

Burton Overy Neighbourhood Plan: Environment Group

Notes subsequent to meeting held 16/7/17: policies to be included in the draft plan

On 1 January 2017, the group discussed its core vision and objectives, which encompassed the following:

Vision: We are passionate about protecting and enhancing the rural, historic character of Burton Overy and its small-field landscape, wildlife habitats and biodiversity. Farming has shaped this landscape for centuries and continues to do so in the present time, with agricultural stewardship of the parish a vital part both of its continuing beauty and ecological health, and its vibrant social and economic community.

Development that would have an adverse impact on these characteristics will not be approved. Defined Local Green Spaces will be protected and enhanced. Any new development will be expected to maintain and enhance existing ecological corridors and landscape features for biodiversity. To mitigate the impact on climate change, any development will be expected to incorporate energy conservation features and have regard to the standards of Building for Life 12.

Key Issue: ensure that the distinctive rural landscape, agricultural community, settlement pattern, historical assets, natural environment and biodiversity of the Parish are protected and enhanced by the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Policy 1 – Protection of Local Green Spaces

The inventory and dot maps will need to be revisited in order to ensure we have included all appropriate spaces here. Proposed Local Green Spaces identified in Burton Overy include historic close land within the settlement, ancient meadowland on its edge, and part of a stream-based wildlife corridor along the Washbrook (more detailed information for each plot included in inventory):

- Field 45 – incorporate into one space with grassed area between field gate and Rectory End road (see notes on inventory, and dot map)
- Churchyard (174)
- Field 33 (Opposite Kings Orchard, Scotland) – within the historical village, includes an ancient hedgerow, scores 78%
- Field 143 (see notes on inventory)
- Field 161, Lower End Paddock to the east of 33 – scores 75%; this is private land but includes ‘priority habitat’ (see notes against that area 161 on the ‘Scores By’ sheet)
- Field 46: scored just below 75% at 72%
- Field 149
- 160 (The Millennium Wood)
- Field 144, Banks Field (village land on Main Street) – incorporate into one space with 155, Banks Field Verge (wide grass verge that holds Telephone Box, Village Notice Board and Jubilee Oak).

Policy 2 – Protection of other types of locally important open spaces as HDC OSSRs

- (i) *Parks and Gardens* – none
- (ii) *Natural and Seminatural Greenspaces* –
 - a. Spaces within settlement already put forward to HDC
 - b. Important woodland areas, and areas with significant woodland species: 49a, 56a, 56b, 75, 146, 166, 172
 - c. Other spaces where scores indicate it
 - d. Old meadowland along stream, with numerous wildflower species: 20 (Carvers Meadow; series of ancient water meadows)
 - e. Other particularly important wildflower areas: 77, 155, 125
 - f. Washbrook area within settlement
 - g. Penfold – existing complications with HDC; Fran can elucidate.
- (iii) *Amenity Greenspace* – none
- (iv) *Outdoor Sports Facilities* – none
- (v) *Provision for Children & Young People* – none
- (vi) *Allotments etc* – none
- (vii) *Cemeteries etc* – St Andrew’s churchyard
- (viii) *Civic spaces* – Rectory End (**can we include this when it is also public highway?** HDC’s own examples indicate to me that we can, and the proposal that we do is based on the fact that, with highway permission, this cul-de-sac has often been used for village events [fetes/pig roasts/tea parties etc.])
- (ix) *Green Corridors or Greenways* –

Two stream-based wildlife corridors:

 - a. A wildlife corridor along Burton Brook, matching the wildlife corridor proposed by Kibworth in their NP and extending along the entire eastern and southern Burton Overy parish boundary, to its southernmost tip. This would therefore run through map plots 10, 11, 39, 40, 63, 64, 89, 90, 91, 107, 108, 125, 126, 137, 138, 169, 171, 172, 173.
 - b. A wildlife corridor along the Washbrook, extending from the parish boundary at the Gartree Road, downstream to the western edge of the parish where it borders with Great Glen.

In addition, an ancient hedgerow and woodland habitat corridor, running from where the Washbrook meets the parish boundary with Great Glen, along the ancient boundary hedge line to the Gartree Road (or if that’s too far, to an appropriate point as far along as possible on the Great Glen boundary).

Policy 3 – Other Natural Environment Sites:

If an ancient hedgerow and woodland corridor, as proposed above, is unsuitable, we would like to protect them here.

Policy 4 – Ridge & Furrow: I understand from the notes of the November meeting that Craig Langton & Peter Barbour have previously established the best R&F fields, and that these are already identified as Non-Designated Heritage Assets. **Do these also need to be identified in the NP?**

Policy 5 – Other currently non-protected cultural heritage assets we wish specifically to identify and propose for protection in the Plan:

- (i) The ancient brick wall bounding the farmyard bordered by Elms Lane and Main Street.
- (ii) The mud wall in the yard of Manor House Farm.
- (iii) The former butcher's paddock (plot no. 46; see also policy 1 above).

[NB: There is also one currently unlisted property, Egerton Cottage, which in the view of the group may need listing protection. The Parish Council will write to HDC].

Policy 6 – sustainable development:

- (i) Energy efficiency: we are not experts in this area, but at minimum we propose that any new development should include energy conservation features and have regard to the standards of Building for Life 12. [John, you might be able to input here].
- (ii) Flooding: John, we decided **your advice on particular wording about policy here would be helpful,** but we do want to include something about the requirement for any new development to take into account any potential impacts of that development on existing drainage, on water flows, surface water, flood risk, etc. I found this wording in the Billesdon plan: "New development should incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) with attenuation, storage and treatment capacities incorporated. Consideration should also be given to potential water logging, land contamination and waste water treatment capacity." Not sure that entirely covers everything we want to say, but it says some of it. We also wanted to point out that history has taught us (as in the past a former part of the village, down by the Washbrook, was washed away) that building right down by the watercourses is not a good idea!).

Policy 7 – biodiversity:

- (i) Hedgerows:
 - a. The presumption is in favour of preservation of all hedgerows and trees within the parish.
 - b. We want especially to protect our ancient hedges, which at minimum includes our parish boundary hedges. **How can we do this? Can we identify them within the plan as a particular kind of heritage asset?** See also above, re. proposed hedgerow and woodland corridors.
 - c. If any hedgerow or part thereof is destroyed for development purposes, we require 3 new, native broadleaf hedgerows to be planted within the parish
- (ii) Trees:

- d. If any tree has to be cut down for development purposes, we require 3 new ones, of native broadleaf species, to be planted as replacements within the parish.

Policy 8 – zones of separation:

- (i) We wish to propose a zone of separation along the parish boundary between us and Kibworth.
- (ii) We also wish to propose the same between us and Glen.

However, we recognise that if matching zones are not in the Kibworth and Glen plans, there is little incentive to do this. Please can you urgently advise?