



EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE
COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF MELTON

PARKSIDE, STATION APPROACH, BURTON STREET, MELTON MOWBRAY

15 FEBRUARY 2012

PRESENT

Councillors A. Freer (Mayor)
P.M. Baguley, M.W. Barnes, G.E. Botterill
G. Bush, P.M. Chandler, P. Cumbers, J. Douglas, S. Dungworth
M. Gordon, M.C.R. Graham MBE, E. Holmes, L. Horton, E. Hutchison
J. Illingworth, S. Lumley, V.J. Manderson, T. Moncrieff, J. Moulding
M. O'Callaghan, J.T. Orson, P.M. Posnett, J.B. Rhodes
M.R. Sheldon, J. Simpson, N. Slater, D.R. Wright, J. Wyatt

Chief Executive
Strategic Director (KA), Strategic Director (CM)
Head of Communities and Neighbourhoods, Head of Regulatory Services
Principal Policy Officer,
Senior Democracy Officer

At the start of the meeting, the Mayor welcomed the large public audience to the meeting and apologised to those having to stand and that it would be understood if they needed to leave before the end. She asked for silence during the meeting and for mobiles to be turned off. She explained that if there was any noise or other interruption during the meeting she would adjourn the meeting to enable any individual or part of the public gallery to be removed. She requested that Councillors and Officers switch on their microphone when speaking and bring the microphone towards them when they speak.

CO81. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for late attendance was received from Councillor Barnes.

CO82. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Minute CO83 – Melton Core Strategy

Councillor Rhodes stated that he considered this was the most important decision this Council had to take. Following legal advice he declared a personal and prejudicial interest due to being a County Councillor and also due to being a Member of the Cabinet and being the Lead Member for Property. He further

advised that the County Council owned a farm to the north of Melton Mowbray which would be affected by any urban extension. He declared that he would leave the meeting and therefore would not take part in the debate nor vote on the matter.

Councillor Graham declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of the Sir John Sedley Trust which owned land to the north of the town. He advised that he was the Council nominee and a Trustee of that body therefore he would leave the meeting.

Councillor Orson declared a personal and prejudicial interest due to being a Cabinet Support Member of the Leicestershire County Council. He had received advice to leave the meeting as related matters had been discussed at meetings he had attended.

Councillor Holmes declared a personal and prejudicial interest due to being a local landowner. She apologised to those who had contacted her about the matter that she had not responded and this was due to her interest. She stated that she would leave the meeting.

Councillor Posnett declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest due to being a Member of the Leicestershire County Council and advised that after taking advice she would remain and speak at the meeting.

Councillor O'Callaghan declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest due to being a member of the Detour Action Group. He stated that after taking advice, he would remain and speak at the meeting.

(Councillors Graham, Holmes, Orson and Rhodes here left the meeting).

CO83. MELTON CORE STRATEGY

The Principal Policy Officer

(a) submitted a report on behalf of the Head of Communities and Neighbourhoods which sought

- approval of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document;
- publication of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and associated consultation; and
- the publication of the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment for consultation.

(b) explained the process of the Core Strategy through a powerpoint presentation called 'Melton Core Strategy' a copy of which was appended to these Minutes at Appendix A;

(Councillor Barnes entered the meeting at 6.42 p.m. during the presentation by the Principal Policy Officer.)

The Mayor thanked the Principal Policy Officer for his thorough presentation.

Councillor O'Callaghan proposed a procedural motion to suspend Procedure Rule 13.4 which related to the length of a speech by each Councillor being 5 minutes as this would not be long enough on this important matter.

Councillor Sheldon seconded the motion and on being put to the vote, it was carried.

RESOLVED that Procedure Rule 13.4 be suspended for the duration of the meeting.

Councillor O'Callaghan stated :-

- This meeting was likely to be the most important meeting of this Council in a generation
- The Council's decision would affect the lives and livelihoods of the people of this Borough well beyond the 2026 timeframe outlined in the Core Strategy
- In making a decision, Councillors had to weigh the overall benefit to the Borough of these proposals against the harm it may do to some of its citizens, over 2000 of whom had signed a petition against the Core Strategy
- As Leader of the Labour Group he confirmed that he had not imposed a whip on this debate formally or informally
- When this was last debated in 2009, he was advised by the Solicitor to leave the room and not to participate in the debate
- When he stood for election as Borough Councillor of the Newport Ward last May he knew, that he would be summoned to a Council Meeting to vote on this important issue and he decided then that he could only stand for election if he was prepared to attend this meeting and represent the views of those people whose votes he was seeking and that at that meeting he intended to speak and vote, whatever the consequences
- Everyone knew that more houses were needed to be built. Under the previous Government figures came top down and we were left to accommodate the housing figures we were given. Under the new Government – and he welcomed this – Councils must determine their own housing numbers
- Last year work was started on a Leicestershire Housing Requirements Project. Initial outputs suggested a housing requirement figure of between 135 to 190 homes per annum. This Core Strategy assumed a build rate for the Borough of 170 homes per annum, 35 homes above the lowest in the range – this made 490 homes for the life of the Core Strategy. This could mean half the number of houses proposed for the Sustainable Urban Development (SUE) were unnecessary
- Although more homes were needed there was significant uncertainty as to how many new homes
- The Core Strategy suggested that 80% of the housing should go into the town and only 20% into the Rural Areas. Yet the town represents only 53% of the population. People want to live in the rural areas – the housing waiting list figures clearly show that
- The rate of house building in rural areas also shows it currently has 70 homes per year – 41% of the total homes in the Borough. It seemed therefore perverse to limit rural house building to 20%, half the current rate
- In doing so the Council risked allowing villages to die, and young people being

forced to move away. He felt villages needed houses to sustain services and keep local people

- If the current building rate continued, in 7 years time the 20% rural quota would be reached and so building would stop. There would then be an embargo on building more houses in the rural areas for at least 7 years. He considered this unsustainable and open to legal challenge
- Rather than allow dispersed development around the town so as to minimise their impact on any one area, the Core Strategy groups them together into a development of 1000 homes and attempts to alleviate the damage that this would cause through a contribution towards infrastructure
- With regard to the bypass he recalled the meeting in the Cattle Market where the Leader of the County Council had promised his first priority was for a bypass for Melton. Several bypasses had opened in and around the County all with Government funding – but nothing for Melton in the past few years. Worse still the current County local transport plan which runs to 2026 does not contain a suggestion of a government funded bypass for Melton Mowbray
- He had written to George Osborne, the Chancellor, before Christmas asking, since he was giving out money for road schemes, if there was any chance of money for a Melton Bypass – he was referred back to the County Council and so drew the conclusion there was no prospect of Government money
- The County Council budget for the next few years is to be approved by next week and makes no mention of any funding towards major road schemes in Melton Mowbray. Yet Leicestershire County Council as a major landowner stood to benefit significantly from the SUE
- He considered there would be no funding towards a Melton Bypass from Government or County until way after 2026 and so traffic congestion would continue
- The Northern SUE delivered between the Nottingham Road and Spinney Lane a short piece of road of 40 degrees just 15% of a complete ring road to alleviate the problems caused by the 1,000 houses of the SUE and no more
- It was not a bypass or relief road, the traffic it would take would mainly be that from the SUE estate
- A suggestion had been made that one day the £4m link between Melton Spinney Road and the Thorpe Road might be completed but he asked who will pay for this? He considered the developers, Government and County Council would not and the Borough Council could not
- He considered the reality was that this link would not be in place until well after 2026
- Even the ability of the SUE to fund the small piece of road in the Core Strategy and other elements regarded as essential for the SUE may be coming into question
- The developers including Leicestershire County Council in their additional comments stated and he quoted *“More consideration will need to be given to the overall level of development that will be required to allow viable development to come forward. Consideration should be given to allowing additional land above the 1,000 houses to be allocated which will provide a greater degree of flexibility once the overall scheme viability is being tested.”*
- In other words the sums may not stack up. He believed the day would come when the developers would turn round and say 1000 houses would not pay for 30% affordable housing, a road, primary school, health facilities and all the other £20m essential items that were wanted from the SUE. And if the Housing Requirements figure for the Borough was reduced by 490 as suggested earlier

then this would put all of the infrastructure at risk

- Meanwhile all the traffic generated by the SUE would come into town down the Scalford Road, Melton Spinney Road and Nottingham Road generating extra traffic and congestion without any prospect of a bypass to alleviate this extra traffic until well after 2026
- He considered that the SUE would cause chaos not relieve it
- The transport study estimated that without the link to Thorpe Road, the traffic from the SUE and he quoted “*will generate a requirement for significant improvement works to Melton Spinney Road estimated cost £3m*”
- Therefore he asked who was going to pay for this £3m and also for the millions necessary to adapt Scalford Road and Nottingham Road as well. He considered the developers would not, nor the county council, nor the borough council and added that the Core Strategy was silent on this point
- He reiterated that the SUE would cause significant problems on the three Northern feeder roads into the town centre adding to rather than reducing congestion in the town, without any relief until well after 2026. He suggested at least 15 years of congestion in the town which is why there was the slogan: No Bypass – No Homes
- Most people who don’t work in Melton work in Leicester so why put the housing in the North?
- The employment land in the Core Strategy would be located in the South West of the Town, so why put the housing in the North?
- The spare school places are in the South of the town – so why put the housing in the North?
- The most significant adverse environmental and landscape impact is in the North – so why put the housing in the North?
- He was not proposing a Southern SUE but it was clearly illogical to site the development in the North
- There was another way and this was provided for in the new Government’s Localism Act which had just been passed by parliament
- This was also suggested by the Core Strategy which proposed that housing other than the SUE might contribute towards infrastructure, such as roads, through the Government’s new Community Infrastructure Levy, the CIL
- The old Section 106 was to be abolished to be replaced by the CIL and in doing so it did not matter where the housing went as a levy on each new house built could contribute towards infrastructure such as a road
- Therefore if the additional houses were dispersed around the town in small groups, not only would the Council not have to waste valuable infrastructure levy towards schools or mitigating the environmental impact but the Council would have more money towards a relief road for Melton
- Therefore there was uncertainty about the figures for the housing requirement for the Borough which would be resolved in the near future through the ongoing Leicestershire Housing Requirement Project
- He restated there was uncertainty about the funding of the missing section of what should be a Northern relief road
- There was uncertainty from the developers about the ability of the 1000 houses to pay for the infrastructure that were deemed essential for the SUE
- It was uncertain who would fund the several millions to fund the necessary road improvements to Melton Spinney Road and in all likelihood the Scalford Road and Nottingham Road
- With so much uncertainty he was not prepared to vote in favour at this moment in time for the Core Strategy which was why he wanted to propose a delay in

considering the Strategy and the need for further work until October 2012

- Much of the work on the Core Strategy documents date from 2005, 7 years ago. The economic climate had markedly shifted since then, the political climate had also changed dramatically as well as the membership of the Council therefore he considered the Core Strategy should reflect these changes
- Further the New Government's localism bill gave the Council new opportunities in terms of planning not just on the CIL but on other elements which the Council should consider before rushing to approve what was already an out of date document
- The officers had identified 2 main risks – first the planning regime may change and the Government may introduce the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This may mean that some core documents may need to be rewritten, take more time and so may cost more money
- He wanted to get it right rather than sign up for a development that could, if the Council got it wrong, blight the lives of thousands of people in this Borough for years to come
- The second risk was for a developer to put in an application for a large scale development before the revised work that he was suggesting was completed. He doubted this would be the case as he considered most developers would wait the additional six months or so for the Council to approve its Core Strategy and apply for development consistent with this. In any case the Council would request officers to work speedily to identify at least 5 years housing land supply;
- In summary he considered uncertainty in the housing numbers and also the mix between rural and town, uncertainty in the deliverability of all the infrastructure needed from 1,000 houses cited by the developers, no prospect of a bypass until well after 2026 and no answer as to who would pay for the millions the documents identify as necessary to upgrade the Melton Spinney Road and he believed the Scalford and Nottingham Roads
- There had been a changed economic and political environment as well as a new Council. There was the Localism Bill with its new opportunities for an infrastructure levy on housing development around the town without the need for a SUE, and there were new ways of developing local plans identified in the Act
- The Core Strategy needed further work. The Core Strategy would set the direction of planning in the Borough for a generation so he urged Councillors to get it right.

Motion

Councillor O'Callaghan proposed the following motion :-

Council notes

That councils need to determine their own housing requirement figures and the uncertainty in the future housing requirements for the Borough of Melton
The ongoing work on the Leicestershire Housing Requirement Project
That initial outputs suggest a range for the borough of between 135 and 190 homes per year
That the lower rate would suggest half the houses for the SUE would be unnecessary
That the proposed requirement of 20% for the rural areas is half the current build rate
That there is virtually no prospect of Government or County funding for major road infrastructure in Melton Mowbray in the foreseeable future to mitigate

against traffic congestion

That there are concerns from developers including Leicestershire County Council about the affordability and profitability of the SUE infrastructure with just 1,000 homes

The additional cost of upgrading the Melton Spinney Road (£3m) and others not costed for in the SUE proposals

The new Community Infrastructure Levy in the Localism Act

The new opportunities to develop planning the Localism Act

The changed economic and political landscape since many of the core documents were written

Council notes the Core Strategy and accompanying documents

Council resolves to request the Rural, Economic and Environmental Affairs Committee and Melton Local Development Framework Task Group to work speedily with officers on resolving the uncertainties outlined above and to finalise these into a report by the end of October at the latest for a decision by Council soon after.

Councillor Dungworth seconded the motion.

Councillor Chandler stated :-

- National Policy now required local authorities to maintain a continuous 5 year supply of deliverable sites for housing.
- The Council believed that it had a 5 year supply but this was being challenged by a developer at a Public Inquiry at Bottesford next week. National guidelines stated that where a 5 year supply could not be demonstrated, planning applications could be very difficult to refuse and not have the decision overturned at appeal
- The Council also could face the real prospect of losing the other significant benefits of controlled development ie. a ring road.
- There were several issues which made the North more favourable than the South, mainly infrastructure costs
- Currently applications were being determined with reference to 'Saved' policies from the 1996/2006 Local Plan
- She referred to Councillor O'Callaghan's statement about building more houses in the rural areas by stating that almost all villages had had infill to the extent that it was becoming impossible to fit any further dwellings in
- The approval of the Core Strategy was vital, as without it developers would want to build houses everywhere

Councillor Posnett stated :-

- This was a very important decision for the Council that would affect people long after 2026
- The Council had a vision for the Borough and for this to work a by-pass was needed and Melton's County Councillors were working hard on this
- One difficulty was that Melton was a crossroads and had a river and a railway line to cross which made the cost of any by-pass very expensive
- She was hopeful that the Council had the money for the extension from the A607 (Grantham Road) to Spinney Road and the County Council's Officers

were also preparing the business plan to present to the Government

- Leicestershire County Council was working hard on behalf of the Borough
- This was one of the hardest decisions she had had to make
- After reading the Core Strategy documents, speaking with residents and reading numerous letters and emails she had received against the proposal she stated that she could not support the Core Strategy for the following reasons :-
 - There was not the infrastructure to cope with the increased traffic
 - The road network was not adequate especially in the north of the Borough to cope with the development
 - The proposed new residents would have to drive through the town to access the hospital, GP Surgery, Supermarkets, leisure facilities and employment thereby adding to the current congestion
 - The effect of the lack of infrastructure would be felt throughout the Borough therefore this was not a ward issue but a Borough issue and would affect people shopping in Melton
 - The Melton Times poll result was 60% of residents said no to the development without a bypass
 - The developer consortium had already started to dictate its terms, and 1000 houses was now 1400 to make the SUE viable
 - The proposed Country Park extension being surrounded by houses and a road system would cut off the corridor to the open countryside and the access to wildlife
 - The proposal would reduce the hydrology in the Country Park
 - The 2009 decision stated that a northern SUE would need extensive mitigation measures eg. Sustainability, landscape, flooding, listed building, country park and she did not believe these items had been costed, and as even the basics are at risk of developer delivery, these items would prove to be unaffordable
 - Due to the uncertainty of the mitigation measures being deliverable in this economic climate, Councillors could not be sure what they were voting for
 - On Localism and the Big Society where residents are meant to have their say, she felt this was not happening and asked when this debate would take place that residents could have a say in shaping the place where they live
- After reading the documents, reading and replying to all the emails and documents against the proposal, she stated that she was elected to represent the views of the electorate and had not seen one email to support the proposal, hence her decision

Councillor Illingworth stated :-

- He had received lots of correspondence and information on this matter
- The Council needed to get this right and balance opinions, fears and concerns against the facts for the greater good
- In balancing these matters, he had not put any weight on his own personal circumstances and would accept what people thought of him due to his decision
- It would be easy to dismiss objectors as NIMBYS but that would be an insult to many genuine, sincere and committed people even if their opinions were considered misguided
- This was the Core Strategy not just the SUE to the north of Melton but the SUE was the biggest single feature of it
- 2000 people had signed up their opposition and against the Borough's

population was this enough to vote the strategy through and offer reassurances and promises that would make it work for them? He thought not

- He questioned rejecting the plan and whether it would set the Council back and in future this could find the Council in a difficult position when dealing with planning applications
- On voting, he considered Councillors must have an opinion and show it
- He considered the Council needed a Core Strategy, but he had sufficient doubt as to whether the one before them was right for the Borough and whether it was acceptable to the people of Melton
- He stated that he would support those people who were against the SUE at the vote

Councillor Sheldon asked a question of the Principal Policy Officer as follows :-

On housing supply, an appeal for more housing had been lost at Loughborough Road, Asfordby. If the strategy was delayed until October, what would be the implications if the Council did not approve it?

The Principal Policy Officer responded :-

The Council had lost a challenge to land supply in Asfordby and also faced a Public Inquiry in the forthcoming week when the Council would be defending its land supply again. He could not comment on the outcome of the Inquiry as this was unknown. In the absence of a Core Strategy it was becoming more difficult to manage land supply as time goes by. The Council had been managing its land supply since the Loughborough Road Public Inquiry but he believed that the Council would almost certainly not be able to identify a 5 year land supply within 2 years. However, the risks increase as each site we currently have gets developed.

Councillor O'Callaghan asked for a point of clarification on the response :-

Was there a risk if the Council had enough land for 5 years over the next 3 year period?

The Principal Policy Officer responded :-

He did not know the outcome of the Public Inquiry which might give us an answer on that point. He believed the land supply would be critical beyond 2 years, over the period to the point land supply became absolute the risks would increase and the challenges with it. Nevertheless, he advised that the Council had identified a 5 year land supply at the moment.

Councillor Lumley stated :-

- He would be voting against the Core Strategy and the SUE to the north of the town
- He had not taken this decision lightly and had listened intently and taken the time to weigh up all sides of the argument
- There were many reasons he would vote against the strategy as both a Councillor representing the Newport Ward and as a resident
- He thanked the officers for their work on the Core Strategy
- He paid tribute to the Melton North Action Group and the residents who had taken time to contact him with their concerns

- One of the reasons for voting against the strategy was to support the overwhelming majority of residents living north of the town who were questioning the preferred SUE option
- He referred to the lack of guaranteed improvement to the local road infrastructure to support the new development and the only confirmed part of the road was from Nottingham Road to Melton Spinney Road which residents had described as a road to nowhere
- This road would not alleviate traffic on Scalford Road, Thorpe Road and Nottingham Road
- Scalford Road had already been confirmed to be over-capacity by the LCC Highways Section and was never designed for the amount of current traffic flow
- The increase in traffic created by even the first phase of development would require any by-pass elements to be in place first
- It had taken him up to 45 minutes to get from the top of Scalford Road to the town centre on many occasions
- With Sainsbury's coming and the planned development next to it on Nottingham Road, there would be an increase in traffic in this area
- The Council had commissioned 3 traffic reports and none had been sufficient to clearly define where the SUE should be
- Residents had overwhelmingly stated that there needed to be road infrastructure in place before any other development took place
- He understood that it was not viable for the developer consortium to build their target of 40% affordable homes as part of a 1000 home development therefore without increasing the level of building to 1300-1400 homes they could not deliver the facilities that were required and were promised
- This is 30-40% increase in size with a knock on effect to the already overstressed road infrastructure
- The main reason for the need for the housing had always been as a way of reducing the Council's housing waiting list, the majority of who on this list were homeless and the rest waiting to make their first step on the property ladder
- The whole premise of the SUE was providing accessible housing to these people and in doing so supplying suitable housing to both cut housing demand and generally making a contribution towards curbing UK-wide inflationary increases in house prices
- Without the delivery of the 1000 home development, the whole plan would be flawed
- It was Conservative central government office's policy not to have large housing estates but smaller ones and to build where the opportunity existed on brown-field land
- There were alternative sites in Melton
- Concerned about building on a known floodplain and would not wish to see homes and livelihoods ruined by flooded homes and buildings
- Any new development could cause flooding in the Country Park which would affect wildlife and the investment of hundreds of hours of voluntary labour
- He understood there was a duty to provide land for travellers but how would houses sell that were in close proximity to such a site

Councillor Sheldon asked a question of the Principal Policy Officer as follows :-

In relation to Councillor O'Callaghan's motion, would it be possible to do the work required and bring the report back to the Council in October 2012?

The Principal Policy Officer responded :-

Community Infrastructure Levy and using the Levy to deliver a road at Melton Mowbray was dependant on a Core Strategy. Some areas were also outside of the Council's gift to resolve. Funding could be explored and judgements would need to be made about the impact of not having a Core Strategy in place. He considered that with existing resources, and dependant on how much other work was required before October the Council could struggle to deliver the items on the list.

Councillor Wright stated :-

- He supported the Core Strategy
- To not approve it would leave the Council open to challenge
- The Council needed to be in charge and in control
- To not approve the Strategy would make the Council weak
- There was a 6 week consultation period to review the issues raised
- He pointed out a flooding reference on Page 74 of the ENTEC report relating to Bottesford that needed to be reviewed

Amendment

Councillor Sheldon proposed an amendment which included the recommendations in the report 2.1–2.5 with two additional recommendations as follows :-

2.6 That this Council identifies appropriate resources to maximise the potential for full implementation of the road infrastructure identified in the Core Strategy, with a focus on seeking, as a priority, investment and funding for those elements which are not directly attributable to the Sustainable Urban Extension.

2.7 For a strategic project to be initiated and coordinated to report best efforts at regular intervals to the Rural, Environmental and Economic Affairs Committee.

Councillor Chandler seconded the amendment.

Councillor Wyatt stated :-

- As a Ward Councillor for the Sysonby Ward he had received many emails on all aspects of the Core Strategy but mainly relating to the road
- This was a Melton distributor road and was not just a Leicestershire County Council matter, it was driven by Melton
- Unless the bypass was built, the houses would not get planning permission as no Councillor would vote for houses without getting the new road secured
- This road needed to be in place in the near future and he was confident it would happen
- New fire and ambulance stations were to be built
- On the Council Tax bill, the Police precept amount was more than to run all the Borough Council's services together
- He referred to Councillor O'Callaghan's speech and previous Labour support for the Northern Bypass

- He would vote for the Core Strategy

Councillor O'Callaghan as a point of explanation stated that he was sorry that the matter had become political. He stated that as advised he had left the Council Meeting in 2009 so did not vote when the matter was last considered and that of the other two Labour Councillors at the time, both did not vote in favour. He stated that each Councillor in the Labour Group would make their own decision at that meeting as to how to vote.

Councillor Cumbers referred to Councillor Lumley's comment relating to travellers and explained that legally land must be allocated for travellers and they too need to access local schools. The Council had a responsibility to ensure that such sites were properly maintained and could not cause problems.

On a point of clarification, Councillor Lumley explained that it was potential house buyers who would not want to buy a house there. He stated that he was in favour of more housing but the location of the SUE was in the wrong place.

On a point of personal explanation, Councillor Cumbers stated that some may not want to buy a home near travellers, this was a matter of opinion but they were part of our population and must be accepted as such.

Councillor Manderson stated :-

- She had thought long and hard about the proposal and the Core Strategy
- She had received lots of emails from people who were concerned
- It was a huge decision for the Council and it needed to be looked at as a whole
- She understood residents were concerned
- The SUE was new if the Council did not put this Core Strategy in place, it would have no control over development
- It was essential it went through at this meeting
- When it comes to the masterplan there would be further consultation
- It would be dangerous and short sighted not to put in place the Core Strategy
- She would be voting for the Core Strategy

Councillor Dungworth stated :-

- He had received lots of emails from people who were concerned but his internet line had been cut in the road near his home and therefore he could not respond
- He considered that the debate had been good and non-political
- He congratulated the Principal Policy Officer and Management Team on the report and all the work leading up to it
- He considered that certain areas needed to be looked at again and the Core Strategy should not be rushed through at this meeting
- He thought the Strategy was pretty good but not as good as it could be
- The risks that had been explained needed to be accepted
- Balancing against the risks, the motion was the best option and there was a 5 year supply of housing land
- If we delay, the strategy could be polished to be something the Council was proud of and could live with for the next 40-50 years
- He would not be voting for the Core Strategy at this meeting

Councillor Simpson stated :-

- The Core Strategy contained a suite of 25 policies of which the 'SUE to the north' was only one of them, number 23
- The detail of the SUE would be in the Masterplan, and those details would emerge through consultation
- 9 out of 10 of the objections/concerns received by email were mainly based on misinformation, and had been picked out to whip up public support, eg.
 - There would be 3400 houses in the north on a flood plain
 - The Council was looking to ruin or destroy the Country Park
- The Sue was very emotive
- The proposal would increase the Country Park by 10 hectares and protect it with a buffer. There were no plans to destroy the Country Park
- The overriding factor or common denominator was the road infrastructure, or apparent lack of it. But it was there, in the draft Core Strategy
- The Council was listening to different views and understood that the public present at the meeting did not want the houses without the infrastructure, including safety issues on Scafford Road
- She was familiar with the Melton Local Development Framework (MLDF) and the Leicester and Leicestershire Integrated Traffic Model (LLITM) report. The report stated that the current identified developer funded road (Nottingham Road to Spinney Road) was sufficient to mitigate the development, but she felt it needed to be farther reaching than that and go from the A607 Leicester Road to A607 Grantham Road (upgrading St Bartholomew's Way and Welby Road to Asfordby Hill)
- Delaying for a few months as suggested by Councillor O'Callahan was not going to change whether it was north or south. This was decided upon and voted for at Full Council a few years ago. It would leave the Council vulnerable, as she had seen with appeals at Development Committee meetings. The old Core strategy 'saved policies', were currently used, in the absence of an up to date Core Strategy
- However the Core Strategy was based on what people had asked for – there were no comments from the south of the town which was not unexpected
- If the decision was to build the SUE in the south, she guaranteed that there would be a petition of over 2000 signatures against it, and a packed meeting here tonight from the South
- Where a lot of the houses in the north of Melton stood and where some of the objectors lived, was once green fields
- The preference of having all the houses in one area, with facilities, another school, footpaths etc came as a result of consultation
- To have small pockets of housing would not bring with it the infrastructure they wanted
- Councillors had all the information they needed to make a decision at this meeting
- The Council should not go forward without a Core Strategy
- She had drafted the amendment, and Councillors had a copy before them
- The first part, to show that the Council was listening and understood the issues with the current traffic problems. This amendment would ensure that further road infrastructure in addition to that already identified to mitigate the new development, would be pursued as a priority by this Council if the Core Strategy was adopted
- The second part of the amendment was in the spirit of Localism and

transparency. Progress would be reported directly to the Rural, Economic and Environmental Affairs Committee. The minutes of this committee's meetings could be viewed on the Council's website

- The information would be open to the public
- She read out the additional recommendations, 2.6 and 2.7 noted above
- She believed that it was achievable by using the CIL moneys from other smaller developments, and applying for grants and funding
- The Leader was already actively seeking funding
- As a brick was not likely to be laid for possibly another 2 years, whilst the Masterplan was developed, there was some time to work on funding
- Well-designed housing stock was needed. Melton was to be a place that people wanted to live, somewhere that future generations children want to live, and work
- The Borough must grow and move forward, high tech employment opportunities were needed, as well as new business and Industrial facilities, new homes that are well designed and thought out, and with the houses comes infrastructure
- That was why she would vote for the Core Strategy at this meeting

Councillor Cumbers referred to a point of clarification relating to a mis-type she had identified in one of the papers. The Chief Executive advised that this would be taken under delegated authority following the meeting, should the decision be to move forward with the strategy.

Councillor Botterill stated :-

- He would like to see the Core Strategy be approved and go forward
- The recession would not last indefinitely and the Council needed to be ready and prepared to go forward
- He would be voting for the Strategy
- On the road improvements between the A607 and the Spinney Road, the Council could fund this if required as there was money in the kitty

Councillor Moncrieff stated :-

- Thanked everyone for coming
- There was no whip on the vote and he would not be voting with his Leader
- He had been involved in working on the Local Development Framework for the past 4 years
- He had responded personally to most of the objections he'd received, many of which would be dealt with in the next steps as the Masterplan was developed
- He would be fighting for the best deal for Melton out of the Masterplan
- The major problem with delay is that it leaves the Council wide open to challenges as developers seek applications where and how they want and the Council would not be able to defend it
- The Strategy would mean the Council has a say as to where houses go and get the best deal from a co-ordinated effort
- The Council would face considerable risks from 'free for all' applications without an approved strategy

Councillor Slater stated :-

- He supported the Core Strategy and had received many emails too

- He used the Country Park and considered that the Country Park was to be enjoyed by the whole of the Borough and not just those in the north of Melton

The Chief Executive advised that Councillor O'Callaghan, as the proposer of the original motion which had been circulated to the meeting, would now close the debate on the amendment. She further explained that Members would then vote on the amendment proposed by Councillor Sheldon and seconded by Councillor Chandler. This being 2.1-2.5 of the recommendations in the report including the additional recommendations being 2.6 and 2.7 which had been circulated to Members prior to the start of the meeting and explained by Councillor Simpson in her speech.

Councillor O'Callaghan stated :-

- In his original motion he had raised concerns and uncertainties and a number of points that needed to be resolved before agreeing a Core Strategy
- The number of houses needed could change
- After 2026 there would be more houses
- There was currently 5 years of housing supply therefore that was not a risk
- If the Council did not approve the Core Strategy tonight, it would not be exposed
- The 1,000 houses in Sustainable Urban Development needed to prove it could pay for things like roads
- On protecting the village envelopes mentioned in the debate, what about the town, he asked doesn't the town have rights to a town envelope and open views of countryside and reject housing
- What about the infrastructure, if the SUE was in the north the infrastructure was essential
- To delay would not put the Council at risk
- Once the Core Strategy was approved, the houses would go in the north, the congestion would be in the north, the masterplan could not change this
- There was no provision for funding a by-pass by the government, the County Council nor the developers
- There were concerns from the developers on affordability with just 1000 homes
- The Council needed to find out where the money would come from for the road and the upgrading of Melton Spinney Road
- The Housing Requirement Project would deliver the number of houses needed by October
- Councillors needed to delay the decision until October to deal with the uncertainties and he urged Councillors to reject the amendment and vote for the motion

Councillor O'Callaghan supported by two other Members requested a recorded vote in accordance with Procedure Rule 15.5.

The Chief Executive explained that Members were to now vote on the amendment proposed by Councillor Sheldon and seconded by Councillor Chandler. This being 2.1-2.5 of the recommendations in the report including the additional recommendations being 2.6 and 2.7 which had been circulated to Members prior to the start of the meeting and explained by Councillor Simpson in her contribution. The named voting procedure would be for Members to individually announce whether they were for, against or wished to abstain on the amendment when she read out their name.

After the votes were collected, Councillor Lumley advised that he had been confused by what Members were voting for and he had voted 'for' on the vote taken and he had meant to vote 'against' on that vote.

The Mayor advised that the Chief Executive had explained the process and what Members were voting for twice and therefore the vote stood as taken.

The Chief Executive advised that the Councillor's explanation would be recorded in the minutes.

The Chief Executive announced the result of the vote as being 17 in favour and 7 against therefore the amendment was carried. The result of how individual votes were cast was as follows :-

No.	Councillor	For	Against	Abstain	Absent
1.	P. Baguley	√			
2.	M.W. Barnes	√			
3.	G.E. Botterill	√			
4.	G. Bush		√		
5.	P.M. Chandler	√			
6.	P. Cumbers	√			
7.	J. Douglas	√			
8.	S. Dungworth		√		
9.	A. Freer	√			
10.	M. Gordon	√			
11.	M.C.R. Graham				√
12.	E. Holmes				√
13.	L. Horton		√		
14.	E. Hutchison	√			
15.	J. Illingworth		√		
16.	S. Lumley	√			
17.	V. Manderson	√			
18.	T. Moncrieff	√			
19.	J. Moulding		√		
20.	M. O'Callaghan		√		
21.	J.T. Orson				√

22.	P.M. Posnett		√		
23.	J.B. Rhodes				√
24.	M.R. Sheldon	√			
25.	J. Simpson	√			
26.	N. Slater	√			
27.	D.R. Wright	√			
28.	J. Wyatt	√			
	Total	17	7	0	4

The Chief Executive advised that as there were no further amendments, the amendment would be put to Members as the substantive motion without any further debate.

Councillor O'Callaghan supported by two other Members also requested that this be a recorded vote in accordance with Procedure Rule 15.5.

The Chief Executive explained that Members were to now vote on the amendment which had become the substantive motion, this being 2.1-2.5 of the recommendations in the report including the additional items being 2.6 and 2.7 which had been circulated to Members prior to the start of the meeting and as previously said/explained by Councillor Simpson in her contribution. The voting procedure would be repeated for Members to individually announce whether they were for, against or wished to abstain when she read out their name.

The voting procedure was carried out.

(Cllr Sheldon left the meeting here, following the vote and before the result was announced.)

The Chief Executive announced the result of the vote as being 16 in favour and 8 against therefore the substantive motion was carried. The result of how individual votes were cast was as follows :-

No.	Councillor	For	Against	Abstain	Absent
29.	P. Baguley	√			
30.	M.W. Barnes	√			
31.	G.E. Botterill	√			
32.	G. Bush		√		
33.	P.M. Chandler	√			
34.	P. Cumbers	√			
35.	J. Douglas	√			

36.	S. Dungworth		√		
37.	A. Freer	√			
38.	M. Gordon	√			
39.	M.C.R. Graham				√
40.	E. Holmes				√
41.	L. Horton		√		
42.	E. Hutchison	√			
43.	J. Illingworth		√		
44.	S. Lumley		√		
45.	V. Manderson	√			
46.	T. Moncrieff	√			
47.	J. Moulding		√		
48.	M. O'Callaghan		√		
49.	J.T. Orson				√
50.	P.M. Posnett		√		
51.	J.B. Rhodes				√
52.	M.R. Sheldon	√			
53.	J. Simpson	√			
54.	N. Slater	√			
55.	D.R. Wright	√			
56.	J. Wyatt	√			
	Total	16	8	0	4

RESOLVED that

- (1) the Core Strategy (Publication) Development Plan Document be approved;
- (2) the Core Strategy (Publication) Development Plan Document be published in accordance with Regulation 27 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (As amended) for a six week period;
- (3) the Head of Communities and Neighbourhoods be given delegated authority to make minor amendments to the document of an inconsequential nature to the overall strategy in accordance with comments from Members at this meeting;
- (4) the Sustainability Appraisal Report (January 2012) and Habitat Regulation Assessment (January 2012) be published alongside the Core Strategy (Publication) Development Plan Document; and

- (5) Members note the next steps which are required following Publication and prior to Submission of the Core Strategy to the Secretary of State under the Provisions of Regulation 30 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (As amended) to :
- consideration by Members of any representations received under Regulation 27(3) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004; and
 - consideration of Submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination of the Core Strategy DPD in accordance with the provisions of Section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004;
- (6) this Council identifies appropriate resources to maximise the potential for full implementation of the road infrastructure identified in the Core Strategy, with a focus on seeking, as a priority, investment and funding for those elements which are not directly attributable to the Sustainable Urban Extension;
- (7) for a strategic project to be initiated and coordinated to report best efforts at regular intervals to the Rural, Environmental and Economic Affairs Committee.

The meeting which commenced at 6.30 p.m., closed at 9.23 p.m.

Mayor