the early hours of the morning teenagers might use the path to light fires and take part in unmentionable activities the six foot fence required would need upkeep and who would do this?

In response members of the committee said that no comments regarding this had been given in writing from previous consultations and on the contrary more footpaths had received a great deal of support and consideration for the safety of school children was a factor in this proposal. Written comments from villagers concerned by this footpath or alternative suggestions to it were welcome.

### **HGV Traffic**

A questioner wanted to know how HGV traffic could be stopped from driving through the village and felt that any attempt was unlikely to be successful. Response was that as it was a major concern of villagers that it should be tried.

### **Traffic signs**

The proposed new position of the 30 mph sign on the Burley Road was questioned and clarified which received general approval. It was pointed out that the electronic sign could not be moved due to electricity supply problems.

A request was made for a small roundabout at the junction of the Toll Bar road, Geetham Road and Exton Road. The questioner was informed that this had been a suggestion in the first questionnaire sent out but to the surprise of the CNPG there were many written responses against this idea and few for it.

David Hollis gave an outline of a possible plan to build on fields adjoining the Rookery and behind the cemetery. As this is outside the current planned limits of development it cannot be permitted at present. Several people at the meeting made their approval of the plan evident by clapping.