

## FOCUSED CHANGES RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED: FC4 - Somerby

Representor Name	Focused Change /Policy Ref	Summary of Representation	MBC Response
Mary Anne Donovan	Somerby	<p>FC1.2 Policy SS2 and SS3</p> <p>The policies do not support sustainable rural development and do not accord with paragraph 126 of the NPPF. The spatial strategy for Somerby Parish should be re-examined and the approach of Cluster Villages used.</p> <p>Object to large scale allocations due to impact on landscape, settlement patterns, heritage impact.</p> <p>FC4 (SOM2 and 3) Evidence that these sites are inappropriate for development due to heritage constraints and should be removed from the allocations.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal and Areas of Separation, Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Studies should be updated with recent evidence to inform allocations, including Historic Park.</p> <p>SOM2 history should include recent appeal decisions stating Somerby has a high value and sensitivity to change APP/Y2430/A/14/2221470</p> <p>SOM3 - History should note appeal APP/Y2430/A/14/22221470 and planning app 77/0581/6.</p> <p>Heritage impacts upon Grade II Vinery. Site is not accurately described, biodiversity should be assessed. Visual impact has not been correctly assessed.</p> <p>FC4 – Lack of assessment of heritage impact.</p>	<p>The Focused Changes did not include any changes to the hierarchy of settlements and remain as set out in the pre submission draft, and justified by the adequate and proportionate evidence set out in the Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report 2016, and the Consideration of Settlement Roles and Relationships Report to MBC, September 2016.</p> <p>The policies as stated for sites SOM1 and SOM2 states that a heritage assessment should be provided to accompany an application for the site(s). These will need to sufficiently assess the impact of proposed development at these sites on the CA and heritage assets to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The appeal decision quoted relates to the erection of a wind turbine measuring a maximum of 61 metres to the tip. The form of development proposed in the appeal is completely different to residential dwellings adjacent to the existing village, and as such the appeal decision cannot be used to provide an assessment of the impact of further residential development in the area.</p> <p>The planning decision 77/0581/6 is 40 years old and relates to different policies that were in place at the time. Somerby was classed as a ‘restraint’ village; a term which no longer exists.</p> <p>Conservation recognises the absence of sufficient information in the preparation of assessments for SOM2 and SOM3. Conservation has met previously with the respondent who has prepared a significant level of information relating to the designated and non-designated heritage assets within the village of Somerby. If possible, Conservation supports the inclusion of this information, where deemed appropriate, and a possible revision of the allocations if any of the additional information is considered to be necessary as a result of the enhanced content and possible significance. Conservation understands that the respondent was recently instrumental in getting the Vinery recognised at Grade II level and this impacted upon comments for application 16/00615/OUT which was recommended for refusal due to the impact on the setting of the listed building and the wider character of the Conservation Area.</p>
Carl Powell	SOM1	<p>Not suitable or effective because of evidence of flooding and flood risk from ALL causes in the Leicestershire Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment 2011.</p> <p>MBC evidence relies only on later Environment Agency mapping which considers only surface water flooding. Flood risk is actually high and annual occurrence. Refers to planning application evidence for 16/00100/OUT. As per NPPF, development should be steered to areas at lowest flood risk. Is development will either flood as well or divert water towards houses to the West or Doctor's surgery and houses to the North, thereby increasing flood risk to them. remove SOM1 - it would help MBC defend current planning appeal.</p>	<p>The Council considers the evidence underpinning the housing site allocations to be robust and proportionate. Any grant of planning permission would need to incorporate flood protection and drainage measures to avoid flood risk to the site or increase it elsewhere. The evidence submitted with the planning applications showed part of the site was at low risk of surface water flooding. Whilst it was refused on the grounds of drainage of the specific proposal, it is not considered that evidence is available to demonstrate that flood protection and a drainage solution is impossible.</p>

Terence Joyce	SOM2	SOM2 should not be an allocation because it is far too close and partly within conservation area , within primary green infrastructure, historical earth works, and most importantly, access to high street via dangerous bend within area of village with constant equestrian activity especially young inexperienced riders. it is regularly used by dog walkers, and is an important grazing site for a well established riding school. Listen and act on local public concerns, and focus on SOM1 which is well outside conservation area and will put less strain on already congested and dangerous high street - a file with a photo of a damaged roadside safety barrier was attached. Also make money available to sort any drainage problem in this part of village	The Council considers the evidence underpinning the housing site allocations to be robust and proportionate. Responses to several of the issues raised has been given at pre submission draft stage. As it stands, both SOM1 and SOM2 are needed as Somerby's contribution to meeting the overall housing requirement of the Borough.
Tracy Watts	Som2	SOM2 – Failed to consider significant and substantiated objections on draft MBC Local Plan re SOM2.	As the representation raises no substantively different issues to those raised at PSD stage, and there is no new information and/or changed national (or local policy) to consider, the Council has no further comment.
H Blakethrough (Somerby PC)	Somerby	SOM1: flooding (recent refusal), lack of employment and public transport SOM2: Highways safety, lack of employment, historic park. Contrary to Sensitivity Study. Loss of children's play areas and football field. SOM3: Heritage impacts, Grade II Vinery, impact on trees, wildlife and archaeological finds. Lack of employment and public transport.	Somerby has no fluvial flooding constraints, however there are historic flooding events which relate to surface water and the capacity of the drainage system. Policy SOM1 requires a developer to demonstrate that flooding mitigation measures will be deployed and the site would not result in adverse impacts elsewhere.  Policy SOM2 seeks to ensure that access would be via High Street only; the Highway Authority have not objected to the inclusion of this site in terms of highways safety. There is limited employment nearby, for example at Burrough Court, Pickhill Abbatoir, Pickhill pork farm, John O gaunt and Gates garden Centre at Cold Overton but further employment opportunities in Melton and Leicester which are accessible by public transport. Policy SOM2 seeks to ensure that the play area would be relocated and enhanced.  Conservation recognises the absence of sufficient information in the preparation of assessments for SOM2 and SOM3. Conservation has met previously with the respondent who has prepared a significant level of information relating to the designated and non-designated heritage assets within the village of Somerby. If possible, Conservation supports the inclusion of this information, where deemed appropriate, and a possible revision of the allocations if any of the additional information is considered to be necessary as a result of the enhanced content and possible significance. Conservation understands that the respondent was recently instrumental in getting the Vinery recognised at Grade II level and this impacted upon comments for application 16/00615/OUT which was recommended for refusal due to the impact on the setting of the listed building and the wider character of the Conservation Area.
Historic England Emilie Carr	SOM2	The addition of criteria in respect of the historic environment within policies SOM2 and 3 is welcomed.	Noted.
Howard Blakebrough	SOM1,2,3	Objects to all the sites' inclusions on a number of grounds.	Principle of sites was not a focused changed. Please refer to your Presubmission Consultation comments.