

## FAO: Ketton and Tinwell Joint Neighbourhood Plan

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to you to lodge my objection to the inclusion of LGS 5 Ketton – Geeston Quarry(former quarry site, Barrowden Road) as a local green space (LGS). At the outset I will declare an interest due to a family relationship with the landowner (my mother). The objection is founded on a multitude of factors that I will outline below. A version of this objection was previously submitted to the local steering group and is referenced in the NP, should you like to see the original version of this objection please contact me and I can share the wider set of concerns as shared in March 2022, many points raised in that letter have now been redacted from the current version of the NP.

Any site being put forward as an LGS needs to:

- The green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; Open space important to the character of the villages (Local Open Space and Local Green Space)
- The green space is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and
- The green area is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

In the proposed NP they choose to focus specifically on Wildlife however to help shape the objection I will frame it in the terms outlined in the NPPF policy:

**Local Significance:** we do not believe the site holds any local significance and should it do so, that significance would be as a industrial/commercial site that provide employment to local residents in the earlier parts of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. More recently it was both a coal and wood store that provided fuel to local residents. Which directly contradicts the proposal, for over 90% of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century this site served as a commercial venture, only ending in the late 1990s.

**Beauty:** the site is by no means beautiful it is a disused industrial estate filled with the detritus of years of use, which are potentially dangerous to those entering the site.

**Visibility:** connected to above the site is not visible from the public road nor any other public vantage point, the site is sunken beneath the horizon and bordered with trees. Even the briefest inspection will reveal that one needs to fully approach the site entrance to gain sight of the site. Evidence included in the consultation NP evidence pack, from March 2022, contradicts the argument laid out in the actual Neighbourhood Plan.

**Tranquility:** the site is located on one side next to a working railway line with regular trains, which in spite of electrification, are audible and cause a

commotion on the site. On the other there is a road, which albeit is quiet, has fast cars as it adjoins next to the increase in speed limit from 30 to 60.

Wildlife: there is limited evidence of wildlife. The site is scattered with rusting metal, old brickwork and concrete that could be potentially damaging to some wildlife. Confusion has arisen concerning some proposals from Leicestershire County Council (LCC) in mid 2013 where it was proposed as a wildlife site. Subsequently this was rejected and the site was not designated as such. However this has caused some confusion amongst local residents. There is nothing unique to this site beyond the norm. A brief comparison with any of the other green spaces in Ketton would reveal the folly of the claim; this is not a site of beauty or wildlife by any stretch. It should also be noted that this designation was suggested by LCC and Rutland County Council (RCC) had no input. There are RCC council documents from the period that label the same site a potential residential development opportunity. A light ecological survey earlier in 2022 revealed limited residential/commercial development issues from a wildlife perspective, albeit further investigation would be required.

I strongly object to the proposal, as I believe the Neighbourhood Plan has failed to demonstrate why this site is in any way 'special'. There is no evidence contained in the plan that can support the assertion.

This site is private land with no public access, it is not visible from the road and the tranquility is subjective as the presence of the train line causes a regular disturbance. I am concerned that any LGS designation may encourage further trespassing on the land, which we have been vigilant to stop. This trespassing could have potential consequences both for the trespasser and my family as the landowners. As previously stated disused materials from this sites industrial past litter the site, and should someone injure themselves we, as landowners, would be liable. Whilst we would not grant access such a misunderstanding based on the LGS designation must be considered.

Elsewhere I would draw attention to the demographic make up of Ketton in comparison with the wider community where it severely under-indexes in the 20 to 40 demographic. A demographic cruelly excluded from the housing market by both the direct and indirect actions of older generations. Whilst not stating a desire to develop this site, it is puzzling why a site such as this would not be considered for new housing to support the first demographic to experience a decline in standard of living in living memory. It does not live in the shadow of the cement works and would be perfectly in keeping with the other housing on Barrowden Road, some of which is less than 20 years old.

Overall I am very concerned that this is simply an attempt to prevent future development of the site rather than an identification of a local site that is special to the community. There is very limited evidence to support the recommendation, what evidence there is appears contradictory, and I can see no justification for why it should be accepted as a LGS in the NP. I would also like to return to RCC site maps from 2011, where the site was labeled for future residential usage.

As a final point, I have it on authority that a number of local residents may actually support the use of the site in some sort of redeveloped capacity and consider it a bit of an eyesore, and they were unaware of the original NP consultation.

Many of my assertions above can easily be supported by photographic evidence, please advise on an appropriate way to submit these.

Yours faithfully,

Oliver Parsons