

FULL NAME	DUTY TO COOPERATE	LEGALLY COMPLIANT	SOUND	WHICH PART	WHICH PARAGRAPHS	WHICH POLICY	WHICH POLICY MAP	WHICH DIAGRAM	WHICH TABLE
MR David F. Hewitt	No	No	No	Paragraph, Policy, Policies Map, Diagram	See text HA66 and HA60	See text HA66 and HA60	See text HA66 and HA60	See text HA66 and HA60	

WHY PLAN NOT SOUND	MODIFICATIONS	HEARINGS	HEARING SESSIONS
<p>Response to Charnwood Local Plan Pre-Submission Draft 2021-2037 Consultation Reference HA66 Rearsby 47 houses.</p> <p>I object to the inclusion of HA66 in the plan with reference to your statements in the pre-submission draft and summary because:-</p> <p>1. To protect and enhance the historic environment and it's setting and the identity of villages. Rearsby is historically a rural farming village. We have had 4 recent housing additions to the village and the current proposal is a step too far regarding the environment. It proposes to build on productive green field farming land, whilst the previous developments already had some buildings.</p> <p>2. To reduce flooding in the Wreake Valley. We already have flood from the Rearsby Brook. These 47 houses will remove farming land that slowly absorbs rainfall. This will therefore flow into the currently over-burdened water courses</p> <p>3. Sensitive to the environment. This is the opposite of being sensitive to the environment</p> <p>4. Be sensitive to landscape and the impotence in maintaining the separate identities though their design and layout, clearly maintain physical and perceptual separation. You say under HA60 that the eastern border of this proposed development has been reduced to allow separation. This is not so at the extreme NE section which still extends towards Rearsby more than the current limits. There is no access road shown to HA60. If this is on the west of the proposal ie opposite Broome Lane, it reduces the separation.</p> <p>5. Protect 279km of open countryside. Obviously this is complete opposite to your pledge</p> <p>6. Support infrastructure.</p> <p>a. 44 house would mean approximately 176 vehicle movements per day. These would enter the Melton Road via a very dangerous corner. Accidents will occur</p> <p>b. This will increase the vehicle movements on the Melton Road. There is already a speeding issue , which has not been addressed.</p> <p>c. There is no cycle path from East Goscote to Rearsby. This means that cyclists have to use the road. With the additional traffic, this will become even more unsafe for cyclists</p> <p>d. Pedestrians attempting to cross the Melton Road around the junction with Gaddesby Lane will have even more difficulty and will end in accidents crossing the road</p> <p>e. Developers would rather build in villages than brownfield sites or areas next to towns. This is because people will pay more for houses in the countryside. You should be offering more incentives to developers to stop encroachment into villages</p> <p>f. There is no mention of cycle paths in your plan. You cannot count white lines at the side of the road, with no physical separation as a cycle path – it is a death trap. More consideration needs to be given to cyclists. There is no cycle path between Rearsby and Goscote</p> <p>Reference HA60 East Goscote 223 houses. This must be the most ill-conceived high density proposal ever.</p> <p>1. The separation issue is as above for Rearsby</p> <p>2. 223 houses means approximately 892 vehicle movements. This would cause real dangerous traffic issues on the Melton Road</p> <p>3. We already have flood from the Queniborough Brook. These 223 houses will remove farming land that slowly absorbs rainfall. This will therefore flow into the currently over-burdened water courses</p> <p>4. See above HA66 for common objections.</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>No</p>	