Natural and Historical Environment

Introduction

Landscape, geology and setting

The Plan Area is located on the dip slope behind the Belvoir Escarpment, a line of northwest-facing hills formed by the outcrop of a layer of iron-bearing rock. The landscape undulates gently down toward Melton Mowbray, with extensive views in all directions but principally south-eastwards over the Wreake valley and into High East Leicestershire. Altitude ranges from 170 m at White Lodge Farm to 103 m at the lowest point on Welby Brook.

The whole parish is underlain by Jurassic bedrock (map, right), although in the southern half this is buried beneath several tens of metres of Quaternary glacial debris (‘boulder clay’, sand and gravel) deposited by ice and water during the Ice Ages about 300,000 years ago. The Jurassic rocks at the surface in the northern half are about 200 million years old; mainly iron-rich sandstones, they have been of economic and landscape importance since Roman times, as a source of building stone and iron ore. Much of this area has been quarried and mined; some during the 19th century but mainly in the 20th – the last quarries closed in the 1970s. Most of the old workings have been restored to agriculture but a few, along with associated mineral railways, have been preserved as nature reserves, where they provide important habitats for animals and plants otherwise rare in the Midlands.

Natural England includes the whole Area in National Landscape Character 74 Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire Wolds. ‘Key characteristics’ of NCA 74 of relevance to Ab Kettleby include ‘elevated plateaux, narrow valleys and distinctive scarp slope … extensive views … from the important watershed … with streams providing significant biodiversity and recreation assets’. Ab Kettleby is also included in Melton Borough Council’s Landscape Character Assessment Units 2 Leicestershire Wolds: Belvoir Scarp and 5 Leicestershire Wolds: Ragdale to
*Saltby Wolds*. Wartnaby and Ab Kettleby churches are recognised by MBC as secondary landmarks for planning purposes.

The Plan Area consists of the three historic townships (later, parishes) of Ab Kettleby, Holwell and Wartnaby. Although they share some characteristics (as described above) there are important landscape and socio-economic differences which residents value and wish to conserve:

Wartnaby is a deeply rural, well-preserved medieval manorial centre, with a 12th century church, medieval earthworks preserving the manor and associated houses, historic fields and a range of domestic and agricultural buildings of ironstone and limestone construction.

Holwell is an originally 8th century settlement whose layout is preserved but whose small, originally workers’ cottages date largely from the time of ironstone quarrying in the late 18th to 20th centuries.

Ab Kettleby is the largest settlement and combines elements of both of the others, having evolved from 9th century rural estate through medieval agriculture to relatively large scale quarrying in the 20th century, with workers’ cottages and ex-Council Houses as well as important 17th-18th century buildings and an historically significant village school. It is also close enough to Melton Mowbray to have a number of late 20th century dormitory developments.

**Existing environmental designations**

- National Character Area 74 *Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire Wolds* (Natural England landscape areas, defined for Planning purposes)
- One Scheduled Monument
- 29 Listed Buildings
- One parcel of registered Common Land
- C.25 areas with Priority Habitats
- Two Leicestershire & Rutland Wildlife Trust Nature Reserves
- Two Regionally Important Geological Sites

**Environmental inventory**

An environmental inventory (Appendix X) of Ab Kettleby was carried out between xx and xx 2017. The work comprised two elements:

- Review of all existing designations and available information, and
- Fieldwork to identify sites and features of natural and historical environment significance in the context of the Plan Area.

The review compiled information from many sources, including:

- DEFRA
- Natural England
- Historic England
Leicestershire & Rutland Historic Environment Records
Leicestershire & Rutland Environmental Record Centre records
(biodiversity and geology)
Environment Agency
British Geological Survey
Old maps (Ordnance Survey, manuscript)
British History Online
Local knowledge

The Fieldwork reviewed of all open and currently undeveloped land (except small private curtilages) in the Plan Area (356 parcels of land and linear features). Significant species, habitats, landscape characteristics, earthworks and other extant features were recorded or checked.

The fieldwork data, combined with all relevant site-specific information from the existing information review, were mapped and tabulated, and every site was scored and evaluated using the nine criteria for Local Green Space selection in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012:

Table X. Environmental inventory scoring system used in the Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion (NPPF 2012)</th>
<th>Score range</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCESSIBILITY</td>
<td>0 1 3 4</td>
<td>e.g. private, no access (0) – visible from public place – accessed via PRoW – fully open to the public (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROXIMITY / LOCAL</td>
<td>0 1 3 4</td>
<td>Distant (0) --- fairly near to --- adjoins (3) or is within (4) settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOUNDED</td>
<td>0 1 3 4</td>
<td>Individual parcel of land (not an undefined area or extensive tract of land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL TO COMMUNITY</td>
<td>0 1 3 4</td>
<td>Local knowledge, Opinion of residents e.g. via questionnaire and at consultation events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATIONAL / EDUCATIONAL USE</td>
<td>0 1 3 4</td>
<td>Actual or potential, informal sports, dog-walking, Forest School use, informal or official open space, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAUTY (including views in)</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>Subjective, relative (give justification); use consultation map results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAUTY (including views out)</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>Subjective, relative (give justification); use consultation map results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANQUILTY</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>Extant, visible evidence. Number of periods/features/records etc. / Relevant existing designations (Historic Environment Records)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE</td>
<td>0 1 3 4</td>
<td>Richness of species and habitats (Priority (BAP) spp. / Priority habitats) / relevant existing designations (Habitat Survey, Local Wildlife Sites / site of geological/industrial history significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILDLIFE SIGNIFICANCE, GEOLGY</td>
<td>0 1 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Maximum possible score] 34
Environmental protections

In the National Planning Policy Framework, the *natural and historical environment* is acknowledged to be an essential component of *sustainable development*; as such it carries equal weight in a balance against social and economic growth, including new development.

This section of the Plan identifies land and features of environmental significance in the parish of Ab Kettleby. It includes policies to protect the best of them from loss or damage by allocating them to categories, based on their type, importance, function (as community assets, for example) and intrinsic value, as follows:

**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTIONS PROVIDED BY THE PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Protection</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Green Space (LGS)</strong></td>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>NPPF criteria (see below) applied locally. Highest environmental importance in the Plan Area, scoring 75%+ overall.</td>
<td>Full protection of the site and its features ‘other than in exceptional circumstances’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statutory Listed Building</strong></td>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>English legislation National significance Age, rarity, aesthetic merit, best of type</td>
<td>Demolition, extension, alteration require ‘special permission’ from HDC. The ‘setting’ of the feature will also be considered if affected by development nearby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site of environmental significance</strong></td>
<td>Non-statutory, but in compliance with English and EU regulations / directives for the protection of species, habitats and heritage assets</td>
<td>National, county and district designations (existing) for biodiversity and/or history Sites not eligible for LGS designation but with demonstrable high environmental significance in the Plan Area, scoring 6-8 for</td>
<td>The sites, significant historical features, habitats and species should be taken into account if development or change of use is planned; presumption against harm or destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>history+ wildlife</td>
<td>Presumption against redevelopment or loss of value</td>
<td>Includes all sites identified by HDC as OSSR, and additional sites identified in the Plan's environmental inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important Open Space</td>
<td>Non-statutory</td>
<td>NPPF and HDC criteria and guidance</td>
<td>No other obligations or burdens on landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>('Open Space, Sport &amp; Recreation' sites, OSSR)</td>
<td></td>
<td>'all open space of public value' in 9 categories (HDC)</td>
<td>No new public rights (e.g. access) are conferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sites not eligible for LGS designation but with demonstrable high community value in the Plan Area. (Some LGS may also be OSSR). Score 75%+ in community value criteria</td>
<td>Policy ENV x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife corridor</td>
<td>Non-statutory</td>
<td>NPPF paragraph 117, etc., and conservation good practice. Broadly linear features identified in the environmental inventory for their biodiversity value and for providing connectivity between habitats and species in the Plan Area</td>
<td>No other obligations or burdens on landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Should be taken into account if development or change of use is planned; presumption against harm or destruction</td>
<td>No new public rights (e.g. access) are conferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy ENV x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Local List’</td>
<td>Non-statutory</td>
<td>NPPF paragraph 17. Identified in the environmental inventory and through community consultation</td>
<td>Less proscriptive than statutory Listing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notification as non-designated heritage assets. Advisory on owners, community and HDC</td>
<td>No other obligations or burdens on landowner if the building is in a Conservation Area. Otherwise both the structure and its ‘setting’ will be taken into account in Planning Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy ENV x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge and furrow</td>
<td>Non-statutory</td>
<td>NPPF paragraph 135.</td>
<td>No other obligations or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Local Green Spaces

Of the approximately 356 inventoried parcels of open land in the parish, 82 (23%) were identified as having locally (or greater) environmental (natural, historical and/or community) significance. These sites were scored, using the criteria for Local Green Space designation noted in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (see Fig. X for the criteria and scoring system adopted for this Plan).

Eleven sites score 76% (26/34) or more of the maximum possible, and meet the requirements for designation as Local Green Space as listed in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF paragraph 77). Their statutory protection will ensure that these most important places in Ab Kettleby’s natural and human environment are protected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NPPF (2012) ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access /4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[photo]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[location map]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY ENV 1: PROTECTION OF LOCAL GREEN SPACES – Development proposals that would result in the loss of, or have an adverse effect on, the following designated Local Green Spaces (mapped and described above, full details in Appendix x), or their settings, will not be permitted other than in exceptional circumstances.

2. Sites of environmental significance

A second group of inventory sites scores highly for ‘history’ and/or ‘wildlife’ (scoring at least 6/8 (75%) under these two criteria) but, because their community value scores are not sufficiently high they are not eligible for Local Green Space designation. The features for which the identified sites have been selected and notified are listed in the environmental inventory (Appendix X). The map (Fig. ENV X) shows their locations.
The **historical environment** sites comprise a) sites with *extant and visible* archaeological or historical features recorded in the Leicestershire & Rutland Historic Environment Records database (Fig. X.1) and; b) other sites of historical and social significance identified in local records and during the inventory process. (Ridge and furrow sites are the subject of Policy ENV XX, below).

**Fig. x.1**: All historical environment sites in Ab Kettleby parish. Only extant features with visible expression in the landscape have been included in the inventory.

The **natural environment** sites comprise a) those where *priority habitats* occur (Natural England mapping) (Fig. x.2), b) where *biodiversity action plan (BAP)* species have been recorded as breeding or as regular visitors; c) Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS), d) Formal nature reserves (Leicestershire &Rutland Wildlife Trust), e) **Validated and Candidate Local Wildlife Sites (LWS)**; and f) sites identified during the inventory process as being of high biodiversity significance in the context of the Plan Area.

**Fig. x.2**: Priority Habitat sites in Ab Kettleby parish.
As described in the table *Summary of environmental protections provided by the Plan* above, these designations and following Policy bring their identified features to the attention of the Planning system in the expectation that there will, in compliance with English and European conservation legislation, be a presumption against permitting or causing disturbance or destruction of the species, habitats or features.

**Fig. x: Sites of environmental (natural and/or historical) significance**

**POLICY ENV X: PROTECTION OF SITES AND FEATURES OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE** – 39 sites (environmental inventory, appendix X, and map Fig. X above) have been identified as being of high local importance for biodiversity (species and habitats) and / or history. They are important in their own right and are locally valued. Development proposals that affect them should take note of the identified features and will be expected to protect them in accordance with current legislation.
POLICY ENV X: REGIONALLY IMPORTANT GEOLOGICAL SITES (RIGS) – Brown’s Hill Quarry and North Quarry, Holwell, are validated sites of regional importance for their geological features (palaeontology, mineralogy, lithology and stratigraphy). Development proposals that affect them should take note of the identified features and will be expected to protect them in accordance with current legislation.

Fig. X. Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS)

3. Important Open Spaces

A further group of sites scored highly in the inventory (scoring at least 75% of the possible total under the relevant NPPF criteria) for their outstanding community value. They have been identified in fieldwork, community consultations and in Parish records.

Relevant Melton Borough Council sources\(^1\) were also consulted so that existing Open Space, Sport and Recreation (OSSR) sites in the three villages could be included in the scope of this Plan. There appear to be none, although Ab Kettleby

\(^1\) Melton Borough Council (MBC) consultation document Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015; Melton Borough Council Planvu maps at www.planvu.co.uk/mbc/mbc/php
seems to have been erroneously omitted from the 2015 consultation document. Sites mapped by MBC as Protected Open Areas (POA) in Planvu have been included in the assessment; although POA is now a redundant Planning term it was felt that these sites would probably still have value as important open spaces.

Fig. x: Important Open Spaces

In the Plan area these sites comprise the following sites, listed in the OSSR categories proposed by Melton Borough Council ([submission Local Plan, [date]]). It should be noted that the term ‘Green Space’ in this list does not imply equivalence with the National Planning Policy term Local Green Space (Policy ENV above).

These sites are highly significant in the lives of local people (and visitors) both for the contribution they make to the layout and rural character of the villages and for their value as community assets.
POLICY ENV X: IMPORTANT OPEN SPACES – Protection and enhancement of the following sites, and their identified significant features, as detailed in the Environmental Inventory, Appendix X, will be supported.

COMMUNITY ACTION ENV 1: IMPORTANT OPEN SPACE - The Parish Council will actively work with Melton Borough Council, landowners, the community and other partners to secure the protection of the locations and features of the following sites (listed below and mapped in Fig. ENV X and detailed in Appendix X) through confirmation as existing, or designation as new, Open Space, Sport and Recreation (OSSR) sites in appropriate typologies, as follows:

PLUS the other ‘queried’ sites on the map – these may be too large for IOS or are outside the built-up areas

**Allotments**
- Allotment gardens, Ab Kettleby (A67)

**Natural and semi-natural Green Space**
- Noticeboard field, Wartnaby (W35)
- Front paddock (?Church paddock), Wartnaby (W36)
- Churchsick, Wartnaby (W38)
- Church field, Ab Kettleby (A59)
- Nature reserve (extension of Holwell Mineral Line LRWT Reserve (H31)

**Amenity Green Space**
- ?any in Ab K – grass patches provided as part of housing developments, etc.?

**Parks and gardens**
- [none]

**Provision for children and young people**
- Play area, Ab Kettleby (?)

**Sports pitches and playing fields**
- Cricket Ground, Wartnaby (W34)
- Primary School playing fields, Ab Kettleby (A38)

**Indoor sport and recreation**
- [none?]
**Burial grounds and churchyards**

?Wartnaby churchyard (not inventoried, not on map)

St James Churchyard, Ab Kettleby (A61)

St Leonard’s churchyard, Holwell? (Not inventoried, not on map?)

---

4. Biodiversity and Wildlife Corridors

It could be said that Ab Kettleby parish is a ‘typical’, ecologically undistinguished area of English Midlands countryside with no major wildlife hotspots, and thus that it has little or no biodiversity significance to be taken into account in the Planning system. This would be a misunderstanding of the concept of biodiversity. England’s biodiversity is entirely and only the sum of the wildlife in each of its parishes: Ab Kettleby is as important in this regard as every other parish, and residents want it to play its essential part in protecting what remains of England’s biodiversity.

This policy is therefore about parish-level compliance with the Melton Borough Council Local Plan, the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Hedgerows Regulations 1997 (as amended), and the European Habitats and Species Directives – and about how Ab Kettleby can ‘do its bit’ to maintain biodiversity.

Connectivity is an essential component of biodiversity. Isolated populations of animals and plants are at risk of destruction or of simply ‘dying out’. Wildlife Corridors aim to re-connect populations and habitats within parishes and more widely. Two potential wildlife corridors have been identified during the preparation of this Plan.

---

**POLICY ENV X: BIODIVERSITY AND WILDLIFE CORRIDORS** – All development proposals will be expected to safeguard locally significant habitats and species, especially those protected by relevant English and European legislation, and, where possible, to create new habitats for wildlife.

Development proposals should not damage or adversely affect the wildlife corridors identified on the map below.

---

**COMMUNITY ACTION ENV X: BIODIVERSITY** do you want this C.A.?
a) The Parish Council in conjunction with other bodies will maintain the environmental inventory list of known sites of biodiversity interest prepared for this Plan;

b) The Parish Council will work with community groups, landowners, funders and other organisations to enhance the biodiversity of the Parish by creating and/or managing habitat sites (e.g. wildflower meadows, woodland, wetland) on suitable parcels of land.

Fig. x: Wildlife corridors

5. Buildings and structures of local significance

LISTED BUILDINGS

29 buildings and structures in the Plan Area have statutory protection through Listing at Grade II* or II. The Neighbourhood Plan lists them for reference, and to note that new development will be required to take into account their settings as defined, on a case by case basis, by Historic England.
LIST WILL PROBABLY BE MOVED TO AN APPENDIX, WITH X-REF HERE
LIST, TO FOLLOW
Source: https://www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/

LOCAL LIST

Based on guidance from Historic England, the Plan identifies a number of other buildings and structures in the built environment of Ab Kettleby, Holwell and Wartnaby that are considered to be of high local significance for architectural, historical or social reasons. Their inclusion here records them as non-designated heritage assets to be taken into account by the Planning system.

USE/ADAPT THIS AS A PROFORMA IF DOING A LOCAL LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[BUILDING/STRUCTURE NAME]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rarity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetic value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidential value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic association</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archaeological interest</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Designed landscapes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landmark status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social and communal value</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. X Local List for Ab Kettleby: buildings and structures of local significance PLACEHOLDER – MAY NEED 3 MAPS AT VILLAGE SCALE
POLICY ENV x: THE SETTINGS OF DESIGNATED AND NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS – Development proposals will be expected to safeguard the settings of Listed Buildings and other heritage assets in the Plan Area.

COMMUNITY ACTION ENV X: BUILT ENVIRONMENT: NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS – The structures and buildings listed here (map above) are non-designated heritage assets. They are locally important for their contribution to the layout and characteristic mix of architectural styles in the village, and their features and settings will be protected wherever possible. The general societal value of a development proposal, or of a change of land use requiring planning approval, will need to be judged against their significance as heritage assets.
6. Ridge and Furrow

The three villages of which the Plan Area is comprised are ancient townships, each of them founded between the 7th and 9th centuries and having been separate ‘estates’, each with a settlement and surrounding farmland, throughout the medieval period. For much of this time the farmland was managed as open fields, using a system of crop, fallow and livestock rotation. The fields were huge, but were subdivided into lands of manageable size and according to the lie of the land. Cultivation was by ox-drawn, non-reversible ploughs: ploughing up and down a field from year to year tended to throw the soil into substantial ridges, with deep furrows between them. Although an inevitable result of the plough design, ridge and furrow was also helpful because it improved drainage on the heavy soils of Midland England. Over the many centuries, the open fields became permanently sculpted into a patchwork of corrugated ploughlands.

The open field system ended with the Enclosures – Wartnaby in ?1764, Ab Kettleby in ???? and Holwell in ?????. Land ownership and rights were amended (often in favour of the largest property owners in the townships), the fields were divided with hedges, and the previous arable fields were converted to permanent grass. Whatever the social effect of this change, for the landscape it meant that the ridge and furrow topography became ‘fossilised’ under the grass.

A second agricultural revolution began in the mid-20th century. Ridge and furrow was destroyed as the grasslands were ploughed for conversion back to (increasingly intensive) arable production. Since 1940, between 85% and 100% of ridge and furrow per parish has been lost nationally².

In the Plan Area the extent of surviving ridge and furrow was surveyed (Google Earth and fieldwork) between June and September 2017 as part of the preparation of this Plan. Of the total of 356 parcels of open land, 46 (13%) still have well-preserved ridge and furrow; by area this is about 107 ha (8%) of the c.1290 ha of undeveloped land.

In English legislation ridge and furrow fields (except for the few that are Scheduled Monuments) are not statutorily protected, despite a recognition that “as the open field system was once commonplace in NW Europe, these [surviving] sites take on an international importance” (Catchpole and Priest, 2012).

Individual fields in the Plan Area are not claimed to be of international importance, but the well-preserved groups are important in their own right and valued by the local community. Any further, avoidable, loss would be irreversibly detrimental. Historic England strongly recommends treating all surviving ridge and furrow as

---

² Catchpole and Priest, 2012. *Turning the Plough Update Assessment (Midland open fields: landscape character and proposals for management)*. English Heritage and Gloucestershire County Council
non-designated heritage assets, and this is the approach taken in this Plan. However, involvement with local farmers and agricultural landowners on a case-by-case basis will be necessary to achieve a sustainable balance between the historic environment heritage and viable agriculture.

Fig. ENV X: Surviving Ridge and Furrow in Ab Kettleby is a non-designated heritage asset

POLICY ENV X: RIDGE AND FURROW – The areas of ridge and furrow earthworks mapped above (Fig. ENV X) are non-designated heritage assets.

Any loss or damage arising from a development proposal (or a change of land use requiring planning permission) is to be avoided; the demonstrable benefits of such development must be balanced against the significance of the ridge and furrow features as heritage assets. In cases where development can be shown to be essential in principle, alternative (i.e. without ridge and furrow) development sites will be selected.
7. Important Views INCOMPLETE

Consultation during the Neighbourhood Plan’s preparation identified a widely-held wish to protect Ab Kettleby’s rural setting, and its relationship with the surrounding farmland and the wider landscape, including its position xxxx………

One of the main ways in which residents expressed this wish was by describing a number of highly-valued views within the village and toward it from the surrounding countryside. These questionnaire/consultation findings were supported by the environmental inventory, which although principally aimed at identifying sites of environmental significance also confirmed the sight-lines of the suggested views and mapped them (below, figure x). There may be too many especially when Wartnaby is added

Fig. X: Important views. See text for explanation INCOMPLETE PLACEHOLDER
8. Public Rights of Way

General intro text – the current situation and any problems/challenges (access, maintenance – LCC and/or local volunteers)

Aspirations, if any

Fig. ENV xx Rights of Way in Ab Kettleby [MAP]

POLICY ENVx: FOOTPATHS AND BRIDLEWAYS - Development proposals that result in the loss of, or have a significant adverse effect on, the existing network of footpaths and bridleways will not be supported.

Any change from the existing rural character of a path or track, including its incorporation into a new development as a paved sidewalk or restricted-width alleyway, will be considered to be an ‘adverse effect’.

COMMUNITY ACTION ENVx: FOOTPATHS AND BRIDLEWAYS - The Parish Council will work with landowners, Leicestershire County Council, community groups and other bodies to achieve enhancements to the present network of walking routes in the Parish.

[TO ADD: OPTIONAL MAP INDICATING GENERAL DIRECTION(S) OF NEW ROUTE(S)]

Please provide rough if wanted
9. Environmental considerations in development

Residents in the Plan Area want their communities to play their part in the sustainable development of the District. As noted in the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Authorities should, through their policies, contribute as fully as possible to the aims of *Biodiversity 2020* DEFRA, 2011. New development in Ab Kettleby should be designed to incorporate the current (at time of Application) best practice standards and methods for biodiversity protection and enhancement.

[OPTIONAL] Building standards for energy efficiency and environmentally-friendly construction and materials are dealt with in Policies Hx and Hxx.

This policy can be included here or incorporated with other ‘building standards’ issues in the Housing chapter

**POLICY ENV X: BIODIVERSITY PROTECTION IN NEW DEVELOPMENT** – Provision should be made in the design and construction of new development in the Plan Area to protect and enhance biodiversity, including:

- Roof and wall construction following technical best-practice recommendations for integral bird nest boxes and bat breeding and roosting sites
- Hedges (or fences with ground-level gaps) for property boundaries that maintain connectivity of habitat for hedgehogs
- Security lighting operated by intruder switching, not on constantly. Site and sports facility lighting to be switched off during ‘curfew’ hours between March and October, following best practice guidelines in *Bats and Lighting* LRERC 2014. Maximum light spillage onto bat foraging corridors should be 1 lux.
10. Renewable energy generation infrastructure

[FOR DISCUSSION – Intro text will follow]

THIS IS A DRAFT ALL-OPTIONS EXAMPLE Does Ab Kettleby WANT to have a locally specific NP policy on this topic?

POLICY ENV xx: RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION INFRASTRUCTURE
1. Renewable energy generation infrastructure will be supported if the proposal can demonstrate that it:
   i. will not have an adverse impact (including, *inter alia*, noise, visual impact, reflections, glare, shadow flicker, water pollution, smell, air quality, gaseous or particulate emissions) on the health, wellbeing or amenities of residents and visitors
   ii. will not have an adverse impact on the area in relation to views or the character of the surrounding landscape
   iii. will not have an adverse effect on biodiversity (species and habitat sites, as in Policy ENV x)
   iv. will not have an adverse effect on statutory or significant historic environment sites, non-designated heritage assets or ridge and furrow (Policies ENV x and x)
   v. will be of an appropriate scale for the size, character and level of other facilities, the built environment and services in the three villages
   v. will be supported by appropriate and relevant assessments and documentation in respect of, *inter alia*, transport, heritage, archaeology, landscape impact, environmental impact, flood impact, ecological mitigation, arboriculture (impact and method) and tree protection.

2. Wind turbine development proposals will only be acceptable if:
   - Turbine tip height is less than 25 metres
   - The proposal is for no more than one turbine

3. Large-scale solar energy generation development proposals will not be supported if:
   - The ground area covered by panels does not exceed 625m² (25mx25m)
   - The panel array is not visible from any valued and accessible viewpoint (see Policy ENV x), or from any private or residential property
   - Reflection (glare) is not evident from any viewpoint

4. Small-scale, local resident, business, amenity or community-initiated, solar and wind generation infrastructure will be supported, subject to the conditions in paragraphs 1 to 3 above and in Policy ENV x.
11. Flood Risk

[General intro text, describing the current situation and noting any problem locations/areas.]

Aspirations/solutions…

![Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (Environment Agency mapping)](image)

[If relevant or needed]

**POLICY ENV x: FLOOD RISK**

Every development proposal for two or more new buildings and/or on a site of greater than 100m² in the Plan Area will be required to demonstrate that:

a) The development and its occupants are safe from flooding for its lifetime;

b) Its location takes geology, hydrology and flood risk into account;

c) Its design includes, as appropriate, sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), surface water management measures and permeable surfaces; and

d) It does not increase the risk of flooding to third parties.

**COMMUNITY ACTION ENV x: FLOOD RISK**

The Parish Council and local community will support proposals by landowners, appropriate agencies and organisations to improve the current infrastructural measures in the Parish for managing and mitigating river, run-off and surface water flooding.