

APPENDIX A – SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS

KEY POINTS RAISED ON SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS THROUGH CONSULTATION ON EMERGING OPTIONS AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Comment made	Officer response
Weighting given to criteria skews the results – for example the points given to public transport	Agree that the points based system can make big changes when a service is lost. Consideration should be given to removing the weighting or adopting a red, amber, green approach.
Approach should consider transport, access to main roads and public transport that allows you to go to work 24/7	The current approach does consider access to public transport. However this should be reviewed and weighting amended
Capacity of services such as GPs and Schools to absorb growth must be considered	Agree, further consideration should be given to the capacity of existing facilities to accommodate development. This should form part of the assessment of villages
Account should be taken of the current population and number of houses	Current village size is important to consider alongside other factors. It should be noted that changes to the way census data is stored makes this difficult to collect for smaller villages
Should consider clustering of villages and an additional “rural hub” category	“rural hubs” may be a better description of many of the villages currently within the Secondary Rural Centre and Rural Supporter categories
Recognise that villages close to Melton Mowbray and Bottesford are also sustainable because they are close enough to access the services in those locations	Noted – consideration should be given to the role of villages such as Easthorpe with Bottesford and Thorpe Arnold with Melton Mowbray
Bottesford and Asfordby have grown so much that they have already reached the maximum capacity for schools and GPs and Dentists	The capacity of school and GPs should be assessed as part of the review of the settlement hierarchy and ability of villages to take additional development
Public transport to larger villages and towns is irrelevant today as people accept that they have to travel for everything and public transport is so poor you cannot rely on it	This is in direct contrast to the earlier comment and to the conclusions of the reference groups about access to public transport. However the reality of service provision in the rural areas does mean that public transport will be less important to many living in the rural areas.
People don’t shop in village shops anymore – they rely on online shopping	Noted. The reference groups also indicated that a village shop might not be so important in the role of villages, however they are important for those without transport and in areas without superfast broadband
Secondary Rural Service Centres and Rural Settlements should be combined as there is little difference in the	Agree, the difference between the two categories is limited as is the difference between the lower Rural Supporters and the Rural Settlements – combining

facilities and size of them	these categories and reassessing those within each should be considered
Larger villages should be enlarged further to make best use of their facilities and to protect the character of the smaller rural villages	This is the basic principle of the approach – where more development is focussed on Melton Mowbray and the PRSCs – however there is still the need to accommodate small scale development in smaller settlements to ensure that they survive and have a mixed community
The approach is sound but need to be able to re-assess services as they are added or lost	Agree
Need development in all villages to maintain the services they have. Smaller villages should not be ignored	Small villages have not been ignored, and the current approach does allow small scale development in all villages - however this is not specifically set out in terms of numbers and no allocations were proposed. This has been reconsidered and it is proposed that a specific windfall rate is included to allow for such development in villages falling within the rural settlement category
Should not use historic building rates to determine new development rates – some smaller settlements might be able to be developed into service centres	Agree that historic build rates shouldn't always be continued. Need to recognise the ability of a place to support development
Should not fossilise settlements – the plan does not "...allow for communities to change roles through appropriate and proportionate development"	Agree, there may be opportunities for villages to change roles through careful development which brings with it additional or improved services and facilities.
Allocations should be made in all settlements regardless of their size or role, but the number of houses should reflect the size of the village now and the ability of its infrastructure to cope.	Noted. This should be considered in light of the site assessment work
Housing should be spread more evenly across rural areas but limited to small sites of 10 or less houses	Noted. This should be considered in light of the site assessment work