

## Comments

### Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan - Main Modifications Consultation (19/03/21 to 30/04/21)

Comment ID	84
Response Date	29/04/21 16:15
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.2

Please use a separate form for each representation.

#### Which Main Modification, change to the Policies Map or section of the Sustainability Appraisal Report Addendum or Habitat Regulations Assessment Addendum does your comment relate to?

MM27 - Deletion of Historically and Visually Important Green Space, HV1027, HV1028 and HV1054

Please use a separate form for each representation.

#### Representation

As a resident of Loddington for almost 20 years I strongly object to the proposal to remove the HVI designation of the important green spaces within Loddington comprising paddocks HV1027, HV1028 and HV1054. They are vital to protect both the 'rural' and the 'historic' character of the village.

Para 27 of the government inspectors report states "HVI's are not the same as LGS. The purpose of HVI's is set out in the 2012 Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document Background paper: open Space and Allotments. This seeks to protect historically and visually important open spaces where they make a significant contribution to any settlement within the Borough, Conservation Area or setting of a Listed Building." THEIR CAN BE NO DOUBT THAT THE SPACES HVI027, HVI028 AND HVI054 DO EXACTLY THAT. If the planning inspector would take the trouble to visit the village she would have to concede that is the case.

Whilst the space HVI054 is the smallest piece of land in question it is located between the historic Loddington Hall and the 13th century St. Leonards Church and acts as a gateway to our Grade II listed Main Street. If this does not deserve the designation then nothing does!

The paddocks HVI027 and HVI028 provide magnificent views of the historic core of the village and are essential to the character of the village.

Para 31 of the government inspectors report regarding LGS states "Whilst I note that the designation of some of these spaces were subsequently supported by local residents, Parish/Town Councils and elected members, that is not the same as them having been identified by communities." In this regard I make two points:

When in 2012 a proposal was put forward to develop the paddock HVI028 (i.e planning application KET/2012/0453) not only were there 32 written objections, there was also a petition signed by 109 residents objecting to the scheme. From a village of only 205 houses this is a clear indication that residents wish to protect the HVI status of this land.

A later application in 2014 received 26 written objections, including one from the parish council. The KBC 'Officers Report' made it clear that ... "The entire site falls within the designated conservation area for Loddington."

Before the planning inspector took a different view many areas of land were designated as HVI status therefore communities surely would have thought that they had been identified as important local green spaces so why would they need to make any further statement!

The residents of Loddington are not NIMBYS. During the last 15 years seven new houses have been built within the village on an "infill basis" and a further four have been approved for build by the local community (the site is currently being prepared for build). This is a 5% to 6% increase in the villages housing stock. Residents will accept restricted infill development if suitable sites come up for development. We simply wish to retain the 'historic' and 'rural' character of the village. Please retain the HVI status of the above land.