

Page	Policy	Comment
17		At least one development proposal would undermine local businesses and make Maisemore's 'Service Village' classification unsustainable
18	HOU1	Strongly support
19	HOU2	Strongly support
20	HOU3	Strongly support
21	HOU4	Strongly support
21	HOU5	OK
22	HOU6	Strongly support
23	HOU7	Strongly support
23	HOU8	<p>This policy needs strengthening in order to prevent larger scale development jeopardising the characteristics of individual settlements, particularly smaller villages. Maisemore is typified by single or very small groups of houses with a very wide range of types and materials and these characteristics are threatened by developments in excess of 8 dwellings. Even at this size, the dwellings should be varied in size and style. To meet the requirement for 556 houses over 20 years spread over 12 service villages, permitted developments should only be in single figures in any one year. As it stands, this policy opens the door to larger 'bolt-on' estates of standard housing, and does not encourage the small scale 'organic' growth that would retain the character of the village.</p> <p>This might best be achieved by allocating land to self-build, which is supported by the government. There is a significant need for building plots in this sector, and the resulting variety of house types would sustain the village character.</p> <p>Neither of the proposed allocation sites in Maisemore is suitable for development in the near future, as the drainage and sewerage system in the village is at capacity. Site A is incorrectly described as adjacent to Uplands Nursing Home. In fact it is adjacent to Maisemore Village Hall. This site is below the level of the main sewerage system in the village, so development would require separate sewage treatment or a pumping station.</p> <p>The proposed allocation breaches the existing village boundary, and there is no evidence of housing demand in the parish to require such a change.</p> <p>Site B – land to the south of Rectory Farm – also breaches the village boundary, and there is no evidence of housing need within the village to justify that. The sewerage issue for this site might be addressed by laying a new sewer directly to the existing pumping station, which might also be used to divert the sewers from Persh Way and Persh Lane, so alleviating some of the problems further down the village.</p> <p>Development on this site would do serious harm to two existing businesses in the village, forcing the closure of one of them. There would then need to be a review of whether Maisemore could continue to be classified as a service village.</p> <p>The largest single development in Maisemore to date has been 8 dwellings. There is no evidence of a local housing need to justify larger developments, which would significantly alter the nature of the settlement.</p>
25	HOU9	The existing village boundary for Maisemore is satisfactory and leaves scope for the small scale piecemeal development that typifies the settlement. There is no local housing need evidence to justify extending the settlement boundary.
27	GTTS1	Not relevant to Maisemore
28	GTTS2	Not relevant to Maisemore
31	IRC1	Support, although no need identified for Maisemore
34	TRAC1	While this is supported in principle, Maisemore has no street lighting, but there is also no 'village centre' in which to provide cycle parking.
35	TRAC2	While this is supported in principle, Maisemore has no 'village centre' to which access needs to be improved. This absence does raise questions about Maisemore's classification as a 'service village'.

35	TRAC3	Strongly supported. Maisemore does not have a bus service that would enable residents to travel to work by bus
35	TRAC4	Supported but ot relevant to Maisemore
36	TRAC5	Strongly support
37	TRAC6	Strongly support, but not relevant for Maisemore
37	TRAC7	Support
37	TRAC8	Not relevant to Maisemore
38	TRAC9	Support, but not relevant to Maisemore
39	TRAC10	Support, but principle should be extended to the whole Borough, not just the town
39	TRAC11	Support, but not relevant to Maisemore
41	RCN1	Strongly support
42	RCN2	Support, but Maisemore has no street lighting and any floodlighting would be unwelcome
43	RCN3	Strongly support. One of the proposed housing allocations would force the closure of a livery stables business in Maisemore.
44	RCN4	Strongly support
46	EMP1	Support, but not relevant to Maisemore
47	EMP2	Strongly support
47	EMP3	Strongly support
48	EMP4	Strongly support
48	EMP5	Strongly support
49	TOR1	Strongly support
49	TOR2	Strongly support
51	TOR3	Strongly support
52	RET1	Supported, but Maisemore has no shops
53	RET2	Supported, though not relevant to Maisemore
54	RET3	Strongly support
55	RET4	Strongly supported, although Maisemore has no shops
55	RET5	Support
56	RET6	Strongly support
59	DES1	Support
60	HER1	Strongly support, though not relevant to Maisemore
61	HER2	Strongly support, though not relevant to Maisemore
61	HER3	Strongly support
62	HER4	Strongly support
63	HER5	Strongly support, though not relevant to Maisemore
63	HER6	Strongly support, though not relevant to Maisemore
65	EVT1	Support, though not relevant to Maisemore
66	ENV1	Strongly support, though not relevant to Maisemore
68	ENV2	Strongly support
69	ENV3	Strongly support
70	ENV4	Strongly support
70	ENV5	Strongly support
71	ENV6	Strongly support. This policy could be strengthened to include restriction of development on existing orchards – as for allotment sites in policy RCN4
73 et seq		Maisemore PC supports the monitoring targets