



MEDBOURNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Referendum Version - May 2018

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Appendix CS-6

Open Event (2) Analysis

hyperlinked from main document
NP Consultation Statement

[CLICK HERE TO RETURN](#)

MEDBOURNE

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT DROP-IN EVENT

13 MAY 2017

CONSULTATION ANALYSIS



CONTENTS

Heading	Page Number
1. Background	
a. Project brief	3
b. Publicity	3
c. Attendees	4
2. Format of Event	
a. Process on the day	4
b. Display Boards	5
3. Results	
a. Environment	8
b. Employment	10
c. Community Facilities	11
d. Transport	12
4. Summary	12
5. Images	13

1. Background

a) Project Brief

Medbourne Parish Council organised an open event at the Village Hall in the Parish in May 2017 (10:00 am – 1:00 pm) to share the emerging policies with those who live and work in Medbourne.

The aim of this event was to seek comments on the emerging policies – including Local Green Space and environment; community facilities; design; transport and business, and indicate a preference for housing locations.

b) Publicity

The drop-in event was promoted in a variety of ways:

- Leaflets and posters were produced promoting the event and these were dropped off at every household and placed on noticeboards.
- Members of the Parish Council spoke to villagers to inform them of the event and to encourage attendance.
- Email and twitter contact was made to promote attendance.
- The Parish Council website page advertised the event to the community



c) List of attendees






A list of attendees is available separately. A total of 76 people attended the event and many comments were made about the emerging policies.

2. Format of Each Event

a) Process on the day

Sign in	Members of the Advisory Committee welcomed attendees on arrival and asked them to complete a contact sheet to record attendance. Arrangements for the Open Event were explained.
Background	The first displays introduced Neighbourhood Planning and described the process.
Consultation on key issues	<p>A series of display boards were spread across the room, each of which focussed on the emerging policies within the draft Neighbourhood Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Housing – location, mix and design.▪ Environment –Local Green Space and other environmental protections▪ Transport▪ Businesses and Employment▪ Community Facilities <p>Having read the displays, attendees were asked to indicate their support for the policy and to comment on each policy using post-it notes and to place them on flip-chart paper alongside each display.</p>

b) Display Boards



3. Consultation findings

People were asked whether they supported the draft Neighbourhood Plan policies and were invited to make further comment:

HOUSING

AFFORDABLE HOUSING:

Yes: 27 No: 4

Comments:

- Must encourage young people to stay in the village (1 agreed)
- Affordable housing for young people who want to stay in the village (2 agreed)
- Affordable housing for local people
- Need to include smaller homes for older residents to “downsize” to! Freeing up larger properties.

HOUSING MIX:

Yes: 29 No: 1

Comments:

- A small amount of 4+ dwellings is also required (4 agreed)
- Gap between small and very large too great
- Agree that some larger homes still needed

COUNTRYSIDE:

Yes: 34 No: 0

HERITAGE:

Yes: 23 No: 0

DESIGN:

Yes: 31 No: 0

Comments:

- If preservation of view is important to design, then this should be a consideration for all properties and not just for listed properties

- Hard to drain into clay?
- Variety should be encouraged within keeping of the village designs
- Design should reflect that of neighbouring properties particularly as a large percentage of the village is within the conservation area. The village has developed with different buildings from different periods. The design policy should allow some newer designs, but sympathetic to existing buildings/materials
- But don't make the policy too restrictive as may affect deliverability
- Suggest all new development should have walking access to village centre (pub, shop, village hall, etc)
- Interesting buildings should be considered...boring designs not encouraged!
- Building design needs shape not boxes

WINDFALL:


Yes: 29 No: 3

Comments:

- Infills should count within a village for the numbers required

HOUSING LOCATIONS

People were asked to identify their favoured sites for housing development. This information will be taken into account alongside the outcome of the site sustainability assessments to arrive at favoured locations for development.



The results from the consultation were as follows:

Site no.

2 - 28 ticks

1 – 27 ticks

4 – 20 ticks

11 – 19 ticks

6 – 16 ticks

5 – 12 ticks

12 and 7a - 4 ticks each

10 – 3 ticks

14 and 16 - 1 tick each

ENVIRONMENT

FLOOD RISK:

Yes: 23 No:0

Comments:

- All new builds to have renewable energy

GROUNDWATER INSTABILITY:

Yes: 21 No: 0

Comments:

- The Old House, 10 Old Green?

BIODIVERSITY:

Yes: 21 No: 0

Comments:

- Rectory Lane – “Green area”

LOCAL LIST:

Yes: 22 No: 0

Comments:

- Church setting should be protected
- Ancient right of way is missing off the list. One of the few churches in the round existing!
- Not sure about all on this list

PROTECTING WILDLIFE:

Yes: 25 No: 0

Comments:

- Curb the badgers as they have dug up and eaten all my tulips? And made a horrible mess

RENEWABLE ENERGY:

Yes: 16 No: 11

Comments:

- No wind turbines (2 agreed)
- No solar farms (2 agreed)
- We should do all we can to promote renewable and sustainable energy. All new builds should have minimal impact on the environment long term if possible

LOCAL GREEN SPACE:

Yes: 34 No: 0

OTHER SITES:

Yes: 12 No: 0

Comments:

- Ancient road, round church – historical significance
- Ancient road should be protected
- Ancient road: plan is now for new house to swallow it up into their garden so it joins church boundary – this must be stopped

IMPORTANT OPEN SPACE:

Yes: 34 No: 0

Comments:

- Garden area owned by village stores (2 agreed)
- Open space 154?
- 145 open space

VIEWS:

Yes: 34 No: 0

Comments:

- Views going up Manor Rd as well as down (1 agreed)

RIDGE and FURROW:

Yes: 34 No: 2

Comments:

- Medbourne should be responsible for protecting ridge and furrow
- Only where the ridge and furrow is clear and remains in evidence

EMPLOYMENT:

EXISTING

Yes: 26 No: 1

NEW EMPLOYMENT:

Yes: 26 No:1

Comments:

- Small business or start up incubator/innovation centre. Arts and Crafts facilities/studios
- Tradesmen workshops – big employment opportunity

HOMEWORKING:

Yes: 26 No: 3

Comments:

- I prefer both policy and action. In addition – most major employers to which residents commute, are increasingly moving to agile/flexible/mobile working, with more employed home workers (1 agreed)

TOURISM:

Yes: 19 No:8

Comments:

- **Tourism is a two-edged sword. I have seen village ruined by active tourism, so No**
- **Limited. Campsite positive. Walking/cycling, but do we have the infrastructure. Footpaths important**

COMMUNICATION:

Yes: 29 No: 0

FARM DIVERSIFICATION:

Yes: 32 No: 0

Comments:

- **Opportunities for workshop and small business development**

COMMUNITY FACILITIES:

EXISTING

Yes: 39 No: 0

Comments:

- **More families required to support the facilities and take up roles to support**
- **Street lighting could be turned off from 12.00 – pre-dawn to minimise light pollution**

NEW and ENHANCED:

Yes: 36 No: 2

Comments:

- **6 months is too long to put together a business plan and could restrict the ability of the seller to sell, also damaging the value of the business**
- **Every newbie needs to step up at some time to HELP**
- **Better cohesion across existing facilities managed by a wide range of trusts etc...**
- **Agreed – present arrangement not satisfactory**

TRANSPORT:

GENERAL ISSUES

Yes: 39 No: 0

Comments:

- **Something has to be done about the huge number of speeding motorbikes coming through the village**
- **Speeding down Main St! Parking on Main St on terrible corner, accident waiting to happen**
- **Traffic calming required**
- **Agree.. for children the middle of the village is a very confusing network of roads, therefore the slower the better**
- **Sympathetic traffic calming**
- **Speeding traffic. Volume of traffic damage. Road condition, pavement condition – Manor Rd**
- **Community Action – who would pay for verge repairs**
- **Speeding is a big concern. Also large farm vehicles over a very OLD bridge – weight issue surely**
- **Speeding into village particularly roads from Uppingham (dangerous over railway bridge) and from Mkt Harboro'. If housing is to be extended in these directions, safety (eg pavements) should have high profile**
- **Parking around Neville Arms and village hall**

SUMMARY

The consultation event was a great success with lively discussions and overwhelming support for the draft policies.

These comments will now be taken into account alongside other comments as the Neighbourhood Plan is finalised.



