

## Comments

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

<b>Comment ID</b>	111
<b>Response Date</b>	30/04/21 11:04
<b>Status</b>	Processed
<b>Submission Type</b>	Email
<b>Version</b>	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 and PM16

Please use a separate form for each representation.

#### **Representation**

I would like to formally lodge an objection and significant concern around the above proposal. I initially would like to observe that I cant believe, we as local residents, are once again having to take time to reinforce our overwhelming views around the preservation of our village in its current form, now and for future generations. I was under the mis apprehension that this matter and similar ones had been to put to bed, and enacted in law through the "local plan". It is very concerning that once again we are having to express our clear opinion.

I have read the inspector report and am struggling to understand the actual point in down grading the protections and status of the areas referenced above. If this isn't the start of a slippery slope to further development then why not leave well alone, which was what was agreed with the village and Parish counsel in previous agreements.

We are extremely fortunate to live in a village where the development has been carefully managed, the few remaining open spaces add considerable value to the aesthetics of the village, to a sense of openness and country side, an avoidance of a feeling of over development, which is enjoyed by all the residents, in particular for the elderly residents who may find it more difficult to drive/travel to gain access to that positive environment. It astounds me that after a period of extreme lock downs and the strong emphasis on mental well being and a healthy life style, that you would choose this time to reduce the protection these areas are currently enjoying.

Specific concerns around HV1028 include the dry stone wall that surrounds that space. it is of significant historical value and is attached to a Grade 2 English heritage property. The open green, unobstructed view across that field has been enjoyed by generations of residents and should be as fully protected as possible for future generations. Any degeneration of its status leads to potential exploitation down the track, this is not just about the next few years, it is about future generations.

HV1027. Is actively used for cattle grazing which also continues to support the rural feel to the village.

The visual importance of these 2 spaces in particular, was discussed and over whelmingly agreed to be significant when the "local plan" was agreed. Nothing has changed since that time, so there is no requirement or rationale to be considering this move.

I hope i am wrong but it feels like this is a response to some national direction around %'s of such land/space, and Loddington is being asked to pay the price to meet some arbitrary target. If the land is still protected with a reduced status, then why make the change anyway? I have a significant concern that lowering the protection of this space leaves the door open to unintended consequences around encouraging future planning applications and it would not take many more houses to be built in the village, for its historical and visually pleasing ambience to be destroyed for ever.

i urge the inspectors to consider the importance of protecting spaces of this type and respect the agreed local plan, leave the protections in place and protect the spaces as they deserve to be protected for now and for the future.