

Melton Core Strategy (Publication) DPD Statement of Consultation

Introduction

Melton Borough Council approved the Melton Core Strategy (Publication) Development Plan Document on Wednesday 15 February 2012. The Core Strategy was then published for public consultation on Wednesday 29 February 2012 for six weeks in accordance with the 2011 Melton Statement of Community Involvement. This Statement of Consultation sets out the steps we have undertaken to prepare, publish and consult on our Core Strategy (Publication) DPD under the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 and the 2008 and 2009 amendments.

The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 came into force on 6th April 2012. The new Regulations consolidate the former Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 and the amendments made to them; and (b) make new provision and amendments to take account of the changes made by the Localism Act 2011. This statement is made pursuant to Regulation 22 (c).

Preparing the Publication Document

Maintaining an open dialogue with our community when preparing the Core Strategy has been a key requirement under the former Regulations and the 2012 Regulations. The Melton Core Strategy was predominantly prepared under the 2004 Regulations (as amended in 2008 and 2009) and has been based on consultation and the preparation of evidence to understand the issues facing the Borough.

Early Work

A number of Discussion Papers were also prepared during the period 2003 to 2006 to raise public awareness of topic based issues the plan would need to consider. The Discussion Papers were published for public consultation and form part of the Core Strategy Evidence Base.

Issues and Options

The Core Strategy (Issues and Options) DPD was made available for public consultation for a period of six weeks between 28 April 2006 and 9 June 2006. The comments we received were set out in the Melton Core Strategy (Issues and Options) DPD Statement of Consultation. The results of the Issues and Options exercise provided the basis for identifying and developing the Preferred Options version of the Core Strategy.

Preferred Options

The Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD was made available for public consultation for a period of six weeks between 31 January 2008 and 13 March 2008. The comments we received were set out in the Melton Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD Statement of Consultation. The results of the Preferred Options exercise provided the basis for preparing the Publication version of the Core Strategy.

Publication

This Statement of Consultation sets out the steps we have undertaken to prepare, publish and consult on our Core Strategy (Publication) DPD in accordance with the provisions of Regulation 20 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations

2012. When we submit the Core Strategy to the Secretary of State we will also submit this Statement pursuant to Regulation 22(c) (v).

We will also submit the Core Strategy (Issues and Options) DPD - Statement of Consultation (2006) and the Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD - Statement of Consultation (2011) pursuant to Regulations 22(C) (i) (ii) and (iii).

The Core Strategy has also been subjected to the Sustainability Appraisal process (SA) as we have moved through the Issues and Options, Preferred Options and Publication stages. An Appropriate Assessment has also been undertaken under the Habitat Regulations. Each of the SA and HRA reports has been made available for consultation at the same time as the appropriate Core Strategy stage itself.

Consultation on the Publication Development Plan

The Core Strategy (Publication) DPD was approved by the Council on 15 February 2012 and subsequently published for public consultation on Wednesday 29 March 2012 for a six week period. A Statement of Representations Procedure was produced in accordance with Regulation 27 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008. The Statement of Representations Procedure provided details on how the Core Strategy had been published for consultation; the methods available to view the Core Strategy; and how representations could be submitted to the Council within the stated timeframe.

A number of other documents will also be submitted to the Secretary of State alongside the Core Strategy (Publication) DPD and as a result were also made available for consultation alongside the Core Strategy:

- Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal
- Equalities Impact Assessment
- Habitat Regulations Assessment
- Infrastructure Schedule
- Statement of Community Involvement

Regulation 19 (a) and (b) of the 2012 Regulations also require the Council to make a copy of each of the proposed submission documents and a Statement of Representations Procedure available to view by the public and to send details of their availability to the general and specific consultation bodies who were invited to participate at Issues and Options and Preferred Options stages. A copy of the Statement of Representations Procedure is attached at Annexe A.

To ensure widespread awareness of the Publication of the Core Strategy in accordance with the Regulations we undertook a number of measures outlined below:

- Published a press release on 20 February 2012 (Melton Times and Melton Borough Council website)
- Published a summary of the Core Strategy in the Melton Mail in February 2012;
- Provided posters to every parish council for display on their parish notice boards and/or at their local hall
- Provided posters to post offices/shops at:
Asfordby; Buckminster; Croxton Kerrial; Frisby on the Wreake; Harby; Knipton; Long Clawson; Scalford; Somerby; Stathern; Waltham on the Wolds; Wymondham; Welby Lane, Melton Mowbray; and Valley Road, Melton Mowbray
- Provided posters to Melton Mowbray, Bottesford, and Asfordby libraries
- Displayed posters at the Council Offices
- CDs containing the following documents were sent to Key Stakeholders:
 - Core Strategy (Publication) DPD;
 - Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal;

- Equalities Impact Assessment;
- Habitat Regulations Assessment;
- Core Strategy Infrastructure Schedule;
- Statement of Community Involvement; and
- Statement of Representations Procedure.
- Letters were sent to all General Consultation Bodies (including the public) listed on our database, setting out information about the Core Strategy (Publication) and the consultation process

Copies of the Core Strategy and the associated Statement of Representation Procedure were publicly available to view at:

- Melton Mowbray, Bottesford, and Asfordby libraries;
- Local post offices/shops in Asfordby; Buckminster; Croxton Kerrial; Frisby on the Wreake; Harby; Knipton; Long Clawson; Scalford; Somerby; Stathern; Waltham on the Wolds; Wymondham; and Melton Mowbray (Melton Borough Council Offices).

Hard copies of the associated proposed Submission documents were also available to view at the Council Offices.

The Core Strategy was made available to view electronically through the Melton Borough Council Website and via the Limehouse online consultation portal.

The public were also able to view the other proposed Submission Documents and the Core Strategy's evidence base on the Melton Borough Website.

Public drop in sessions were held at the Council Offices between 9:00am and 17:00pm on 14th, 21st, 28th of March 2012 and the 4th April 2012. The drop in sessions were publicised through the Melton Mail.

The submission of formal representations could be made via the following means:

- Limehouse online consultation portal
- Email
- Fax
- By hand to the reception at Melton Borough Council Offices or by post to Melton Borough Council

Representations Received on the Core Strategy (Publication) DPD

We received 513 individual items of correspondence (which varied enormously in size) during the consultation period. They were from 141 different parties. 95 (67%) respondents were individual members of the public, 20 (14%) were from representatives of the development industry, business or landowners, 14 (10%) were from local government (excluding Parish Councils) and other public bodies, 4 (3%) were from Parish Councils, and 9 (6%) were from local amenity and interest groups or organisations.

The main issues in each of the representations are set out in Annex B. A summary of comments received on the Core Strategy as a whole and for each Chapter is set out below:

General

44 representations were received on the Core Strategy as a whole.

Numerous representations highlight concerns and dissatisfaction with the consultation process stating that it is complex and the period for consultation was too short, so discouraging public participation. Several comments state that the period of consultation should have been extended to 12 weeks given the amount of information involved and importance of the document. The advertising and publicity of the consultation events were also considered inadequate whilst it is judged to be difficult to locate on the website. A

number of comments find the Core Strategy too detailed, lengthy and complex which does not make it user friendly. It is also stated that the document contains conflicting statements, qualifications of intent, an absence of supporting argument for policy direction, and, a number of inaccuracies. Various representations question the legal compliance and soundness of the Core Strategy.

The evidence base is considered to be out of date and inadequate by a number of representations received. Various comments also state that the NPPF and Localism Act have not been reflected in the Core Strategy.

Several representations question the need for the level of development contained in the Core Strategy. It is also stated that the general distribution of development with 80% focussed on Melton Mowbray is arbitrary and does not reflect population distribution or market demand. There is considered to be a rural bias in terms of protection whilst the benefits of development in preserving rural communities are ignored. Comments also question how sustainable communities are defined.

A number of representations focus their comments on the proposed Melton North SUE. They state that it will increase traffic to unacceptable levels, especially on Scalford Road, Nottingham Road and Melton Spinney Road; affect the Melton Country Park and sever its links with the countryside; destroy wildlife habitats; be located in an area of high landscape sensitivity; be located some distance from the employment and leisure sites to the south; provide gypsy and traveller accommodation which is not required; be contrary to the sustainability appraisal and be unviable and undeliverable. The need to develop infrastructure as soon as possible is also highlighted and some comments declare that funding will not be available to provide all necessary infrastructure. The requirement for a bypass is seen as vital with comments stating that the road to be provided by the SUE will be inadequate. Many comments dispute the location of the SUE with some stating that development would be better dispersed around several sites, especially brownfield, whilst others state a southern option to be preferable. Some representations consider that all options for the SUE have not been fully explored and that the decision was predetermined.

Various representations state their general support for the Core Strategy which is considered a sound, well-researched and thorough strategy which appears legally compliant. It is also commented that the evidence base appears appropriate and that the aims and objectives reflect the sustainable Community Strategy. Leicestershire County Council welcomes engagement throughout the process.

Chapter 1: Introduction

14 representations were received on this Chapter.

Many stated that the consultation period of 6 weeks was too short for the complex nature of the Core Strategy. Some representations believed the Core Strategy to be unsound on the basis that it was not consistent with NPPF. One objector stated that previously Saved Local Plan Policies should not be used after the Core Strategy

Several development interests requested that the plan period for the Core Strategy is extended beyond 2026, proposing 2028 or later, to provide flexibility and conform with the NPPF. It is claimed that the cross boundary effects of the Core Strategy have not been fully addressed, and this could influence travel and economic activity. Northern developer consortium asks that the Core Strategy make reference to the requirement for the provision of infrastructure from individual sites as well as the SUE.

Concerns regarding the SUE include that it will lead to cramming of the town, impacting on resources such as health, education, leisure and transport. Concerns were raised in relation to the capacity of John Ferneley School. Questions were raised over why the villages are being protected from extensive development and the town not. With proposed employment growth located to the west of the borough, the SUE to the north is felt to be illogical. Doubts

were expressed about the SUE's viability. With no firm funding in place for the SUE's infrastructure then the Core Strategy is questionable. A question was also raised over why evidence reports appear to have been funded by parties with a vested interest in the SUE.

The general consensus was that perhaps housing is needed, but not in the quantity and location planned. It should be spread between town and suitable village sites. The 80:20 split proposed does not represent the existing balance and fundamentally changes the shape of the borough. The proposals represent a growth rate that is greater than ONS forecasts, which will put added pressure on services and increase traffic congestion. The Grantham Road to Leicester Road link is needed.

Concerns were expressed about the high landscape quality of the northern SUE location, all environmental reports about landscape appearing to have been discounted. The recent extension to John Ferneley School and its impact on landscape is not considered a valid reason for allocating the SUE. Consequences for the Country Park were allegedly not properly considered when the SUE decision was made, with no specific plans for the protection of the Country Park from encroaching development. The SUE will impact on wildlife and the park itself. The main lake in the Country Park is already a balancing reservoir and would flood if required to serve an additional 1000 homes, which will impact on nests in breeding season.

Chapter 2: Melton Borough Profile

11 representations were received on this Chapter.

On the back of information about the environment, concerns were expressed about the SUE's impact on a listed building, the fact that the development is proposed on agricultural land, its impact on attractive countryside and wildlife (especially in the Country Park), and increased flood risk.

Following on from the description of Local Priorities in 2.13, several comments relate to traffic congestion. They state that the traffic modelling is outdated, with no traffic modelling undertaken since the closure of King Edwards VII School and the expansion of John Ferneley School and concern that the modelling does not take account of through traffic and excludes the A607 to A606 link. Concerns were expressed about the lack of funding for road infrastructure and for resolving traffic congestion. Many believe that the proposals will increase travel times and traffic accidents within the town. Poor public transport services are responsible for reliance on the private car. A park and ride scheme is suggested for reducing town centre congestion. Many feel that the Northern SUE will increase congestion, especially with funding for the by-pass yet to be confirmed, and the SUE should be located to the south, closer to employment and school capacity.

Concerns were expressed that the proposed locations for housing growth do not properly reflect population distribution and the proposed 80:20 development split could see village services suffering as a result. Also, some rural locations, such as Bottesford, are sustainably located to accommodate additional development.

It was felt that jobs should be created before the houses in order to ensure there are sufficient employment opportunities for influx of population. One comment was that applications for extensions to smaller dwellings should be refused in order to retain them and preserve much needed smaller housing stock.

Chapter 3: Our Vision and Objectives

24 representations were received on this Chapter.

Several representations consider that the proposed distribution of development does not reflect the population distribution of the Borough as the focus of housing would be on the

town. It is regarded that this disadvantages the rural community, especially the young; increases travel to work in rural areas; and, has a detrimental impact on affordable housing and will destroy the spatial vision. Some state that housing should be more evenly distributed through the town and villages to reflect the needs of the community.

Various representations raise the detrimental impact which development will have upon traffic levels and the congestion that will result. Concerns are also raised that development will not improve the local economy or infrastructure.

A number of representations make specific reference to the SUE and the impact this will have on services and facilities such as education, health and the Melton Country Park. Several representations state that the SUE will not improve the quality of life of residents and will impact on the best quality landscape. Some comments state that more brownfield sites in the town should be developed before the SUE.

It is not considered by some representations that the protection of the countryside will be achieved through the Core Strategy and that it will be detrimental to wildlife. Concern is also raised in various comments that reference to the historic environment is not included in the objectives. A number of representations suggest amendments to the spatial vision in relation to the historic environment, rights of way, green infrastructure and climate change.

A number of representations support the visions and objectives; however, others disagree with some representations stating that no regard has been given to the NPPF and the Localism Act.

Chapter 4: Meeting the Need for Development

23 representations were received on this Chapter.

Representations expressed concerns that the proposed target of 3400 homes over the plan period will increase the population over and above ONS forecasts. The 3400 figure was established on the basis of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), which is to be abolished, so the RSS should not have been used to inform future housing requirements. The statement about local community support for the planned housing growth conflicts with letters and petitions suggesting otherwise. The 80:20 development split will leave rural settlements at a disadvantage, forcing young families to move to the town, where development will be focused. Furthermore, there is no reference to how the rural wedge of all planned development will be distribution across the various rural villages.

The forecast employment requirement is less than that required for standard population growth; additional jobs are required in response to the proposed housing growth and then some in order to prevent out-commuting.

Melton has failed to attract major non-food retailers, leaving gaps in available services and facilities. One respondent disagrees with the retail study conclusion with regard to no further need for convenience shops and limited need for non-food shopping facilities, especially in light of current non-food provision. Another finds the recommendation for 2500sq m of non-food shopping facilities is positive; however concerns are expressed in relation to where this floorspace will be provided since the building of the new Council offices on land earmarked for such development.

The existing leisure centre is inadequate, the site is too restricted and the preference is for a new site rather than the redevelopment of the existing provision. Concerns were expressed in relation to the future requirement that all developments will make a contribution to sport and recreation and how this will be achieved. There is little or no evidence to confirm that adequate leisure and health facilities will be provided and assurances are needed. The current town centre medical practice struggles to meet demand, this will only be exacerbated by proposals and development and expansion opportunities within the current site are limited.

The school reorganisation within Melton has been costly and unnecessary and there is little or no evidence to confirm that adequate education facilities will be provided and assurances are needed. However, the expansion of Belvoir High is welcome.

There is no local need or evidence for a 1000 unit urban extension, so it would be more logical to apply the lower Regional Plan figure, for which there is enough available land without the SUE, so offering greater flexibility of location. It is unrealistic to expect the SUE to deliver all necessary contributions. The current SUE proposal is not large enough to fund a primary school so there may be a need to re open the previous main school at John Ferneley and there is no guarantee that sports facilities will be provided by the SUE. The additional traffic created by the SUE will cause chaos, adding to congestion within the town and deterring businesses from locating in Melton and so the funding for the by-pass road and road improvements should be certain before homes are built. Surface water drainage will be a problem and could require new sewers and balancing ponds.

Leicestershire County Council asks for a specific policy for waste management principles and infrastructure to be included within the Core Strategy to outline the strategic approach across the District to managing waste and could then consider the potential need for additional waste infrastructure to accommodate the growth proposed. The Environment Agency does not feel that the protection of groundwater and remediation of contaminated sites has been adequately addressed.

Chapter 5: Where Development will take Place

91 representations were received on this Chapter.

Some representations dispute the urban/rural split and question the focus of development upon Melton Mowbray suggesting that the villages should accommodate more development in line with the current distribution of the population. It is considered that providing more development in the villages would assist in preserving the services and facilities they provide and make them more viable. The availability of affordable housing to the rural population is also a worry for some which could force the younger generation away from villages where they were born. Concern is also raised that the views of the rural population take precedence over residents of the town and that the absence of a Town Council give undue weight to the parishes. It is also feared that the concentration of development upon Melton Mowbray will place undue pressure upon the infrastructure and services in the town, especially the transport network.

Other representations welcome the distribution of development and the fact that only small-scale development will occur in the villages with Bottesford raising particular comments that its village nature should be preserved. However, a developer suggests that Bottesford should be allocated more housing.

The location of the SUE to the North is questioned by many of the representations with some suggesting that the development could be accommodated upon existing brownfield sites. The SUE is seen to place undue pressure on services and the transport system and be located in the area of highest quality landscape. The fact that the SUE is not located adjacent to the employment area is also an issue for some representations with this resulting in the SUE not being considered to be located in a sustainable location and likely to increase commuter traffic. The ability of 1000 dwellings to provide the infrastructure required is also disputed and there are concerns that development could occur without an adequate improvement to the road network. It is not considered by some that the proposed road to be delivered by the SUE will be of strategic benefit to the town and the existing road network will be gridlocked.

It is also suggested in some representations that the proposed development would be better spread throughout the town rather than concentrated in an SUE. Others consider that a

southern option would be better and more likely to be delivered whilst a new village on the former airfield is favoured by some.

The evidence base used is considered inadequate and out of date by some representations and there is seen to be non-compliance with aspects of the NPPF. It is also questioned by several whether the monitoring of the Strategy will be adequate.

The Northern developer consortium request that the plan provides flexibility and that headroom should be provided in the housing figures whilst the focus of development upon Melton Mowbray is welcomed.

There are concerns from some that communication has been poor and that consultation has been inadequate.

Chapter 6: Meeting Our Housing Needs

28 representations were received on this Chapter.

The affordable housing requirement is seen by some development interests as a barrier to development and it should be reduced according to scheme viability. Specifically the affordable housing requirement on individual rural units is seen as a counterproductive. Affordable housing need should not be used to justify developments, especially when homelessness is not visible. The proposed 80:20 development split does not match population distribution and as a result rural areas are being denied affordable housing.

LCC consider that the ageing population is well referenced and catered for, although the Core Strategy does not refer to extra-care provision; the requirement for Lifetime Homes is a positive point in respect of an ageing population. However a developer considers that the costs involved could undermine development viability. Suitable housing for the elderly is important to encourage downsizing. Design is also important with regard to apartments and smaller dwellings, ensuring sufficient garden space. Higher density developments will meet the need for smaller units and extensions on smaller units should be restricted.

The developers of the SUE consider that deliverability of the SUE will be affected by housing mix and affordable housing requirements; some larger properties should be planned for, or the overall SUE unit figure, increased to achieve the necessary land valuations.

The objectors to the SUE claim that 3400 homes proposed over the planned period is far greater than is actually required and one interpretation of population growth suggests 1535 new homes over the plan period, instead of 3400 currently proposed. This would reduce the per annum build rate from the 170 currently documented to 96. On this basis the SUE is unnecessary and instead various brownfield sites could deliver the required 1535 homes. There will be no or little demand for the 1000 homes delivered in the SUE and any potential occupiers will come from outside the borough, leading to the creation of a 'commuter ghetto'. There is no justification for siting the residential development to the North and the employment land planned for there is not sufficient. Development will put unnecessary pressure on existing services and funding for service expansion is not confirmed.

The Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group expressed concerns about using the same criteria as market housing for Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision because of the impact of this on achievability as a result of land valuation. They also do not consider it clear what actual number of pitches was proposed. The preference is for smaller sites and for one site to be located in a rural setting. Impact on existing settled communities and impact on heritage assets were raised, along with a request for investing in resource distribution. Finally, there was concern that circumstances have changed to such an extent that the existing Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment is no longer representative.

Chapter 9: Meeting Economic Needs

28 representations were received on this Chapter.

There is general support for the chapter in several representations. It is considered that the policy to regenerate the rural economy should be flexible and concur with the NPPF.

Some representations request reference to specific sites and existing industrial areas.

The evidence base is considered unsound by some and it is questioned whether the method of monitoring and the targets selected are relevant. The separation of housing from the employment growth area is not seen as sustainable by some.

The need for provision of high-speed broadband to reduce car-borne trips is highlighted by the County Council.

Chapter 8: Access and Travel

48 representations were received on this Chapter.

Many objectors claim that the northern Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) will increase congestion on existing roads, especially Scalford Road and Thorpe Road. There is already stationary traffic and gridlock at certain times in weekdays, especially on market day; two-thirds of heavy traffic passes through town; the accident rate is allegedly very high. Traffic from the SUE will also cause road safety problems on Scalford Road, especially near the school and if Option 3 is selected (which is claimed to be pre-determined). Scalford Road is claimed to be already over capacity, while Melton Spinney Road and Thorpe Road are too narrow.

It is felt that traffic models are out of date and inaccurate and that they show that a southern SUE would be a better option, in terms of relief from congestion (Ptolemy report) and cutting emissions (LLTIM). There is concern about different assumptions in the LLTIM and the CS on household size. The evidence base is claimed to be unsound.

It is claimed that the proposed northern link road will be a congested rat-run, although others say it will go nowhere. It is criticised as pointless, not wanted and unaffordable; and as having an adverse impact on the Country Park. There is no public funding for this and other roads and the developers will not fund this amount of infrastructure without more houses. A full ring road, or a Thorpe Road/ Leicester road link, or at least a link to Thorpe Road, is needed, especially by business, and this should be built before any development. However it is stated that the developers will not pay this until later, resulting in congestion in the meantime. There is felt to be no credible plan to deliver the infrastructure, noting that the Infrastructure Delivery group does not exist. Phrases such as “exploring options” are not enough and reveal complacency.

The lack of connection and the distance between the northern SUE and the Economic Growth Area in the west will allegedly increase congestion through the town and undermine a sustainable transport strategy. Objectors doubt the claim in the CS that there is no direct relationship between the residents of the SUE and the jobs at the EGA, but it is also claimed that most residents of the SUE will commute elsewhere, creating an unsustainable dormitory suburb. They also question whether the strategy will contain trips within the town as stated.

The objectors believe that the sustainable urban extension and modal shift targets will fail; it is easy to promise but is flawed and unrealistic and needs more evidence to support it. They point out that the north of Melton Mowbray is poorly served by buses and is not well connected to the railway station, whence trains to Leicester are already overcrowded. Recent cuts in bus subsidies will undermine the sustainable transport strategy, especially in rural areas. Money spent on alternative transport modes will be wasted.

It is too far to walk from the proposed SUE into town and cycle routes will only be used for leisure, not travel to work (especially in bad weather), because of the unsuitability of Scalford

Road and the local topography. The medical centre and proposed Sainsbury store are 1.5 miles away. The developers have no commitment to funding cycle routes, but more investment is needed in cycle and pedestrian crossings on Norman Way and in serious cycle routes, although some criticise use of the disused railway for this purpose because of conflicts with wildlife.

Several objectors feel that more rural development would help bus services there. A few point out that Bottesford is the ideal place for more houses, rather than Melton, because of its rail service. Others state that focusing development in Melton Mowbray will encourage more trips from rural areas to access services.

Two parish councils, and the Buckminster Estate, are concerned about the lack of consideration of rural issues, pointing out that bus services are under threat, cycle route 48 is not mentioned, and that there is need to tackle the problem of damage to roads by HGVs. All feel that the modal shift target is laudable but unachievable in rural areas and should not be imposed there.

Chapter 9: Improving Melton Mowbray Town Centre

12 representations were received on this Chapter

A range of different views is put forward about the future of the town centre. One notes that recent development and Norman Way have restricted the town centre and opposes redevelopment of a car-park for retail. There is a need better traffic flows, easy parking and varied shops and facilities (including public toilets) to encourage visitors. Another believes that the retail area is too spread out, covering Snow Hill, the cattle market and the proposed Sainsbury's site. There is a need for policies on Snow Hill and for sympathetic development of the cattle market site. Others refer to the need for more cycling facilities and to the need for partnership working, especially between MBC and the Town Estate.

The Civic Society (although commenting on the wrong version of the CS) states that Melton cannot compete with larger centres for national retailers, so should take full advantage of heritage assets and other features, for instance there is no mention of the importance of the river for leisure or of better pedestrian access from the station to encourage more diverse use of the town centre. Small independent retailers and quality shops should be the aim. The shoppers' survey is now out of date, e.g. in relation to internet shopping.

MNAG express concern over the ability of MBC to monitor objectives and over the lack of resources for delivery in the face of cost savings, including no mention of BID income. The

Town Centre AAP should be part of the CS in order to ensure deliverability and meet duty to cooperate.

English Heritage, LCC and the Civic Society feel there should be more emphasis on the historic environment, including changes to Policy CS12.

A retail planning consultancy states that there is no requirement to demonstrate need for development, as in Policy CS12 and that instead it should refer to the sequential test and impact assessment. It also seeks Sainsbury's retail consent to be recognised in the CS, including strategic redevelopment of the Nottingham Road in Policy CS12 site to be "for retail".

Chapter 10: Our Environment

33 representations were received on this Chapter

Many of the representations raise concerns over the impact of the proposed SUE to the north of Melton Mowbray upon biodiversity, geodiversity, a listed building and the historic character of the area. Particular concern is raised through the effect this would have upon

Melton Country Park, its wildlife, tranquillity and the separation from surrounding countryside by a road and houses. The use of the disused railway line for a pedestrian and cycle route is also questioned due to the effect upon its status as a Local Wildlife Site.

Some representations state that the landscape character assessment has been discounted in the siting of the SUE on land which is identified as being of the highest quality. Also the agricultural land quality is highlighted as being higher in the north than the south of the town. A number of comments also state that this contradicts with the desire to protect the countryside. Some comments declare that the principle of locating development on land of least environmental value has not been applied to the SUE. Concerns are also raised that the biodiversity study has been ignored by siting development around the Country Park.

A number of representations raise the importance of green infrastructure and the potential to provide access and rights of way maximising non-motorised travel. The allocation of green wedges is questioned in a number of comments.

English Heritage objects to the lack of a core policy for the historic environment.

Chapter 11: Tackling Climate Change

27 representations were received on this Chapter

There is generally support for Policy CS19 on Sustainable Development and Construction, but some detailed changes were suggested by the Environment Agency and LCC, including more information to be provided on predicted carbon emissions from travel to/from developments and more emphasis on the longer-term environmental performance of buildings.

Rather more concerns were expressed on the Energy Supply policy and text. Some point out that sites identified in the 2008 report on wind energy have not been favoured by the industry, with alternative sites submitted instead, while Peel Energy state that this report is relatively old and is too broad-brush to enable calculation of wind energy potential. There is a need for information on what renewable energy levels are currently being provided. The industry and others point out that targets are low, can only be minima, and should provide a range; CS20 is likely to grossly under- estimate potential for renewable energy and so could suppress this, contrary to NPPF which does not set limits based on need.

Peel Environmental Ltd and the NFU have concerns about references to biomass, ignoring content of Municipal Solid Waste and Commercial & Industrial Waste and of wet agricultural bio-mass and their potential contribution to energy supply.

Some feel that there should be less negative criteria, balancing adverse impacts against the importance of delivering renewable energy, although stronger protection for the historic environment and criteria on sustainability and access are sought. Clearer policy is needed to guide development outside the areas that have been identified for renewable energy development.

Some concerns have been expressed by developers and others about the requirement for development to provide 10% on-site renewable energy, because of the impact of this on viability, contrary to NPPF. Without supporting evidence this part of Policy CS20 is unsound. It is also felt to be out of date and inflexible in the face of changing technology.

A few comments were received on flooding, one related to increased run-off from the SUE and the ability of existing flood prevention measures in the Country Park to cope with more development. A minor wording change is requested by Anglia Water.

Chapter 12: Better Design

7 representations were received on this Chapter

A few representations welcome this policy, one pointing out that there is no additional cost to good design, linked to master planning and community involvement. One developer is concerned about the ineffectiveness of the Building for life Criteria. English Heritage and one other raise the lack of emphasis on the historic environment, including (but not confined to) conservation, listed buildings and heritage assets and their settings. EH request separate policy on the historic environment. Other comments relate to the adverse effects of excessive parking and highways access and the design of Parkside.

Chapter 13: Growth at Melton Mowbray

89 representations were received on this Chapter

Several representations raise concern with the amount of development and state that there is no evidence to support the housing numbers in the Core Strategy. Various representations believe that the SUE is not necessary and the additional housing required could be accommodated on brownfield sites. The suitability of the location of the SUE to the North of the town is also disputed by many and it is suggested that all reasonable alternatives have not been considered. It is also suggested that the location to the North has been predetermined prior to consultation with a disproportionate reliance on traffic evidence. Some representations consider that development should be spread on several sites throughout the town; others state that a southern option is preferable and supported by evidence; whilst some suggest a new village on the airfield site is preferable. A few comments state that the rural area should accommodate more development and that concentrating development in Melton Mowbray will increase commuting. The location of the employment growth area, remote from the SUE, is called into doubt by a number of comments.

Many people highlight the fact that the infrastructure in the town will not accommodate the population growth proposed. A number of comments do not consider that 1000 houses will be viable and more dwellings will be required to provide the funding for the amount of infrastructure in the Strategy. Several representations consider that the SUE will significantly exceed the 1000 dwellings stated. The guarantee that services and facilities will be provided is also brought into doubt in various comments and the deliverability of the SUE is questioned. Some representations raise concerns that the SUE will have a detrimental impact upon the provision of education services.

The effect upon the highway network is raised in various representations; notably the congestion which will occur on Scalford Road and Melton Spinney Road. The various traffic studies used to support the Core Strategy and conclusions drawn are disputed in some representations. Many consider that a relief road should be provided prior to any development occurring. Several representations state that an entire ring road for Melton Mowbray is required whilst others propose alternative routes for a bypass. There are also concerns that increased traffic will add to pollution and have a detrimental impact on road safety. Given the distance of the SUE from the town centre and multiple journeys a number of representations question whether sustainable travel options will be possible and a loss of funding for bus services will put further reliance on the private motor vehicle. The Nottingham Road to Melton Spinney Road link is considered pointless by some representations.

The SUE is considered by many to have a detrimental impact upon the countryside and it is highlighted that it will be located in the area of highest quality landscape around the town, straddling a ridge line, creating an adverse visual effect. A number of people have highlighted that the development at John Ferneley is not a new build but an extension. Several representations also consider that there will be a detrimental impact on the Country Park, biodiversity and wildlife and it is considered in a number of comments that wildlife corridors will be severed. Various representations note that it is an area of archaeological

potential and also that development would destroy the historic town. It is stated by some that the historic environment should be better protected.

Various representations raise concerns that the site of the SUE is liable to flooding and the source of funding for SUDS is questioned. The fact that the SUE will affect runoff and drainage from the site to the detriment of the flood alleviation scheme and wildlife at the Country Park is also raised. The potential for the presence of radon gas on the SUE site is a further concern raised through some representations.

Various representations state that the SUE will not relate well to its surroundings and that the quality of life for neighbouring residents will be lost. The detrimental impact upon the peace and tranquillity of the surrounding area is also a concern for a number of representations and it is stated that a balanced community will not be created.

The need for gypsy and traveller sites to be provided is contested in a number of representations and it is considered that an up to date study of need is required.

The Northern SUE consortium confirms they have been working together since 2007 and that significant management time, resources and investment in third party consultants has been spent on the project. Their representation continues to state that options and contracts on land would not have been required if the SUE was not deliverable or viable. The SUE is considered the most sustainable means of growth with Melton Mowbray the best location. They state that the green infrastructure links with the Country Park are to be maximised and an extension to the park is proposed. The location of the SUE to the north is seen as providing an unrivalled contribution to the ring road.

Further representations from the Northern SUE consortium state that the SUE should provide 4-6 ha of small scale employment. They also state that headroom should be provided in terms of housing numbers to allow flexibility. It is also detailed that a high proportion of smaller dwellings may have implications and a range of house types should be allowed to ensure a mixed balance community.

A number of comments recognise the importance of the economy and attracting business; however questions are asked as to how this will be achieved. Some representations state that more houses without jobs will increase unemployment and deprivation.

The robustness of the evidence base is called into question in some of the comments received and a number of representations state that the evidence base is outdated and uses incorrect information. The use of the evidence base to determine the location of the SUE is called into question by some. Several responses state that the NPPF has been disregarded and the Core Strategy is now superseded by changes to policy.

There are concerns from some that communication has been poor and that consultation has been inadequate, too short and poorly advertised. A number of representations state that the town is under represented in decision making and that the rural area has undue influence through parish councils and rural Councillors.

Chapter 14: Managing Investment

22 representations were received on this Chapter.

A number of representations question the viability of the SUE and its ability to provide the services and facilities identified in the Core Strategy. Some comments state that developers will require more than 1000 dwellings to make the scheme viable. The uncertainty that infrastructure will be provided and a lack of definite investment and funding is also highlighted in a number of comments which suggest that without robust financial planning and funding sources the Core Strategy is flawed.

Representations request that further studies are undertaken to identify what can actually be provided and that there is transparency to the process.

Several representations emphasise the importance of a bypass and its funding to Melton Mowbray; funding from Leicestershire County Council is seen as improbable. Financial failings would provide inadequate road infrastructure which are identified as a major risk.

Various comments state that the Strategy does not conform to national policy on infrastructure planning.

Leicestershire Constabulary question the lack of policing infrastructure in the schedule. Leicestershire County Council welcomes the inclusion of waste and recycling facilities in the infrastructure schedule.

The Northern SUE consortium welcomes the sensible, pragmatic approach to infrastructure needs and phasing. The recognition of CIL funding for infrastructure and its impact on viability is noted. The Core Strategy's consistency with the NPPF in terms of deliverability is also welcomed.

Chapter 15: Monitoring our Strategy

7 representations were received on this Chapter.

MNAG comment that the monitoring framework fails to provide a robust and audible methodology to monitor delivery and so is unfit for purpose and unsound. It should contain clear objectives, indicators, SMART targets, trajectories, triggers and contingencies. An employment trajectory should be provided. It does not deal with strategic waste disposal issues, especially construction waste, nor minerals requirements and minerals planning.

A developer also expresses concerns about the inadequate contingency planning in the event that the SUE is not delivered and the inflexibility of the CS. An alternative strategy is needed with a clear trigger; the current intervention criteria are insufficient and fail to guarantee a 5 year land supply, contrary to the NPPF.

EH considers the CS unsound without monitoring indices for the historic environment.

Some other comments relate to objections to the SUE, but do not refer to the Monitoring Framework.

Appendix 1: Housing Trajectory

3 representations were received on this.

A developer believes that the timescale for completions from the SUE is unduly optimistic, given that the broad location and amount of housing is still subject to the CS process and AAP is to be prepared to determine boundaries. Completions are unlikely to occur until 2015/16.

MNAG argue that the trajectory based on 170pa is unjustified, top down and not evidence based. It does not take account of brownfield sites. MNAG claim that a significant number of SHLAA sites were dismissed for policy reasons, for instance those not adjoining settlements where development is to be allowed by the CS. It also questions the justification for a decline in small sites from 65 to 45p.a.

Another respondent queries some detailed aspects of the trajectory, based on a misunderstanding of the terminology and figures involved.

Appendix 2: Policy Monitoring Framework

2 representations were received on this.

The Northern SUE Consortium welcomes the positive approach to monitoring 5 year housing land supply, but seeks a rewording of one sentence to ensure land brought forward in the

event of a shortfall in delivery is additional to the established figures. Another comment raises various objections to the SUE but does not refer specifically to the Monitoring Framework.

What Happens Next?

The Melton Core Strategy (Publication) DPD will be considered for submission to the Secretary of State. A review of the representations has been undertaken to identify any issues which may prevent submission of the Core Strategy, but none have been found. However, a schedule of focused changes will be submitted alongside the Core Strategy for consideration at the independent planning examination.

In addition to this statement, the representations received on the Core Strategy (Publication) DPD will be submitted to the Secretary of State for consideration as part of the examination process. The Inspector will determine whether the Core Strategy has been prepared in accordance with the legal and procedural requirements and will test the soundness of the Core Strategy.

Annexe A

Melton Borough Council

Statement of Representations Procedure

Notice of the publication of Melton Borough Council's Local Development Framework Core Strategy (Publication) Development Plan Document

Melton Borough Council plans to submit the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) to the Secretary of State of Communities and Local Government. Prior to this we are publishing the Core Strategy (Publication) DPD for public representations

Title of Document

Melton Core Strategy (Publication) Development Plan Document (February 2012).

Subject Matter and Area Covered

The Core Strategy relates to the whole Borough and is the principle planning document of the Melton Local Development Framework. The Melton Core Strategy contains the Borough Council's spatial vision, objectives, strategic policies, and a monitoring and implementation framework to measure delivery of the vision and objectives for the period up to 2026.

Period within which representations must be made

Representations should be made in a 6 week period starting on Wednesday 29 February 2012. **Representations must be received by midnight on Wednesday 11 April 2012.** Anonymous comments or comments received after this date will not be accepted.

Locations for inspection of the Melton Core Strategy and other proposed submission documents

All submission documents, including the Core Strategy (Publication) DPD and the documents listed below are available to view on the Melton Borough Council's website and the Online Consultation Portal Limehouse.

- Sustainability Appraisal Report
- Habitat Regulations Assessment
- Equalities Impact Assessment
- Infrastructure Schedule
- Statement of Community Involvement

Melton Borough Council Website

www.melton.gov.uk

Online Consultation Portal – Limehouse

<http://melton.limehouse.co.uk/portal/>

In addition, **all submission documents** will be available for inspection at:

Melton Borough Council Offices

Melton Borough Council, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, LE13 1GH – open Monday to Friday 9am – 5pm

The **Submission Core Strategy DPD only** will be available for inspection at the following locations within the usual opening hours:

Melton Borough Public Libraries

Melton Mowbray Library, Wilton Road, Melton Mowbray Leicestershire LE13 0UJ
Bottesford Library, The Old Primary School, Grantham Road, Bottesford, Nottingham, NG13 0DF

Asfordby ICT Centre, Asfordby Parish Hall, 24 Main Street, Asfordby, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, LE14 3SA

All library opening hours are viewable at www.leics.gov.uk.

Local Post Offices and Village Shops

Asfordby Post Office, 3 Bradgate Lane, Asfordby, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, LE14 3YD

Buckminster Village Store, 2 Main Street, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 5SA

Croxton Kerrial Post Office, 8 Main Street, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG32 1QW

Frisby on the Wreake Post Office and Shop, 17 Main Street, Frisby on the Wreake, Melton, Leicestershire, LE14 2NJ

Harby Post Office, 39 Nether Street, Harby, Melton Mowbray, LE14 4BW

Knipton General Stores, 3 Main Street, Knipton, Grantham, NG32 1RW

Long Clawson Village Store, 5 The Sands, Long Clawson, Melton Mowbray LE14 4PA

Spar and Post Office, 52 Valley Road, Melton Mowbray LE13 0DX

Scalford Post Office, 9 School Lane, Scalford, Melton Mowbray, LE14 4DT

Somerby Post Office, 25a High Street, Somerby, Melton Mowbray, LE14 2PZ

Stathern Post Office, 31 Main Street, Stathern, Melton Mowbray LE14 4HW

Waltham on the Wolds Post Office, 15 High Street, Waltham on the Wolds, Melton Mowbray LE14 4AH

Wymondham Post Office, 55 – 57 Main Street, LE14 2AG

Post Office, 73 Welby Lane, Melton Mowbray, LE13 0ST

Craven Street Post Office, 15 Craven Street, Melton Mowbray, LE13 0QT

Copies of the Core Strategy are available on request from the Policy and Plans Team. The price of the Core Strategy is £10.00 including postage and packaging or a CD can be purchased for £6.00 including postage & packaging. **Cheques should be made payable to Melton Borough Council.**

Address to direct representations

Representations can be submitted to Melton Borough Council using the following methods

- Online: <http://melton.limehouse.co.uk/portal/>
- Email: ldf@melton.gov.uk
- Fax: 01664 410283
- By hand to the reception at Melton Borough Council Offices or by post to: Melton Borough Council, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, LE13 1GH

All representations should specify the section of the Melton Core Strategy DPD to which they relate, and the grounds on which they are made.

Request to be notified

Representations may also be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of the following:

- That the Melton Core Strategy has been submitted for Independent Examination;
- The publication of the recommendations of any person appointed to carry out an Independent Examination of the Melton Core Strategy; and
- The adoption of the Melton Core Strategy.

Further information

Further information can be obtained by contacting the Planning Policy team by emailing ldf@melton.gov.uk or telephoning 01664 502 502.

ANNEXE B

**Melton Local Development Framework Core Strategy (Publication) Development Plan
Document: Representations**

Summary of Main Issues by Chapter

GENERAL

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
21	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Mr Lawrence Dryell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document deliberately structured to dis-empower residents and deter them from participating in consultation • Consultation period too short.
24	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Mr Colin Brown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much traffic on Scalford Road • School has grown so MBC figures out of date. • No need for all houses in the north- spread them around. • Against 3 travellers' sites.
51	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Lincolnshire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough and well-researched strategy. • Good to see prominence for public health, but DPH Annual Report on Public Health should be listed in references. • Strategy should state the types of food shops to be encouraged, e.g. a range of healthy, fresh food providers. • Would like use of Health Needs Assessments as part of closer, more formal working between planning and public health.
52	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Mr Gary Christmas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to northern SUE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Roads into town, e.g. Scalford Road, too narrow for traffic increases. ○ The only area in Melton with high landscape sensitivity rating. ○ Would affect Melton Country Park- "the jewel in the crown" which will become an enclosed town park. ○ Spread the development all around the town including brownfield sites and K Edward school site. ○ Location of EGA in the SW in relation to SUE in the N will add to gridlock. ○ 1000 houses not enough for developers to contribute to a relief road. • Need a review of policy with more resident input.
88	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Burton and Dalby Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments.
89	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Burton and Dalby Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request to be notified.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
90		Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Mr Mike Powderly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has followed the strategy as it develops since 2008 • Meetings not well attended through poor publicity and venue changes
93		Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Mr Gary Reek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irresponsible to develop 1000 houses on the highest quality landscape around the town. • Doubts the justification for a large number of employees moving into what is a small market town: no infrastructure links to attract businesses. • There is 5 year supply of land, which should be built on first. • Inconsistent to oppose greenfield development at Bottesford and propose it in Melton. • Insufficient transport infrastructure – Scalford Road already beyond capacity, especially since enlargement of John Ferneley School; Spinney Lane too narrow; link to Nottingham Road will increase the traffic; massive traffic problems already at peak times. • Other services also do not have capacity, e.g. medical services, sewage, water drainage. • Government proposals call for small manageable developments, unlike this. • Development will have a significant impact on wildlife in the country park. • Large scale development in one area will have a devastating effect, especially on traffic congestion.
98		Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Mr Digby	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appears to have followed the legal process and be a legally compliant, sound, thorough and clear document. • Most of the opposition engaged in the process late. • Supports the pressure to develop the infrastructure at the earliest possible time.
99		Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Dr Leslie Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed and complex document which is not user friendly. Intentionally confuses the reader, has conflicting statements and in is in some cases incorrect. • Inaccuracies were not corrected, leading to doubt that it was read and understood. • Only 6 weeks consultation period allowed- a deliberate tactic to minimise consultation response. • Document is difficult to find on the complex MBC website. • Wants a ruling whether or not MBC were fair and legally compliant.
11 2		Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Ms Helen Chadwick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appears to have an appropriate evidence base. • Polices provide a good coverage to enable sustainable development., but there are some gaps.
11 6		Melton Core Strategy Publication	Mr Phil John	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laudable vision and aims are not matched by clear commitment to deliver them, relying on hope: not effective. • Uses broad sweeping statements which are difficult to comment on or monitor; this is not what is intended

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
	DPD		by “flexibility”. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No sound evidence for the U-turn from southern to northern SUE. • Most of the development is shouldered by a small section of the community with no funding for infrastructure. • Premise that it is best to locate all development in one place is flawed and has no substance behind it. • There is plenty of space around town and in villages to share out the impact of development. • A widespread development would have least impact on the environment, the overloaded roads and the community. • Much of the CS therefore fails to meet a key objective of a better quality of life for everyone, now and in future.
13 3	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Dr Andy Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document is very long and could have been consolidated. • Difficult to find on the MBC website. • Consultation period not long enough. • Difficult to believe councillors had time to review it in detail. • Full of contradictions, in some cases out of date information and no clear idea of what will be delivered. • Questions the legality and soundness of the process and of the CS and SUE. • Questions if LCC are dictating where the development should go for land ownership reasons.
14 6	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Mrs Susan Marshall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBC do not wish to cram villages as they have limited services, but this is not applied to the town, whose residents need safeguarding as much as villagers. • Landscape impact of John Ferneley School is a reason for the northern SUE, but this is an excuse and ignores the impact on the country park, which will be cut off from the countryside, destroying wildlife habitats. • Rolling landscapes should be protected for future generations to enjoy. • Encouraging people to walk, cycle or use public transport will not work when there has been a cut in bus services. • Placing SUE to the north and employment to the south west will cause havoc on the roads. • Questions the quantity of housing needed and object to choice of location. • Impact should be spread between several town sites and the villages, including brownfield sites in town. • Developers are already questioning the viability of 1000 houses- believes 1800 will be needed in the 1st phase. • No confirmed funding for infrastructure and facilities needed.
15 2	Melton Core Strategy	Mr and Mrs Boustead	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern SUE a recipe for traffic chaos. • Will sever wildlife to and from the country park.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
	Publication DPD		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of employment and leisure is to south and west of Melton, so quality of life of residents on Scafford Road and Nottingham Road will be reduced due to traffic. • SUE should not be considered until LCC funds are available for a bypass. • LCC as landowner will gain by supporting the development; it should put council tax money back in for a bypass.
16 2	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Mr Roger Penford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to 1000 to 3400 new houses and 2 gipsy sites. • Spinney Road is already dangerous with no footpath and Twinlakes expanding. • Development will exacerbate problems at junction with Thorpe Road and risk serious accidents. • No consideration to infrastructure.
16 4	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Mr Kenneth Dimaline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aim to get peoples to walk, cycle and bus is a dream; northern SUE and western commercial development will shatter the dream. • CS is flawed from the start because it ignores fundamental issues, especially roads. New road will funnel traffic to existing congestion.
16 5	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Mr Michael Cavani	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about soundness and legal compliance. • Consultation period too short – 12 weeks is normal. • Councillors given insufficient time to read and absorb documents. • Wording of resolution in relation to Employment Growth Area is misleading – should have been “south-west”. • Advice from LCC is biased because it is a landowner. • People were disenfranchised because some members for affected wards (landowners or County Councillors) could not vote.
17 3	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Dr Matthew O'Callaghan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous top-down housing figures replaced by local determination. • Leicestershire Housing Requirements Project suggests 135 to 190 pa; 170 is 35 above the low figure, which is 490 over the plan period. If 135 is true, then half the houses are unnecessary. • Significant uncertainty as to how many homes are needed. • 80% houses are going to the town which has 53% of the population. The 80:20 split is arbitrary and contrary to market demand and council waiting list. • Ruling group on Council is biased towards rural area. • Current rural house building is 70 pa, 41% of the projected 170 pa figure; so it is perverse to cut this by half. • This risks allowing villages to die, with local services closing and people forced to move away. • Amount of affordable housing will also be reduced, despite need and 20% limit will force up prices. • Once 20% reached will there be an embargo on more houses? This could be open to legal challenge. • Opposed to concentration of houses in one location in town rather than dispersing them to limit impact.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A bypass will not be achieved despite promises from LCC and it is not included in the Local Transport Plan to 2026. There is no prospect of Government or LCC funding. • The SUE only delivers a short piece of road, sufficient to mitigate the 1000 houses and no more; and even this is coming into question. • Nobody will pay for the £4m link through to Thorpe Road. • The whole scheme, including £20m essential items, does not stack up, especially if real demand is for only 490 houses. • Meanwhile all traffic will come down Scafford Road, Melton Spinney Rd and Nottingham Rd, generating extra congestion with no prospect of a bypass. • Transport study states that £3m improvements to Melton Spinney Road are needed, CS is silent on who will pay for this. • Putting the houses to the north when employment and spare school capacity is to the south, and the most adverse environmental and landscape impact is to the north, is clearly illogical. • A major reason put forward in 2009 was developability, with the consortium more prepared. But this is a loose confederation mostly of option holders with tensions between them, which could get worse given two development scenarios. • To the south there is one major landowner, the Town Estate, which is in a better position to provide a link road. This would more than just alleviate its own traffic and would be cheaper than the northern link because of less environmental impact/ mitigation and spare school places. • Localism Act has new ways of producing Local Plans. • CIL means that it doesn't matter where the housing goes as all will contribute, so housing could be dispersed around the town. • With so much uncertainty, Council were wrong to decide its Core Strategy in February 2012. It should have postponed it until October. • This would also allow updating of evidence base much of which dates from before the recession. • Political climate has also changed, with new councillors. • Risk of re-writing to take account of NPPF is also a reason for delay. • Risk of losing appeals because of a lack of a 5 year housing supply has been shown to be false by success at the Bottesford appeal. • CS does not comply with the requirements of the NPPF. • Concerned that only 6 weeks consultation period was allowed, whereas Council policy is for 12 weeks for complex issues.
21	Melton Core	Mr John	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of balance between rural and urban development.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
1		Strategy Publication DPD	Gibbs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentration in one place is detrimental to the area as a whole.
24 4		Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Mr David Turner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document poorly constructed in terms of syntax and use of out of date reference information. • Not an easy read and difficult to pick out the salient points; sustainable travel is minor and inconsequential. • Lacks currency given financial restrictions on infrastructure/ services. • Clear rural bias in terms of protection, while not realising the benefits of development for vibrant communities.
26 7		Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Mr Chris Donegani	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposes housing to the north and employment to the south west and admits it will be difficult to fund the connecting link. • Also fails environmentally because of impact on green infrastructure.
27 7		Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Melton North Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sound because not the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. • MNAG represents a significant proportion of the adult population, based on a 2,400+ petition. • 6 weeks is too short to study & comment on such an important document. • Difficult to reconcile statement that extensive consultation has taken place with minimum consultation period being undertaken at each step. • Masterplan consultation period was extended to 12 weeks after lobbying and this example of poor administration has been repeated over the CS consultation. • CS is not legally compliant because it does not comply with SCI and the Regulations. • CS is unsound because of failure of due diligence to present an Investment Appraisal of delivery including an equal weighting investigation of alternatives. • Reasonable alternatives for the SUE have not been investigated; there was a predetermination in favour of the northern SUE by MBC, LCC and Prospect Leicestershire in 2008 before the SA was done. • No evidence of confirmed delivery of aims and objectives – only unreasonable and inappropriate aspirations. • Should be a risk matrix identifying factors influencing delivery and mitigation plans for risks. • Main concern is CS's reliance on deliverability of the northern SUE and the decision making process which led to this as the preferred option in November 2009. • Council has not complied with SEA requirements because it did not fully consider all the options. • Difficult to understand the reasons why the north was chosen for the SUE given the SA identified the north as not the best option. • Reasons based on traffic flow and extension to John Ferneley school are open to challenge.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBC fails to recognise the ADAS Land Character Assessment. • Panoply of traffic reports no longer form a credible evidence base because the planning assumptions for the bypass have been changed by deletion of the southern Leicester Rd-Oakham Rd link. • Paragraphs 4.6 and 15.4 of the CS show that the evidence base has not been improved / updated in order to speed up the process of delivery. This indicates an absence of due diligence and undermines the credibility of the whole plan. • Wants more detail of confirmed resources, and of what will be delivered, where, when and how, especially in relation to community facilities. • Compared to the southern option, it has highest environmental and landscape impact, lower quality of life assessment, attracts a lower population, produces fewer employment opportunities, has questionable deliverability, is further from employment in SW Melton and in Leicester, has poorest public transport, has less accessibility, is not necessarily more cost effective, has significant impact on roads, is further from leisure facilities, and does not take account of recent changes to education provision. • More information is required on employment, including an employment land trajectory and employment mix. • 5% economic growth assumption is not supported by a plan to deliver the number of jobs demanded from the houses proposed. • No evidence of how a 16% (or higher) growth in population will impact on key services (health and education) and local infrastructure.
288	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Mrs Debbie Adams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation period too short. • Wording and phraseology of the document not user- friendly. • Surprised Councillors can understand it. • Unsound because figures and reports date back to 2006; much has happened since then.
291	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Broughton and Dalby Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes progress on the CS. • Not clear how the vision of ensuring a better quality of life for everyone, now and in the future, will be measured.
301	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Broughton and Dalby Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes principles in CS which aim to protect the environment from inappropriate development, but they are not yet adopted. • Need to include a statement that the CS principles already carry weight to stop developers bringing forward schemes that go against the CS in the meantime.
309	Melton Core Strategy Publication	BPR Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document too long and complex. • Criteria for a sustainable community are flawed, especially in relation to bus services and regarding public houses as a community or leisure facility. They should have a minimum population.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
	DPD		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions how much scope local communities have in neighbourhood plans. Some better than none. • Renewable energy section very badly written. Uses MW (megawatts), which is potential power output and not MWhr (megawatt hours) which is the likely energy output in relation to time. Wind will not meet demand at certain times, especially in winter if wind speed is too low or too high.
310	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Mrs Philippa Beech	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests to extend the consultation period were refused, despite the amount of information and the importance to all residents. • Many of the points are vague and difficult to comment on.
328	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Mr D. Brook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document reads like a draft version. Due to contradictions, qualifications of intent and absence of supporting argument for policy direction.
330	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome engagement throughout the LDF process. • Transport modelling and a sustainable transport strategy have demonstrated the road links required. • High modal shift targets will be extremely challenging in a rural district; corresponding investment in alternatives to the private car will be needed. • Supports the overall direction of growth and is working with landowners to deliver the project. • A new primary school and an extension to John Ferneley School will be required. • Supports the aspiration for an excellent electronic communications network. Superfast broadband is essential to deliver across a range of policies and priorities in the CS and should be emphasised. It should be provided in all new housing and employment developments.
353	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Font size too small to be as accessible to as many people as possible.
375	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Mr John E Clark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A high number of statements of intent – will MBC held to account for not delivering in full? • Doubts whether they, and aspirations, can be fulfilled; or whether this is political spin. • Statements of previous achievement would enable assessment of how well MBC is tackling problems. • Does the document have ‘bite’?
384	Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Buckminster Trust Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally supportive of the CS, although some detailed concerns set out elsewhere.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
405		Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Susan Love	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too large and complicated to be understood by many residents. • What action has been taken to make everyone aware of its significance?
407		Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Revd Dr Janet King	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surprise and concern at short time (including Easter) allowed for consultation given size and complexity. • Much of the research to support the CS is out of date.
410		Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Anglian Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serves some parishes- most of the borough covered by Severn Trent.
433		Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Melton Community Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports document. • Aims and objectives of CS reflect the Sustainable Community strategy.
434		Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Joanne Belcher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessively large and not easy to find. • Timescale for response relatively short. • Objections raised previously still not answered (copy of e-mail attached) • MBC using old documents to justify decisions; these figures are now questionable and at the time supported a southern SUE. • Northern SUE is not what the local needs are.
441		Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Peter Brett Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS should fully reflect the NPPF presumption in favour of development., a ‘golden thread’ through plan-making and decision-taking. All local plans should contain clear policies that guide how the presumption should be applied locally. • 12 Core Principles should underpin the plan, including supporting sustainable economic development in order to deliver new homes, business and industrial units, and supporting thriving local places. • CS was published in advance of the NPPF and should better reflect its aims, especially the presumption and the support of sustainable economic growth.
446		Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expect that the Council will make changes to the Core Strategy to ensure compliance with the NPPF as part of its transition into a Local Plan. • Welcomes that the HRA and AA incorporates previous comments and do not have any further comments to make; they may need to change if significant changes made to CS at Examination.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will comment further on SA after it has been revised to take account of changes.
45 4		Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Mr Keith Allen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most important and far-reaching document in 42 years; only 6 weeks to comment is surprising and inappropriate. A more democratic approach is to allow longer.
47 3		Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	South Melton Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning system has now changed – full impact of these changes not yet understood. • MBC’s lack of assessment of the changes means uncertainty about how planning decisions can be enforced.
10 5		Melton Core Strategy Publication DPD	Dr Leslie Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Split between town and rural area should be more balanced, say 55:45 • 1000 homes will put services in town under pressure. • CS is biased towards rural areas. • Brownfield sites should be used before greenfield- suspects this is because of LCC owned land. • CS4 allows dwellings in flood risk area - not sound planning. • Radon ingress on land to north will cause health problems. • SUE will have serious environmental effects on wildlife, hedgerows, trees and Melton Country Park. • Why plan housing development in the north separate from employment development in the south? • CS should not progress unless firm funding is in place for new roads. • Up to date traffic survey required with computer predictions of traffic scenarios with northern SUE and employment development to the south. • SUE will not be integrated into the landscape. • Required facilities, especially primary school and recreation, will not be delivered. • Proposed road link goes nowhere and will cause problems at Melton Spinney/ Thorpe Road and Scalford Road/ Norman Way junctions. • Employment growth area is in opposite direction to the SUE leading to more congestion, possibly gridlock.

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
22	1	Introduction	Mr. Lawrence Dryell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation period too short. • LCC have vested interest. • Traffic studies ignored –updated studies would change the situation.
60	1	Introduction	Ashwood Property Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not consistent with NPPF. • Should extend to 2028 or longer to comply with NPPF.
117	1	Introduction	Mr Phil John	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation period too short. • Lack of response by MBC to feedback from recent SUE consultation. • Fails to ensure a better quality of life for everyone, now and future generations
132	1	Introduction	Ms Helen Chadwick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross boundary effects not fully addressed.
147	1	Introduction	Mrs Susan Marshall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1000 houses at Melton Mowbray leads to cramming of the town, whereas rural villages are safeguarded because of lack of facilities. • Facilities and infrastructure in town cannot be provided. • John Ferneley School’s landscape impact is not a reason for allocating the SUE. • SUE will disastrously impact the Country Park. • Beautiful landscapes should be protected. • Wildlife habitat should be protected. • Recent cuts in bus services undermine ability to increase public transport use. • SUE in north with employment growth to the west will increase car travel leading to traffic congestion and rat runs. • Housing is needed but not in this quantity and location: should be spread between town sites and suitable villages. • 1000 houses will not be viable and there is no funding for infrastructure, putting the CS into question.
148	1	Introduction	Mr Ken Lucas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document is too complex discouraging involvement.
161	1	Introduction	Woodcock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More time needed to consider the document. • Incorrect reference to John Ferneley as a ‘new’ school. • The school cannot cope with 1000 more houses.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grantham Road to Leicester Road link road need; otherwise there will be town centre gridlock. • More Brownfield sites within the town should be developed first. • Illogical to have houses in the north and employment in the west. • Extra 3000 people will not benefit the town because of the impact on services, e.g. doctors. • The whole SUE should be re-thought.
178	1 Introduction	Friends of Melton Country Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS proposes houses on the zone of highest landscape quality around the town. • ADAS reports 2006 and 2011 on character and sensitivity of landscape are not referred to; these are fundamental to countryside protection. • Various reports do not prove the strategy, so putting the soundness of the CS in doubt. Sustainability and legality therefore also doubtful. • No reference to NPPF 2012, which means that the CS will be out of date and irrelevant. • No specific plans for protection of the Country Park from encroaching development. • Playing fields adjoining the Country Park (as in Masterplan Option 3) will interfere with wildlife corridor. • The main lake is already a balancing reservoir and would flood if required to also serve 1000 new houses, impacting nests in the breeding season. • Cycling/ footpaths would have a detrimental effect on wildlife. • “Vague promises” of 40 extra hectares will not benefit wildlife as it is not at the northern end of the park; developers have indicated that there will be no extra land. • Publishing of the CS without proper site plans is not sensible and highlights it is of doubtful legality. • Consequences for the Country Park were not properly considered when SUE decision taken. • Recent appeal at Bottesford was dismissed and the same principles apply to this location.
198	1 Introduction	Mrs Margaret Glancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS proposes houses on the zone of highest landscape quality around the town. • ADAS reports 2006 and 2011 on character and sensitivity of landscape are not referred to; these are fundamental to countryside protection. • Various reports do not prove the strategy, so putting the soundness of the CS in doubt. Sustainability and legality therefore also doubtful. • No reference to NPPF 2012, which means that the CS will be out of date and irrelevant.
212	1 Introduction	Mr John Gibbs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation period too short- cynical and against local democracy.
228	1 Introduction	Mr. Richard Kendall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80/20 split of housing allocation does not represent existing balance; it fundamentally changes the shape of the borough without proper assessment of impact, e.g. on village services and growth/ employment. • CS does not provide for appropriate affordable housing. • It discounts all environmental reports appertaining to landscape.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It does not assess risks or have risk mitigation strategies. • No robust financial plan and funding based on contributions from developers who have indicated that the amount of affordable housing and the country park are not sustainable. • Greater rate of growth than ONS forecasts so increasing pressure on services and traffic congestion. • No evidence of how the increase in population will be accommodated, e.g. impact on schools, health and social services, leisure facilities. • It does not solve traffic problems; mitigating traffic is based on hope that funding will be made available. • Exclusion of sections 1-3 of the by-pass is not logical and negates all traffic reports. • Does not take account of recent changes to planning legislation. • Over-reliance on just one site with no contingencies allowance.
319	1	Introduction	Mr Mark Twitney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation period too short. • It should not have taken place after the SUE consultation, giving the impression that the SUE decision had already been taken.
331	1	Introduction	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan period too short, contrary to NPPF; does not address longer term needs of the borough. Harborough Inspector requested a 2 year extension and roll forward of policies. • Welcomes the new role of Neighbourhood Planning.
414	1	Introduction	Northern SUE Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective of sustainable development is at the heart of the consultation document; fully endorses the SUE. • Plan should be extended to cover a 15 year timescale so as to be more responsive to change • In the absence of a 15 year timeframe, allow for 'headroom' • Para 1.6 is misleading, implying that LPAs have sole discretion on housing figures, whereas it must be based on evidence and is not just locally driven. • Saved policies should not be used after the CS is adopted; they may be inconsistent with NPPF and the 12 Core Planning Principles. NPPF rather than outdated policies should fill any gaps in policy, since the adopted Local Plan, unlike the CS, may not be sound. • The CS should identify sites within the broad location for development of the SUE, focussing on early phases in support of the 2013 date in the trajectory. Sites may come forward before the AAP is adopted. • Make reference to the provision of infrastructure being expected from individual sites as well as the SUE.

CHAPTER 2 – MELTON BOROUGH PROFILE

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
118	2	Melton Borough Profile	Mr Phil John	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic modelling does not take through traffic into account • Modelling data out of date • Modelling conclusions incorrect • Lack of infrastructure/road funding • Northern SUE will increase congestion • SUE to South would not require new school
169	2	Melton Borough Profile	Melton North Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not address traffic congestion • No A607 (Leicester Rd) to A606 (Oakham Rd) link undermines modelling
179	2	Melton Borough Profile	Friends of Melton Country Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on most attractive countryside • Location of housing does not reflect population distribution • Increased travel times in town • Jobs should be created before housing to reduce commuting • Impact of SUE on listed building • Increased flood risk • Number of secondary schools incorrect 3 not 4 • Small village schools will become unsustainable due to location of development • Increased road accidents due to congestion • Disregard to issues of local importance – traffic congestion • No funding for bypass available • 80/20 split will disadvantage technology available in rural areas • Development on agricultural land • Impact on countryside/wildlife
199	2	Melton Borough Profile	Mrs Margaret Glancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location of housing does not represent population split • Increased congestion • Bottesford suitable location for development • Impact of SUE on listed building • Increased risk of flooding • Impact on wildlife/natural habitat • Questions number of schools • Impact of development split on village schools

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased road accidents • Disregard to issues of local importance – traffic congestion • Impact on obesity • Closure of rural services • 80/20 split will disadvantage technology available in rural areas • Loss of agricultural
240	2	Melton Borough Profile	English Heritage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of listed buildings incorrect • Number of Scheduled Monuments incorrect • Remove “Ancient” from terminology • Add Registered Parks and Gardens
278	2	Melton Borough Profile	Melton North Action Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No effective funded strategy on resolving traffic congestion – a top priority • Section of bypass from A607 (Leicester Rd) to A606 (Oakham Rd) no longer included • No recent traffic survey undertaken since closure of KEVII and extending John Fernley • Lack of credible evidence base
289	2	Melton Borough Profile	Mrs Debbie Adams <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased congestion in town • SUE located in wrong location for those working to the South (Leicester)
366	2	Melton Borough Profile	Leicestershire Local Access Forum <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional wording to para 2.22
462	2	Melton Borough Profile	Leicestershire County Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove “Ancient”
487	2	Melton Borough Profile	Dilys Shepherd <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor opportunities for public transport increasing car usage
492	2	Melton Borough Profile	Bottesford Parish Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with need for smaller properties and identify the difficulties of extensions increasing dwelling size • Need to assist farmers and farm diversification • Suggest small park and ride in Melton at supermarket to encourage town centre use

CHAPTER 3 – VISION AND OBJECTIVES

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
140	3	Our Vision and Objectives	Mr Neil Goodfellow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on traffic • Impact on Country Park
193	3	Our Vision and Objectives	Woodcock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for consultation extension • Wording suggests John Ferneley is a new school • New road link required • Impact on traffic • Loss of greenfield not necessary, brownfield sites could accommodate • Housing to North, employment to the West without new road not logical • Health infrastructure cannot accommodate further growth
200	3	Our Vision and Objectives	Mrs Margaret Glancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of support for young people • Views of residents ignored • Impact on traffic • Population split not represented • More affordable housing needed in the rural Borough
235	3	Our Vision and Objectives	Mr Richard Kendall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focusing housing on the Town will disadvantage rural communities, especially the young • Focus on town will increase travel to work in rural areas • Detrimental impact on affordable housing focussing it at the SUE to the expense of rural areas contrary to Council's own policy • Quality of life for everyone will not be improved by the SUE • Protection of the countryside will not be achieved by the Core Strategy • SUE will impact on the best landscape area • Detrimental impact on the Country Park
268	3	Our Vision and Objectives	Melton North Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focusing housing on the Town will disadvantage rural communities, especially the young • Focus on town will increase travel to work in rural areas • Detrimental impact on affordable housing focussing it at the SUE to the expense of rural areas contrary to Council's own policy • Quality of life for everyone will not be improved by the SUE • Protection of the countryside will not be achieved by the Core Strategy • SUE will impact on the best landscape area • Detrimental impact on the Country Park

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
36 5	3	Our Vision and Objectives Leicestershire Local Access Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Widen spatial vision to make reference to rights of way network Include a dedicated section referring to existing network and potential improvements, wording for additional paragraph suggested Amend para 3.5 add to Reduce Traffic Congestion - "by encouraging more use of public transport and non motorised travel. To this end to facilitate a more coordinated public transport system." Amend para 3.7 para 3 add - "and opportunities for residents to access it for leisure using non motorized travel will be encouraged by linking rights of way in the urban areas to the wider network" Amend para 3.7 para 7 add - "and opportunities for residents to access it for leisure using non motorized travel will be encouraged by linking rights of way in the urban areas to the wider network"
36 7	3	Our Vision and Objectives Leicestershire Local Access Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add statement about public transport and non-motorised travel to Melton SCS objectives Add reference to linking to rights of way network by non-motorized transport.
37 7	3	Our Vision and Objectives Mr John E Clark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns with obesity conflict with Rural Capital of Food
38 3	3	Our Vision and Objectives Buckminster Trust Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the spatial vision reference to villages
41 5	3	Our Vision and Objectives Northern SUE Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to market housing in para 3.5 bullet point 5 Provide stronger linkages to NPPF text by amending 3.5
43 5	3	Our Vision and Objectives Joanne Belcher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development will not improve the local economy and infrastructure SUE to North will cause traffic congestion Insufficient car parking in town Visual impact of SUE Brownfield land should be developed first Housing should be distributed around the town and villages Loss of Greenfield land Impact on wildlife No need for additional G & T sites
45 6	3	Our Vision and Objectives Mr R Booth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports Vision
46 3	3	Our Vision and Objectives Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend 3.7 Melton Mowbray Town Centre: insert ' respecting Melton's rich history , the town should match its brand...' Amend 3.7 Protecting the countryside: amend '...managed to protect our valued and much loved historic

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
			and natural landscape.'
48 3	3	Our Vision and Objectives Mrs Shelagh Woollard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with 80/20 housing split but suggest a definition of “small-scale development” to define what constitutes inappropriate and unacceptable development
49 3	3	Our Vision and Objectives Bottesford Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sainsburys will remove custom from town centre • New Council Offices are built on flood plain contrary to CS • Spatial vision concentrates on community but neglects green infrastructure
50 6	3	Our Vision and Objectives Long Clawson Dairy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long Clawson Dairy support the vision and objectives
51 5	3	Our Vision and Objectives Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased recycling should be included in Objective 27
1	3.8	Spatial Vision Mr Lawrence Dryell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree
27	3.8	Spatial Vision Mr Robert Wells	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reference to G&Ts
18 1	3.8	Spatial Vision Friends of Melton Country Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80/20 split doesn't reflect needs of the community and will be detrimental to villages • Increased traffic congestion not management • Detrimental impact on landscape and countryside • Key objectives outdated since change of government • No regard to NPPF and Localism Act
24 1	3.8	Spatial Vision English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic environment is not recognised in key objectives • Amend objective 22 to "natural, built, and historic environment"
26 3	3.8	Spatial Vision Peel Energy Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must ensure consistency with NPPF. • Tackling climate change not adequately addressed in spatial vision. • Amend Spatial Vision, final para, to include “generating energy from low-carbon and renewable sources”
30 0	3.8	Spatial Vision Mrs Debbie Adams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80/20 split will not enable villages to remain vibrant • Melton North SUE and 80% of housing will destroy the Spatial Vision
46 4	3.8	Spatial Vision Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend spatial vision para 4 to mention historic character of the countryside

CHAPTER 4 – MEETING THE NEED FOR DEVELOPMENT

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
2	4	Meeting the need for development	Mr Lawrence Dryell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disagrees with statements re self containment (out-commuting), housing requirement (houses for sale/to let), and industrial job growth. Melton has failed to attract major non- food retailers . MBC should provide new swimming facilities and shut down the Waterfield pool.
75	4	Meeting the need for development	Ashwood Property Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not consistent with NPPF Extend Plan period to 2028 Clarify residual requirement after completions since 2006
91	4	Meeting the need for development	Mr Mike Powderly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No local need demonstrated for 1000 dwelling SUE. Housing waiting list is only 3% so not a priority area. RSS and CSs are politically imposed by EMRA and LCC. Housing accepted in return for a by-pass which will not be delivered because of cost. Additional 2000 jobs needed to serve new housing, plus 4000 to stop out-commuting. This is unrealistic. Increased commuting will increase road deaths and travel costs. Limited hospital service remains in the town. School reorganisation has been too costly and sites of closed schools sold off to recoup costs. Proposed northern extension is barely large enough to fund a primary school. May need to re-open the previous main school at John Ferneley. The SUE will present problems for surface water drainage, requiring new sewers and balancing pond. Town centre is under threat from approval of Sainsbury’s store by the Council, off-setting high cost of its offices on a site which should have been mixed use. Previous town centre redevelopment has not fostered trade and the historic fabric of the centre is under threat.
119	4	Meeting the need for development	Mr Phil John	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence to support the statement that the community supports the amount of housing. This level of housing is not correct in the current economic climate. The time-consuming determination of a good basis for housing and economic development should be done. Does not accept that the high end number should be taken. Future economic growth will not happen, especially without new roads, and so cannot be stifled.
141	4	Meeting the need for development	Mr Neil Goodfellow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not all development contributes to sport and recreation facilities. What sports facilities will be guaranteed for the northern SUE?

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When will sports hall be replaced?
166	4	Meeting the need for development Mr Michael Cavani	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence to support the statement that the community supports the amount of housing. Real evidence from petitions and letters would suggest otherwise. Increase of 1300 jobs requirement in 4.9 and fall of 600 industrial and warehousing employment in 4.10 should result in a need for just 700 jobs.
180	4	Meeting the need for development Friends of Melton Country Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local decision on housing numbers and consideration of community needs have been disregarded in relation to the urban/ rural split. Rural communities will be disadvantaged as a result. No evidence to support the statement that the community supports the amount of housing. Newspaper opinion poll suggests otherwise. Communication needed on Examination. MBC should not be using RSS target in the light of proposed abolition of the Regional Plan.
201	4	Meeting the need for development Mrs Margaret Glancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amount of development does not reflect population split, the needs of the borough and future generations. Forcing young families to move to the town for affordable housing is out of order and unsound.
219	4	Meeting the need for development Mr David Turner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence to support the claims of business development. The SUE will result in traffic chaos- adding to existing congestion will put off businesses relocating here. PGI status for Pork Pie will not prevent other food production moving elsewhere. Rural Capital of Food puts all eggs in one basket. The town does not meet the need for non-food partly because of the poorly managed 'Melton' brand and partly because the reality does not meet the vision. Expansion of Belvoir High is welcomed. LCC withdrawal of free travel from Long Clawson and Hose will reduce capacity at John Ferneley.
220	4	Meeting the need for development Mrs Anne Meek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not demonstrated that there are enough jobs for present or new residents or that new employers are not being discouraged by the current overcrowded roads. Need have certainty about finance for roads before houses built.
230	4	Meeting the need for development Mr Richard Kendall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demand for 3400 houses is unproven- target is based on a previous top-down growth strategy and will increase the population above ONS forecasts. This is amplified by the 80:20 split. CS does not explain how infrastructure will be provided- schools, employment and traffic alleviation. EMRP target should not be used in the light of abolition of RSS and economic situation. Alternative range of 135-197 is still top-down and not based on evidence for the borough. In the absence of evidence, it would be safer to go for the lower figure. There would be enough land to meet this without a SUE, allowing more flexibility of location.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political, urbanised, top-down approach is in opposition to new planning guidelines. • MBC have abandoned an evidence-based approach for the sake of expediency. • Forecast employment is less than required for population growth and population growth associated with 3400 homes is higher than stated (6000 not 3500). • No evidence that adequate school, leisure and health facilities will be in place.
279	4 Meeting the need for development	Melton North Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section is not based robust and credible evidence. • It is not the most appropriate strategy of the alternatives • No regard to national policies. • Para 4.6 undermines validity of the CS by admitting that preparation of evidence based on a different figure would be time-consuming and add delay. • Housing requirement is based on values and predictions from central and regional government, contrary to the Localism Act. • Reassessing housing requirement will require a reassessment of job needs- based on a 7752 population increase (derived from multiplying 3400 new homes by an average household size) the job need is 2258 as opposed to 1300. Undesirable effects will result. • The effects of this on retail, recreation, health and education have not been fully considered.
307	4 Meeting the need for development	Mrs Debbie Adams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence to support the statement that the community supports the amount of housing. • No land available for provision of 2,500 sq. m. of non-food shopping floorspace, since MBC's offices were built on earmarked land. • Latham House Medical Practice cannot meet community needs with increased infrastructure since it is surrounded by roads and other buildings and has inadequate parking.
320	4 Meeting the need for development	Mr Mark Twitney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to closure of children's leisure pool at Waterfield
339	4 Meeting the need for development	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific policy for waste management principles and infrastructure, other than within major growth sites. Requests a separate policy.
355	4 Meeting the need for development	Melton Mowbray & District Civic Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing need is exaggerated - an oversupply of nearly 58%. Correct figures would make previous Option D (Small Sites) more attractive. • No mention of proposed country park west of the Town Estate Golf Course. • Support the Council in retaining all school playing fields for vigorous play, sport, walking etc.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
363	4	Meeting the need for development	Melton Mowbray & District Civic Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of evidence, as required by NPPF, to support the SUE which exaggerates the number of houses needed. • New plan should be published which takes account of assessed housing need and brownfield site availability. • More business activity required to reduce out-commuting before further houses built. • 1000 houses will endanger the character of the town, not strengthen it.
368	4	Meeting the need for development	Leicestershire Local Access Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add to para 4.22 "Links to and between these areas and the wider rights of way network need protecting and enhancing" • Add to para 4.26 " "We will also protect and where possible create non motorised routes both to provide access to these sites but to also provide a means of taking exercise and fresh air for the general health of the population"
416	4	Meeting the need for development	Northern SUE Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS should contain more flexibility to facilitate delivery beyond 2026; could be 197dpa for the next 5 years, as part of the SUE. • Or could "restart" the plan at 2011 so that all dwellings (3400) contribute to infrastructure. • Employment land includes planning for the long-term – same should apply to housing.
442	4	Meeting the need for development	Peter Brett Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagrees with conclusions of retail study that no more convenience and limited non-food shopping is required • Qualitative arguments should apply to convenience as well as non-food shops, especially for a high end and a deep-discount store . • Qualitative factors from the PPS4 Practice Guide should be referred to in the CS
476	4	Meeting the need for development	South Melton Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a new site for sports facilities rather than redevelop Waterfield.
494	4	Meeting the need for development	Bottesford Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mention of distribution, location and mix of dwellings for Bottesford.
516	4	Meeting the need for development	Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater and remediation of contaminated sites are not adequately addressed. • Suggested addition to Policy CS4

CHAPTER 5 - WHERE DEVELOPMENT WILL TAKE PLACE

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
3	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mr Lawrence Dryell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the light of precedence for Brownfield sites, opposes Greenfield site at the SUE; extending village envelopes would be better. South of Melton proposal should be re-submitted. Conflict between refusal of 50 homes at Bottesford and the SUE. Views of rural population take precedence over those of Melton Mowbray residents.
11	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mr. Alan Danbury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No post office in Long Clawson; if this is a critical attribute, it should not be a Rural centre.
18	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mr Lawrence Dryell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vision of a new community could be applied to other centres, e.g. Bottesford. Refusal of housing in rural areas / no expansion of village envelopes are used to add weight to the SUE. Melton Mowbray disadvantaged by no parish council.
45	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mr & Mrs Pompa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports Strategy and many detailed proposals. Concern about scale of development in Rural centres, especially Bottesford. Calculates that 50 dwellings will be provided in Bottesford, which offers limited employment opportunities, so travelling distances, especially to Nottingham on the congested A52, will be increased. This is not sustainable. Public transport too infrequent. Primary school cannot cope with numbers. Village character and historic buildings would be undermined. Character already eroded by ordinary infill development. Edge of village estates will create a dull commuter town. Bottesford has already taken its share of development. Policy of not allowing development in advance of facilities in small villages should also apply to larger villages.
59	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Ms. Ann Cluskey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Melton Mowbray should have the same protection as villages with limited facilities and services because its infrastructure will also be under pressure from the SUE. Develop at King Edward VII school site rather than on rural fields. Landscape appraisals show high quality in the north. SUE in the north will affect the whole town without traffic infrastructure.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
64	5 Where Development Will Take Place	Dr Andy Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment is not in the north, thus increasing commuting travel. • MM will be a commuter town because it cannot attract new business in the current climate. • Building to the north will increase journeys to community facilities, shops etc and to employment. • Strategy will not achieve more walking and cycling- build more flats on Brownfield sites around town centre. • Grow the villages to make them more commercially viable and give them much needed affordable housing for the young. • Build on Brownfield sites in town, e.g. King Edward VII School, which is conveniently located for all facilities, and on the Sainsbury's site, which could go out of town. • By-pass needed but there is no funding for it. • Building housing to the north and employment to the south does not make sense without the bypass. • Investment Plans are out of date and cannot be delivered. • 80/20 urban / rural split should be 55/45 to mirror existing population. • Current road infrastructure not coping. 1000+ houses will destroy town through traffic congestion. Sainsbury's will worsen this. • LCC should use money from sale of land at the SUE to pay for the by-pass now. • MBC cannot guarantee new facilities, services and infrastructure as developers' profit margins too small. MBC need to clarify what is being provided before the CS moves forward. • Doubts MBC's knowledge / forecasting of business needs. • Supports sustainable villages, so 50% development should be in the rural community. Build on all Brownfield sites in all villages and consider building in all villages. • Villages have been consulted, but not the town. Parish councils. Plans in villages but not the town. This is undemocratic –provide a Town Council.
76	5 Where Development Will Take Place	Ashwood Property Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS is not effective because it cannot be monitored. Policy does not set out the overall spatial strategy, i.e. the amount and distribution of housing development in the borough, especially the rural area.
85	5 Where Development Will Take Place	Ms Johanna Allen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth over the last 50 years has not involved increasing the size of the town centre which has difficulty coping in terms of parking and the road system. But growth could attract larger retailers. • Better to have a new separate community with its own facilities. • 1000 houses not enough to enable contribution to infrastructure. • 80% new housing in town is too much -should be 50:50 split. • Use the old airfield south of Melton, rather than farmland.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
100	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Dr Leslie Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council are ignoring ADAS report showing the SUE is on the highest quality landscape around the town. • Some of the evidence documents are out of date. • Assumption that more industry can be attracted is optimistic without infrastructure so the SUE will become a dormitory for commuters to outside MM. • No more likely that residents of the northern SUE would cycle or walk than in any other location. • People will use cars to get to work unless the employment is in the same area. Hence development without new roads will lead to chaos and gridlock. • No provision for affordable housing for those outside the town. • LCC have a vested interest in the northern SUE. • Vacant Brownfield land around the town should be chosen for residential development, e.g. King Edward VII School. • Predicted requirement is 3600, not 1000 homes, which needs a bypass. • Plans for investment and allocation of resources based on outdated 2006 statistics. • Vision and Objectives needs to be reviewed in the light of NPPF . • 80/20 urban/rural split will not provide houses where needed; more logical to split 50:50. • 1000+ houses will cause current ailing infrastructure to break down. • Infrastructure and commercial growth should precede housing. • 1000 houses is not sufficient to support the infrastructure and services. Hence MBC must have confirmed that further development would follow. • Only the views of the Parishes have been formally heard, because they have Councils. The town loses out because there is no Town Council. • Rural population would have to live in the town to get affordable housing, so not supporting rural facilities and instead putting pressure on facilities in the town. • The CS is biased to the rural areas, almost protectionism, whilst placing the town under extreme pressure. • MBC appears to oppose village cramming but not town cramming. • MBC have ignored the environmental quality of the land identified for development
106	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Ian Shrubbs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treatment of Melton Mowbray is out of balance with that of the villages and Rural Centres. • Villages were consulted through Parish councils but the town was presented with the finished CS. • SUE in the north and employment in the south does not support sustainable travel. • Existing infrastructure struggling at peak times. Bypass funding unlikely. Northern link road will not solve problems.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
111	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Long Clawson Primary School	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential capacity problem at Long Clawson Primary School, where pupil numbers have increased over the last 5 years. • This raises concerns about Rural Centre designation where increases in housing stock are likely. • Requests liaison with LEA to ensure increases in village size take account of school infrastructure limitations. • Only limited potential to increase size of school but an amendment to plans for replacement of a mobile classroom could offer a solution, subject to funding.
120	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mr Phil John	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separation of employment growth area and SUE goes against sustainable travel. A SUE in the south would support this goal. • Development of 80% new housing in the town is disproportionate and not justified by facts. • Investment plans are out of date. • Assumption of a focus for development in one place is unsound. There are other options. • Parish councils were consulted but the town does not have an equal voice because it does not have a Town Council. • What is the equivalent of a sustainable village for the town? • No statement regarding Neighbourhood Planning for the town.
144	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mrs Denise Krzeczowski	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SUE in the north is not sustainable. • Urban/rural split should be 60/40. • Affordable housing should be built on brownfield sites first, e.g. King Edward VII school grounds. • Town has changed since LDF started in 2006, especially the education system and expansion of John Ferneley School. • Increased traffic and danger to pupils walking on Scaford Road. • No funding for bypass or road from Nottingham Road to Melton Spinney Road, so town will be gridlocked. • Encouraging people to walk or cycle to work is wishful thinking. • Put SUE on hold until funding is in place for bypass.
149	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mr Ken Lucas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SUE should not be allowed based on the hope that services and facilities would follow (as ruled out for villages).
151	5	Where Development Will Take	Mr Ken Lucas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective use of land by re-using Brownfield land should lead to development of land at King Edward VII School. • Moving away from village cramming should be applied to the SUE proposal.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
		Place		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MBC have not take account of the environmental quality of the SU site, ignoring ADAS report.
158	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Leicester, Leics, & Rutland PCT Cluster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to ensure that housing growth in rural areas can be accommodated by GP facilities; if not, impact of growth must be mitigated.
163	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Dr Andrew Bickle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenges designation of Long Lawson as a Rural Centre, partly because it is based on erroneous information, i.e. no post office. Also Long Clawson is out of place compared with other Rural centres, being smaller and without facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> no major connecting roads, no school capacity, only 1 pub which is 'precarious' free bus service to school being stopped poor internet access
167	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mr Michael Cavani	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Split between 1500 houses (eventually) in the north and employment growth in the SW goes against sustainable transport strategy (5.2) No guarantees that infrastructure will be in place before development or at all. 80% development in Melton Mowbray is an unfair split.
202	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mrs Margaret Glancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable transport strategy contradicted by locations of SUE and Employment Growth Area. Proportion of new houses should reflect existing population split. 80% development in the town will not provide housing where it is needed based on population. King Edward VII School should be used for development. Investment plans and allocation of resources are out of date. "Our policy direction may have the potential to deliver a decision making framework..." is a limp statement and not sound. NPPF will require Vision and Objectives to be reviewed.
213	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mr John Gibbs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limiting development in villages is inconsistent with allowing 1000 houses in a SUE without funding for facilities and infrastructure. There are more sites on Brownfield land, e.g. King Edward VII School. No infrastructure to cope with extra traffic through town by commuting residents.
221	5	Where Development Will Take	Mrs Anne Meek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spread houses around town, not in one place.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
		Place		
223	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mr Donald Cottingham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use Brownfield site at disused airport to the south, rather than Greenfields with the highest landscape value.
229	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mr Richard Kendall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS pre-determines location by the 80/20 urban/rural split, forcing young people needing affordable homes in rural areas to move to town. • Strategy also goes against Brownfield first approach, since many rural Brownfield sites are discounted. • Overly reliant on the SUE with no contingency plan if this is found unacceptable through the planning process. No flexibility as required by PPS12.
232	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mr David Turner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy based on out of date, 6 year, old housing surveys. • SUE will not be a self-contained community, because services cannot be resourced. • Villages are untouchable • Rural development does not meet local needs but provides houses for commuters to cities. • Rural communities must have their character preserved while thriving and moving forward. • Work with local employers such as Long Clawson Dairy to create real local employment. • How will link between rural housing development and complementary facilities work in practice? A few dwellings in villages are unlikely because of the need to provide facilities not needed in town. • Use more Brownfield sites in town rather than the current Greenfield SUE.
238	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mr John Gaunt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment in the south-west and housing in the north will increase traffic on already crowded roads; too far to walk, cycling unsafe and public transport being cut. Building housing nearer work opportunities would minimise town centre traffic increases. • 80/20 urban/ rural split does not make sense, starving villages of investment and moderate growth. Does not reflect existing 50/50 population • This will result in out-commuting to Melton , further congestion and loss of local schools, shops, pubs and post offices. • SUE conflicts with the re-use of land and buildings; there are enough sites on Brownfield land for 1000 houses without agricultural land, e.g. King Edward VII. • Investment plans based on out of date information – further study needed, e.g. development at Scalford Road and Twinlakes have changed traffic volumes. • Paragraph 5.8 is repetitive padding with no information on how many houses are proposed. But figure and timescale is irrelevant since existing infrastructure cannot cope. • Developers have already indicated that 1000 houses is not enough to provide all the link road, so no

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
				funding for new facilities to provide a sustainable community.
269	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mrs Susan Marshall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The south would be a more logical location, closer to employment growth area. • Location of SUE to north with EGA to the south west will cause chaos on roads through the town centre. • Delivering 80% houses in the town will force villagers to live in town. 40% Council waiting list are in villages. • Cramming villages is to be avoided but no concern about cramming the town. No concern for residents of the town. • Brownfield land should be considered first. ADAS report states the SUE site is on the highest quality landscape.
280	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Melton North Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ch5 not founded on a robust and credible evidence base • Not the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives • Does not have regard to national policy. • The 80:20 split for new housing between town and rural is arbitrary and contrary to the market demands. • The ratio was determined by consultation but the majority of respondents came from rural areas. Also ruling group on the Council is composed largely of councillors who live in rural areas. • Town residents form an underrepresented minority as defined by the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. • Rate of house building in the rural areas is currently 70 homes per year - 41% of the total built. It is perverse to limit rural house building to 20%, half the current rate. • Demand for Council house places also favours rural area • Limiting rural house building will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Risk allowing villages to die because of lack of critical population. ▪ Force young people and down-sizing elderly to move away ▪ Push up house prices ▪ Reduce the availability of affordable houses. ▪ Cause problems if the current rural building rate continues. • By-pass is unlikely to be publically funded because it is not in the Leicestershire Local Transport Plan. • LCC is a major landowner and so will benefit from the SUE, a major factor in the decision to go north. • The length of road to be delivered by the SUE will only mitigate the 1000 houses and not be of strategic benefit for the town. No funding to pay for a link to Thorpe Road until at least after 2026. • Even provision of the Nottingham Road to Melton Spinney Road section may not stack up for 1000 houses, requiring more development post-2026. • Without the link to Thorpe Road £3m will be needed for improvements to Melton Spinney Road, but there

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
				<p>is no source of funding for this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SUE will cause significant problems in 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. • The housing should not be put in the north because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most of the people who don't work in Melton work in Leicester ▪ The employment land will be located in the South West ▪ The spare school places are in the South ▪ The most significant adverse environmental and landscape impact is in the North • The consortium in the north is a loose confederation, fragile and could break up; only LCC own the land- all other developers just have options. • In the south there is just one major landowner, so development should be easier. The link road would be easier to provide as the first major segment of a relief road. • A dispersed pattern of development could be achieved, including K Ed VII School, the Leicester Road site and Ministry of Defence land to the west. Need evidence that these sites were considered and why they were excluded. • With CIL dispersed sites would still contribute towards the bypass and would not involve spending money on environmental mitigation and school places, so leaving more for the relief road. • With uncertainty over household forecast and infrastructure contributions, MBC were wrong to decide its CS in February 2012. • The economic and political context has changed significantly since the CS proposals first came forward. The process should be postponed to take this into account. • Risk of NPPF undermining the CS is not a reason for deciding the CS in February. • Risk of losing appeals on 5 year supply grounds without the CS has been shown to be unfounded by dismissal of the Bottesford appeal. • CS does not comply with NPPF in relation to the SHMA and SHLAA evidence. • Inadequate consultation time was allowed for the CS- it should have been 12 not 6 weeks.
305	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mrs Christine Gaunt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing in the north and employment in the south will not be beneficial given long-standing traffic problem. • Not clear why MBC suddenly changed from south to the north for expansion. • CS does not address cycling safety issues, especially conflict with HGVs • Concentrating development in the SUE will deny rural residents access to affordable housing, affecting village life through loss of facilities. • Farmland in SUE does not meet aim of using vacant and derelict land. Instead the airfield and K Ed VII

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
				<p>School should be redeveloped.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reference to these alternative sites in documentation. • Technical language is not user-friendly. • Pedestrians not being well catered for, e.g. complex crossing arrangements at junctions in the town centre. No evidence of real intention to improve safety for walkers, so objective is unsound. • Objection to SUE is based detrimental effect of such a large development on a small rural town: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final number of dwellings not clear- could be 3,500 or more. • Employment opportunities will not match population growth • Massive impact on surrounding countryside. • Character as a market town and rural landscape/ historical heritage will be lost. • 6 week consultation too short –no regard for democratic process.
308	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mrs Debbie Adams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No soundness to SUE because it will not have good access. • No room for cyclists because of traffic congestion and unsafe; too far to walk into town from SUE; public transport too costly; so most people will use a car. • If all brownfield sites are taken into account, no need for SUE. • 80% houses in Melton is too many.
343	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mention residential travel plans and Personalised Travel Plans for individual households. • Clarify what neighbourhood plans should achieve • Consider area travel plans prior to development as part of design.
356	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Melton Mowbray & District Civic Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Show Nottingham railway line on map on p.19
373	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mr Stuart Clarke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20% houses (34 per year) in rural areas is “already realistic in terms of developments taking place.” Should state that large scale development will not be permitted and 50% must be on Brownfield land.
385	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Buckminster Trust Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes policy on development in rural areas where there is good access to services and facilities.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
408	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Sue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection of villages from cramming is not matched with similar concern for town residents, especially since facilities and infrastructure cannot be provided.
417	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Northern SUE Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome flexibility of phrase “about 1000 more homes” at the SUE. As work commences a more precise figure can be defined but it must not have a false ‘number ceiling’ which denies the opportunity to take account of longer requirements, as in para 157 of the NPPF. “Headroom” within the housing figures should be provided by the CS, not the AAP. Headroom should be up to 5 years (850 dwellings) and would add longevity to the strategy, indicate areas for future growth and relieve pressure on AAP process. Add further text to recognise that a larger amount of housing land may facilitate development beyond the plan period. Welcome the acknowledgement that the town has best potential for growth and to lead investment. Agree the 80%: 20% split. References to 2026 plan period should be more flexible. Support Policy CS1, reference to around 1000 homes and the AAP approach. Request amendment to read “around 1000 new homes <u>minimum</u>”. Delivery at the SUE in 2013, as in the housing trajectory, may need reference to encouraging earlier sites coming forward, perhaps ahead of the AAP but within a broad agreed concept Masterplan. Early delivery would be subject to appropriate infrastructure contributions.
447	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mr Colin Love	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As stated by the Council at a recent appeal, Bottesford is a poor location for large scale housing as residents have long distances to travel to work, very few by bus or train. Rural centre designation does not confirm it is right for extensive development, since old street structure cannot accommodate this. Nothing can be done about existing HGVs but further industrial development should not be encouraged. Village cannot be socially integrated into Melton Borough but it must not be seen as an outpost opportunity for badly planned expansion. Must remain a village, not become a small town.
448	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Fairyhill Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that the CS has significantly altered the balance of development away from the historical norm and rural areas. Policy for Category 1 and 2 villages is bizarre, restricting the size of houses on infill plots. Contrary to the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Demand is for good quality family homes and the Council should not interfere with the market. Smaller affordable dwellings should be provided through the exceptions policy.
459	5	Where Development	Mr Peter Casewell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large and small scale should be defined so there is no ambiguity and it cannot be argued through appeal.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
		Will Take Place		
465	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various changes emphasising the historic nature of the market town. • Stress impact of development scale and location on natural and historic character of Rural Centres and Sustainable Villages; CS2 and CS3 to also include environmental sustainability.
472	5	Where Development Will Take Place	South Melton Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumption that there is a need to protect the rural character of the Borough is flawed because it does not take into account the quality of environment in the town.
479	5	Where Development Will Take Place	South Melton Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development in villages is being artificially capped and limited to local development only. External demand thus centred on town.
484	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Mrs Shelagh Woollard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bottesford in danger of becoming urban- developers will see Rural Centres as locations for large scale development. Wording needs to be tightened to exclude large scale development, which must be defined. • Bottesford has long average travel to work distances, with few people using public transport. Other villages may be more sustainable- greater thought should be given to travel to work distances in classification. • Parts of Easthorpe are closer to Bottesford facilities than parts of Bottesford. Easthorpe should therefore be considered for some expansion, while maintaining separation.
486	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Ms Caroline Arthur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing to clarify that large scale development will not be permitted (in Rural Centres?) • Current applications in Bottesford exceed 34 dwellings pa for the whole rural area. If permitted, Bottesford would cease to be a village. • Reasons for dismissing appeal at the old Clay Pit should equally be used to refuse site at Belvoir Road. • Traffic concerns at Belvoir Road. • Access to Belvoir Road site is beyond the village envelope. • Developing centres nearer to Melton would reduce distance to work and increase work opportunities.
488	5	Where Development Will Take Place	Dilys Shepherd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define 'large sites' in relation to rural centres.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
490	5 Where Development Will Take Place	Elizabeth Bland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current applications in Bottesford exceed 34 dwellings pa for the whole rural area. If permitted, Bottesford would become a town like Bingham. • CS states that only small scale development should take place in Bottesford. Small scale and large scale development needs to be defined. • Developing centres nearer to Melton , Loughborough and Leicester would reduce distance to work by more than building in Bottesford.
495	5 Where Development Will Take Place	Bottesford Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over statement by Ashwood Properties that Bottesford could take 220 houses over 13 years. No room in the village envelope.
507	5 Where Development Will Take Place	Long Clawson Dairy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the classification of Log Clawson as a Rural Centre.
513	5 Where Development Will Take Place	Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection, noting that most development will be directed to Melton Mowbray, outside the board's district and catchment.
519	5 Where Development Will Take Place	A Cooke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests property be put back in the Long Clawson village envelope.
62	CS 1 Development at Melton Mowbray	Dr Andy Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban/rural split should be based on existing population, 55/45.
77	CS 1 Development at Melton Mowbray	Ashwood Property Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80/20 split is not justified and is not demonstrated to be the most appropriate strategy • Residual 20% insufficient to cater for rural settlements. • 70/30 split (the mid-range option put forward in the Issues and Options) would be more appropriate
113	CS 1 Development at Melton Mowbray	Ms Helen Chadwick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensible that Melton Mowbray should be the focus of development because of the range of services, including offices, there and the need to support the vibrancy of the town centre.
182	CS 1 Development at Melton	Friends of Melton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Argument that development in the north will support sustainable travel is not sound, since commercial development will be in the south, leading to gridlock.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
		Mowbray	Country Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Split of new development does not reflect current population and so villages will have little or no growth and the young no access to affordable housing. King Edward VII School should be used for 1000 houses as it is more accessible. Plans for investment and allocation of resources are out of date. '...policy direction may have the potential to deliver a decision making framework' is a limp statement and unsound.
195	CS 1	Development at Melton Mowbray	Mr R D Chandler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% houses in Melton does not reflect evidence nor maximise enhancement of services, sustainability and wider benefits. 70:30 split would be more appropriate, reflecting historic completion trends. 20% gives only limited scope for open market housing in the rural area with implications for affordable housing. NPPF states that some market housing should facilitate significant affordable housing to meet local needs.
258	CS 1	Development at Melton Mowbray	Mr John Gaunt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence to support allocations: sites for 1700 houses (outside the SUE); demand/ occupiers for business, office space and additional retail ? No confidence in MBC to consult, plan and monitor delivery through Annual Monitoring. Consultation forced through with inadequate time for considered response.
321	CS 1	Development at Melton Mowbray	Mr Mark Twitney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unreasonable to allocate 80% housing to MM and only 20% for the rest. Will result in young people leaving their villages – not sustainable and leading to an ageing village population. 50% believe traffic congestion to be the matter most in need of improvement, which will be worsened by the SUE. A better alternative would be the airfield site (Kettleby Magna) – originally proposed for 1200 homes, now used for leisure and employment.
443	CS 1	Development at Melton Mowbray	Peter Brett Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports MBC's objectives in respect of focusing development at MM as the main social and economic focus, and strengthening its role as a market town and in delivering the Melton 'brand'. No reference to how retail development outside of 2,500 sq. m. of non-food will be assessed. NPPF (and PPS4) requirements for retail outside town centres are not translated into policy. Amend Policy C1 to reflect NPPF. No different threshold for impact assessment identified.
78	CS 2	Rural Centres	Ashwood Property Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CS not founded on a robust and credible evidence base. The rural settlement hierarchy is based on an overly simplistic assessment of a limited list of services and facilities, with no weighting according to their relative importance. The resultant settlement classification is largely arbitrary and does not sufficiently focus new housing in the most sustainable rural settlements. Apply higher thresholds for the type and number of qualifying facilities and services.
79	CS 2	Rural Centres	Ashwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bottesford should be classed as a Primary Rural Centre in recognition of its size, function and range of

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
		Property Limited	<p>services/ facilities, including a secondary school and railway station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suitable and deliverable sites have been excluded from the SHLAA on policy grounds contrary to national guidance.
80	CS 2 Rural Centres	Ashwood Property Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CS2 is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, and is not able to be monitored . No indication as to how the rural housing provision is to be distributed between the different settlement categories. A total figure of 220 dwellings would be justifiable in Bottesford. Change policy to specify that 50% rural housing be within Rural Centres and that this comprises 20% in Bottesford and 10% in each of the other 3 Rural centres.
84	CS 2 Rural Centres	Mr W Seddon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for land to be put back in the village envelope
94	CS 2 Rural Centres	Mr Mark Cuddigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests a paddock in Long Clawson be included within the New Village Envelope.
114	CS 2 Rural Centres	Ms Helen Chadwick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development in Bottesford should take account of neighbouring boroughs (Rushcliffe and South Kesteven) – lack of cross boundary consideration. Consider extension of village envelope at Asfordby. Long Clawson and Waltham could take more development in keeping with the village feel; additional services would be useful.
177	CS 2 Rural Centres	Mr Alastair Benton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments suggested to bullet points in Policy CS2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..without extending the village envelope or onto sites with restrictive covenants ...but not onto S106 precluded areas or on the basis of one-off contributions Further consultation needed on settlement boundaries since previous proposals are now out of date. Local priorities should not be a hasty rush to housing regardless of the 5 year supply.
183	CS 2 Rural Centres	Friends of Melton Country Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% allocation of housing to town contradicts existing population figures- should be 53/47 –Rural Centres can accommodate more and other villages would benefit from improved services. Parishes have been consulted, but not town people. Principle of more housing in town not consulted on. Rural communities would benefit from increased housing preventing any threat to services. MBC will not allow development in village with no services but will allow the SUE even though developers say there is insufficient funding for facilities. CS favours rural areas over the town making it unsound. CS not making effective use of Brownfield land, e.g. K Ed VII MBC want to move away from village cramming but support town cramming

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBC have ignored environmental quality of the SUE land.
196	CS 2 Rural Centres	Mr R D Chandler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Rural Centre identification • Policy CS2 does not provide the proportion of new housing to be provided in the different categories of rural settlement. A disproportionate amount of development could therefore take place in sustainable villages, rather than rural centres. • As a result the amount of housing could be determined by village form and envelope rather than the strategy, making the CS unsound. • Land allocations for open market and affordable housing should be made to give a more balanced community and conformity with NPPF (para 54). • Amend CS2 indicate a proportion of rural housing to go in Rural centres and to include open market housing in allocations.
259	CS 2 Rural Centres	Mr John Gaunt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80/20 split doesn't reflect demographics. • Not clear what number of houses 20% equates to. • Consultation with villages not reflected in approach for the town, which has development imposed upon it. • Rural communities could absorb more housing than 20%.
404	CS 2 Rural Centres	Susan Love	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to Rural Centre designation at Bottesford because of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Flood risk which would be increased by new building. ▪ Distance from Melton, so can't meet its needs. ▪ No need to provide houses for Nottingham and Grantham. ▪ Pressures on village centre ▪ Limited employment opportunities and unsuitability to take more because of HGVs
457	CS 2 Rural Centres	Mrs L Cole	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes Rural centre designation. • Need to establish through CS2 land allocations to meet housing and employment needs. • Thriving village with good communications and facilities. • Policies should facilitate sustainable growth: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allow flexibility to accommodate delays in delivery of the SUE elsewhere. ▪ Add to CS2 "making housing allocations to secure growth and safeguard services". ▪ Cross reference to Policy CS9 re employment land needs. ▪ Amend 1st bullet point in CS2 to allow sustainable development adjoining the built form. ▪ Include market housing in 2nd bullet point in CS2. ▪ "No need for large sites" in para 5.14 is too restrictive-could be a sustainable mixed use on a large site.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
460	CS 2	Rural Centres	Mr Peter Casewell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial centre of Bottesford has access and safety problems and existing built form prevents realistic expansion of facilities.
471	CS 2	Rural Centres	Mr Richard Hallam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes 56 new homes off Belvoir Road, Bottesford. Only small developments allowed, totalling no more than 34 dwellings p.a. in the whole rural area.
496	CS 2	Rural Centres	Bottesford Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly support Policy CS2 Where will employment land, 17 houses pa, 2ha park go? Extend village envelope?
31	CS 3	Sustainable villages	Mr Mark Molyneux	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Queensway is not a sustainable village and should not be listed as such. Amend policy to designate Queensway as "other Village".
46	CS 3	Sustainable villages	Mr M Howard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with policy on Sustainable Villages
53	CS 3	Sustainable villages	Shouler & Son	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All villages are sustainable. Amend policy CS3 so that small sensitively designed developments are allowed in any village that has at least one of the listed services. Assumes churches count –where listed they should score double.
63	CS 3	Sustainable villages	Dr Andy Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to rural and village safeguarding while making Melton a congested place with stretched services and facilities.
70	CS 3	Sustainable villages	Belvoir Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that Policy CS3 is not flexible enough to enable it to continue to contribute to sustainability, especially as most of the Belvoir Estate Villages are not regarded as "Sustainable Villages". Would welcome recognition of its role and greater flexibility to allow it to continue to provide for local housing needs.
108	CS 3	Sustainable villages	Mr Anthony Maher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistent to stop development in "other villages" unless tied to delivery of services or facilities, but not apply the same approach to the SUE.
115	CS 3	Sustainable villages	Ms Helen Chadwick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcomes development of services in larger villages which can absorb reasonable levels of development in small pockets. Affordable rural housing and rural businesses are essential.
150	CS 3	Sustainable villages	Mr Ken Lucas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistent to allow development in "other villages" tied to delivery of services or facilities, but not apply the same approach to the SUE.
260	CS 3	Sustainable villages	Mr John Gaunt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MBC are prepared to safeguard existing services and facilities for the rural area but place under pressure those very same facilities and services in the Town
270	CS 3	Sustainable villages	Mr Chris Donegani	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Queries need for re-assessment as services change and funding to reinstate lost services.
290	CS 3	Sustainable villages	Broughton and Dalby	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Error in list of villages in relation to Queensway.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
			PC	
386	CS 3	Sustainable villages	Buckminster Trust Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Policy CS3 especially in relation to Buckminster, Sewstern and Wymondham.
23	CS 3	Rural Centres	Mr Alastair McQuillan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long Clawson does not have a Post Office
65	CS 4	Making Effective Use of Land	Dr Andy Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A percentage of houses will be built on high flood risk land • Concern about long term health consequences of disturbing radon. • SUE will close wildlife corridors; smaller developments would lesson impact.
109	CS 4	Making Effective Use of Land	Mr Anthony Maher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 5.24 is contradicted by SUE, rather than using K Ed VII. • Para 5.25: opposition to village cramming contradicts town cramming by 1000+ houses at SUE.
265	CS 4	Making Effective Use of Land	Mr John Gaunt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 5.25: opposition to village cramming contradicts town cramming by 1000+ houses at SUE. • There are sufficient Brownfield sites for 1000 homes; building to the north will be followed by more houses on Greenfield land to fill up to the link road. • MBC not mindful of the environmental quality of Greenfield land- see ADAS report on land now proposed for housing.
322	CS 4	Making Effective Use of Land	Mr Mark Twitney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make use of former airfield site previously proposed for 1200 homes.

CHAPTER 6 – MEETING OUR HOUSING NEEDS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
66	6 Meeting our housing needs	Dr Andy Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix 1 (Page 61) accounts for only 66 affordable homes over the plan period.
101	6 Meeting our housing needs	Dr Leslie Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why only 66 affordable homes over plan period in Appendix 1 yet 700 of the SUE to be affordable. Question over need for large number of small dwellings What is meant by affordable houses? Contradiction between 6.6 and Appendix 1.
121	6 Meeting our housing needs	Mr Phil John	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest 6.18 reads “more affordable housing will be built in rural areas” Why is the SUE and North or East the obvious location for Gypsy and Traveller sites? What about locating sites in the South or West? Roads and services are no different on the North and East compared to the South, West and the villages. What will the Core Strategy invest to ensure the existing community is not affected by policy CS6
184	6 Meeting our housing needs	Friends of Melton Country Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80:20 town and villages development split does not match population split Rural areas are being denied affordable homes as a result
203	6 Meeting our housing needs	Mrs Margaret Glancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80:20 town and villages development split does not match population split Core Strategy questionable and unsound.
315	6 Meeting our housing needs	Melton North Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questionable evidence base No regard to national policy Deliverability of SUE, housing mix and affordable contribution questionable 3400 new homes over the plan period is unnecessary Population forecasts suggest 1535 new homes would be sufficient Build rate should be 96 per annum instead of 170. On this basis the SUE is unnecessary. Suggest various Brownfield sites could deliver homes Unlikely there will be sufficient demand for 1000 new homes CS would lead to an unnecessary population increase in Melton Town. This increase will put pressure on existing services. Further evidence needed with regard to what services and facilities will need increasing and the costs involved in this as a result of population growth.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where will the funding come from in order to provide the additional services • Not enough employment land planned for in relation to expected population growth.
341	6	Meeting our housing needs	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lifetime homes positive since it will meet the needs of an aging population. • No specific mention of extra care housing. • County’s extra care housing strategy identified a need for an additional 500 extra care places across the County • Core Strategy takes account of aging population but not the role extra care housing could play in meeting this need.
357	6	Meeting our housing needs	<p>Melton Mowbray & District Civic Society</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed housing numbers do not meet natural population growth • Occupiers of new homes will come from outside the borough • Concern over developments becoming “commuter ghettos” • Planning needs to be firm to ensure mixed developments happens. • Design quality is poor or average in the East Midlands, need to improve this. Consider outside support for this. • Better design policy needs to outline more how this will be achieved • Housing stock should be compared to towns of a similar size to Melton • Smaller households are increasing but this doesn’t mean more smaller houses are needed. • Households might want more space as lifestyles change, i.e working from home. • Apartments and smaller houses are important but should be well designed, including sufficient open space. • Garden spaces are too small, if more reasonable physical activity and health objectives could be achieved. • Average household income is close to figure required to buy an entry level home therefore the need for affordable homes may be exaggerated. • Affordable housing should be easily accessible to the town centre and facilities. • Provision of affordable housing should not be used to justify overdevelopment.
374	6	Meeting our housing needs	<p>Mr Stuart Clarke</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figures relating to income and affordability are misleading. • Key is the range versus needs. • Average flat is affordable but they are brought by investors. • No homelessness is visible, sleeping rough, therefore how is housing an issue. • Shouldn’t try to meet the national average for housing mix, too small and different households live in rural areas compared to cities. • Housing for the elderly is very important in order to make downsizing attractive.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the most northern villages of the Borough, Grantham is the nearest town and this has lots of affordable homes.
395	6	Meeting our housing needs Mr Patrick Belcher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No justification for sitting residential development to north or east.
418	6	Meeting our housing needs Northern SUE Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £9 million relief road will affect affordable housing figures NPPF states that policies around affordable housing should be flexible in light of market conditions NPPF states policy burdens should not affect a sites ability to be developed. Scheme viability is key to ensuring delivery. Questions core strategy's weight
449	6	Meeting our housing needs Fairyhill Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village envelopes have remained unchanged leaving little room for development. Council dictates the size and type of development that takes place in villages Restricting the size of new build properties and not extensions is unreasonable. Planning system is unfair and inconsistent. Surplus of small houses in villages, demand is instead for family housing. Smaller houses should be provided through the exception policy more so they have been already. Planning should be more open, positive and fair across the borough. Core strategy is not in accordance with the direction of NPPF.
477	6	Meeting our housing needs South Melton Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional sites are now available that could offer a more dispersed approach to development. Higher density development should be pursued to meet need for smaller houses.
485	6	Meeting our housing needs Mrs Shelagh Woollard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriate to seek national average of 41% one or two bedroom properties because this figure accounts for cities and Melton is smaller and rural. Wording should be tighter to prevent in appropriate development. No definition in Appendix 1 on what is classified as a small development site or a large development site.
489	6	Meeting our housing needs Dilys Shepherd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Of the 170 dwellings per year there should be a specific Melton vs. Village number split to avoid village becoming towns.
497	6	Meeting our housing needs Bottesford Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need for smaller dwellings because they have been made larger through extensions. Extensions on smaller properties should be resisted.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Name	Summary of Main Issues
55	CS 5	Strategic Housing	William Davis Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to Lifetime homes on new dwellings • The associated cost will burden developments. • Especially unnecessary when it is not a mandatory requirement • Believe this requirement is inconsistent with national policy and should therefore be considered unsound. • Object to the affordable housing requirement in CS5. • This requirement is not justified. • Policy also lacks flexibility in terms of the proportions of affordable housing required. • Schemes should be allowed to reduce affordable housing requirements in light of viability evidence. • Affordable housing policy does not conform to national planning policy and as such is unsound.
71	CS 5	Strategic Housing	Belvoir Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement that every home provide to affordable housing is counterproductive. • Trust that provides affordable housing but that doesn't fit RSL model, would like to work together to develop other suitable models of affordable housing provision.
197	CS 5	Strategic Housing	Mr R D Chandler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing contribution in CS5 should be treated as targets, not fixed rates, in order to take account of market condition, viability and scheme specifics.
387	CS 5	Strategic Housing	Buckminster Trust Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS5 is unsound on the basis that a 40% contribution on individual properties is not viable due to low base house prices in this area. • 30% target would be more appropriate. • Suggest amending rural affordable housing target same as the rest of the district, 30%
419	CS5	Strategic Housing	Northern SUE Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SUE: Delivering a large proportion of smaller will deliver less value to fund the rest of the scheme costs. • In order to accommodate this the total number of units should be increased. • If short term need is for smaller properties, the medium and longer term need will be for larger properties. This should be considered in other to achieve positive land values and deliver other necessary infrastructure.
14	CS 6	Gypsies and Travellers	Mr Robert Wells	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dislike of proposed location of Gypsy and Traveller • Question over how resources will be distributed • Are the sites are necessary
16	CS 6	Gypsies and Travellers	Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confusion over total number of pitches to be delivered. Suggest minimum pitch figure is included in policy CS6, instead of site figure. • Preference for smaller sites. • Concern over deliverability of sites if the same criteria as market housing are applied. • Consider this requirement is also inconsistent with national policy.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
107	CS 6	Gypsies and Travellers	Ian Shrubbs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why 2 sites in the SUE • Impact on local population • Other more suitable sites
242	CS 6	Gypsies and Travellers	English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy unsound because lacking reference to heritage assets • Recommend addition to last bullet point of "and; there are no adverse impacts upon heritage assets and their settings ".
323	CS 6	Gypsies and Travellers	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over 2 sites being located in the SUE • Preference for one Melton Mowbray site and one rural site.
332	CS 6	Gypsies and Travellers	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since the original needs assessment there have been several policy and operational changes • Believe these changes will affect need levels. • Need to revisit needs assessment in light of these changes • Para 6.23 - Gypsies and Travellers should be Capital 'G' and 'T'
420	Policy CS 6	Gypsies and Travellers	Northern SUE Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request explanatory text to be included in the policy. • County Council own land to the north of Melton and support provision therefore their land should be used to deliver the proposed sites • No desire from other land owners to use their land to deliver the sites. • Consortium concerned that delivering sites on their land could impact on land values and infrastructure delivery. • Suggest above is incorporated into the strategy with the following: "the County Council are supportive of provision for Gypsy and Traveller Sites and will work sub regionally to plan and provide for this need, utilising their land where available and appropriate.'

CHAPTER 7 – MEETING ECONOMIC NEEDS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues	
12 2	7	Meeting economic needs	Mr Phil John	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic model takes no account of traffic from Twin Lakes.
13 1	7	Meeting economic needs	Ms Helen Chadwick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Role of the airfield site and Snow Hill not properly addressed –include a specific policy on these sites.
20 4	7	Meeting economic needs	Mrs Margaret Glancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Town needs employment to survive. Don't use good quality farmland for employment.
25 7	7	Meeting economic needs	Ian Shrubbs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include a mixed development on the southern edge of town, including a large supermarket and non-food retail, plus a business park, including relief road from Leicester Rd to Oakham Rd.
28 1	7	Meeting economic needs	Melton North Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenges soundness of section on grounds of relevance of evidence and ability to monitor progress against targets. No evidence of meeting Duty to Cooperate. Objectives are not SMART No assets and resources to meet objectives which are undeliverable. No plans to deliver enough jobs for 3400 households in proposed homes. Employment land driven by land available, not assessment of need. Employment land trajectory required. No detail of rural employment land targets or of who will deliver them and how.
29 2	7	Meeting economic needs	Broughton and Dalby PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rail test track should be referred to.
29 8	7	Meeting economic needs	Broughton and Dalby PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crown Business Park and the Old Dalby Trading Estate at Old Dalby should be referred to, to ensure future development here meets local needs and is sustainable.
31 1	7	Meeting economic needs	Mrs Debbie Adams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Separation of housing from employment is unsustainable.
36 9	7	Meeting economic needs	Leicestershire Local Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.19 - add "safe walking and cycling routes to work will also be promoted" 7.35- add " a joined-up network of routes for non motorised travel from the urban fringes into the rural

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
			Forum	<p>areas would assist such diversified activities and bring benefits to the urban dwellers as well"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.36 - add "Every opportunity will be taken to rationalise the often fragmented bridleway network"
393	7	Meeting economic needs	JCA Planning and DevelopmeC consultants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of client's site would help meet CS economic objectives. 30 ha shortfall of employment land acknowledged in CS and supports intention to meet the need for jobs. while the Core Strategy expects the number of industrial and warehousing jobs is expected to fall over the coming years, they believe that there is no reason why this should necessarily be the case Land at Old Darby could provide a modern sustainable business park. Reflect NPPF in supporting economic development.
466	7	Meeting economic needs	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.34: Re-using rural buildings: add '...compatible with countryside locations and the quality and character of the affected structures'
498	7	Meeting economic needs	Bottesford Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Queries deliverability, location and HGV traffic impact of employment allocation for Bottesford.
505	7	Meeting economic needs	Long Clawson Dairy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports recognition of expansion or relocation needs para 7.13) and responsiveness to changing economic conditions (para 7.25) Welcomes express recognition of expansion needs of food and drink industry. But CS not sound as drafted because 2nd bullet point of Policy CS9 not flexible enough in relation to expansion of businesses in rural locations.
61	CS 7	Employment and Economic Development	Mr Tom Kingston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggests a site for employment development in Long Clawson.
337	CS 7	Employment and Economic Development	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mention of high speed broadband for homes and rural businesses.
346	CS 7	Employment and Economic Development	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of high speed broadband is a high priority to reduce car-borne trips. Travel plans should not be limited to employment developments; should cover residential, retail, leisure etc.
388	CS 7	Employment and Economic Development	Buckminster Trust Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports Policy CS7 because small scale business units are not confined to MM and Rural Centres.
421	CS 7	Employment and Economic	Northern SUE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcomes Policy CS7 which should provide for an allocation of 4-6 has. within the SUE. Amend accordingly.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
	Development	Consortium	
508	CS 7	Employment and Economic Development Long Clawson Dairy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes 2nd bullet point of CS7
510	CS 7	Employment and Economic Development Long Clawson Dairy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add new criterion to Policy CS7 to safeguard specific Key Employment Sites from changes of use which would limit business development.
34	CS 9	Rural Economic Development National Farmers Union	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports policy
222	CS 9	Rural Economic Development Mrs Anne Meek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make Melton more attractive to business by building a ring road before development.
299	CS 9	Rural Economic Development Broughton and Dalby Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS9 balances economy and environment but statements are subjective and can be interpreted in different ways, e.g. what is “small scale”? • Care needed in promoting equestrian activities: can lead to large traffic on rural roads. Further protection needed than just “sensitive to the character of the area”.
302	CS 9	Rural Economic Development Broughton and Dalby Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports live-work units, but can be a loophole to secure residential permission outside village envelopes.
338	CS 9	Rural Economic Development Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to broadband.
389	CS 9	Rural Economic Development Buckminster Trust Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports policy as in line with NPPF.
509	CS 9	Rural Economic Development Long Clawson Dairy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy not flexible enough in relation existing businesses in rural locations, contrary to NPPF para 28.
511	CS 9	Rural Economic Development Long Clawson Dairy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy noted

CHAPTER 8- ACCESS AND TRAVEL

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
4	8	Access and Travel	Mr Lawrence Dryell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8.22 not accurate. Ptolemy model shows North SUE will provide less relief and increase cross town traffic. • 8.23 –the link road will become a congested rat run, is not wanted and is unaffordable. • No development should be allowed before roads.
19	8	Access and Travel	Mr Lawrence Dryell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable transport strategy doomed to failure. • Congestion Management Study is stating the obvious. • No public funding for roads, developer funding is unviable. • No business plan to find funding.
29	8	Access and Travel	Mr. M.P. Bell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for a bypass was available until 2007; then A1 was improved. • Current bypass proposal will leave HGVs going through half of town centre. Full ring road needed.
41	8	Access and Travel	Mr & Mrs Shipman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extra traffic for houses is colossal for current roads. • Nottingham Rd- Grantham Road link road essential to avoid gridlock and rat runs.
69	8	Access and Travel	Dr Andy Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walking and cycling will not work in bad weather so congestion will not reduce. • 1000 houses, the supermarket and location of the employment growth area will mean worse congestion. • Lack of links from SUE to EGA means CS is flawed. • Putting 50% houses in rural areas would result in improved public transport. • Access to station from Northern SUE will increase traffic. • Bottesford is the ideal place for more houses to reduce numbers in Melton. • Developers' funding insufficient for all infrastructure and facilities. • New development will not reduce local trips. No funding for a sustainable network. • Insufficient jobs in Melton so out-commuting will increase. • No funding for by-pass so develop a strategy without new roads. Nottingham Rd- Melton Spinney Rd link will increase congestion. • Strategy for modal shift is flawed and based on out of date information. • Contradiction between paragraphs 8.20 and 8.22. MBC can't control where people work. • Need to link A607 to east and west means that southern option would be better • 1000+ houses will lead to standstill. • Another school on Scalford Road will increase traffic- road cannot be widened and is dangerous.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road between Nottingham Road and Thorpe Road is pointless. • Developers are not prepared to provide all services. If road is built it will be at the end of the residential construction with congestion in the meantime. • Road will not reduce cross town trips to the school; Scaford Rd is too small and there is no room or funds to widen it.
72	8	Access and Travel	Ms. Ann Cluskey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports are out of date and inaccurate. • Location of houses in relation to employment will mean more traffic through town. • Bus services do not serve new developments to the north. • Town centre too far to walk. • All action taken to ease traffic flow; no room for more parking.
86	8	Access and Travel	Ms Johanna Allen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of population of the SUE will work out of town. • Major roads will not be built in the near future and existing roads are inadequate. • Particular (variable) problems on Thorpe Road, partly caused by Twin Lakes and housing estates.
10 2	8	Access and Travel	Dr Leslie Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports are out of date and inaccurate. • Cycling, walking and public transport unlikely to help especially given location of employment growth and in bad weather. Too far from town to use cycling or bus for work and shopping trips. • Walking and cycling provisions are a pipe dream. • More development in villages would improve viability of rural bus services. • Rail will not be used by northern SUE residents without improved routes through town centre. • Bottesford is the ideal place for more houses to reduce numbers in Melton. • Developers' funding insufficient for all infrastructure and facilities, so development should be elsewhere in the borough. • MBC cannot justify reduced car use without interviewing new residents - providing facilities for alternative modes will therefore be a white elephant. • Melton congested at peak times and will get worse. CS flawed because suggests homes will built before road. • No houses without full by-pass. • No funding for by-pass so nightmare congestion will result from housing development. • Trips from new housing cannot be contained within Melton. Insufficient jobs in Melton so out-commuting will increase, as well as trips within the town from the north to commercial development in the south. • 1000 new homes will increase car use with cycleways and walkways unused except for leisure. • There will be a direct relationship between the SUE and proposed and existing employment areas, leading to travel in all directions through town.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel to Leicester and south of Melton not catered for by the only new road planned, which will only accommodate traffic if residents work to the north. • Increased traffic on Scalford Road will endanger pupils of John Ferneley School and of the other school on Scalford Road. • Developers unable to provide infrastructure based on 1000 houses. Irresponsible for MBC to impose growth without guarantee of funding- plan infrastructure first. • Illogical to build the ‘wrong’ road- it will not satisfy the major requirements of the new development, go nowhere , provide no relief and add to the chaos of gridlocked roads at peak times.
110	8	Access and Travel	Mr Anthony Maher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modal shift will be more difficult in the north because of location of employment growth. • Lack of developer funding makes assumptions of CS unsound. • By building in the north occupants will travel through town to employment, causing more congestion.
123	8	Access and Travel	Mr Phil John	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable transport will not be achieved with a northern SUE and SW economic development. • Aspiration for a bypass not supported by a concrete plan. • Strategy hinges on unrealistic targets for modal shift. • Assertions in 8.20 are unsound; no evidence that there will be no direct relationship between jobs in the EGA and the SUE residents • Full link between Nottingham Road and Thorpe Road required, otherwise there will more congestion on already overloaded/ narrow Scalford and Melton Spinney Roads. • Sufficient funding for the right class of road and the complete link will not be achieved through current SUE plans. Many more houses needed, which would add to congestion, especially during building works. This is not acceptable. • No evidence of achievability and roads will lag behind housing. • Southern SUE/ bypass is best option. MBC have made an unsubstantiated u-turn to go north, which is not cheapest. • Phrase “exploring opportunities” in CS11 shows wishful thinking.
127	8	Access and Travel	Ms Helen Chadwick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modal shift desire is admirable but underdeveloped; no indication of how it will be implemented. • Dangerous crammed traffic lanes and unfriendly crossing places need to be resolved, especially on Norman Way • Serious cycling routes and facilities for cyclists could increase the economic activity. • Gather more evidence for a sustainable transport plan.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
14 2	8	Access and Travel	Mr Neil Goodfellow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will need a dramatic improvement in cycle routes to stop at least one car per household going through town to reach work, school or leisure. • No commitment from developers to cycle routes. • The Crescent development is adding to congestion with no improvements to cycling, walking, parks etc. • Needs a joined up, planned approach.
15 3	8	Access and Travel	Mr Ken Lucas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key transport issues cannot be addressed with housing to the north and employment growth to the SE/W. • Town has a major congestion problem which will increase. • In para 8.9 employment growth area should be to the SW. • No funding for all items so CS is flawed. • Wrong to assume that a higher number of trips can be contained within the town by a SUE to the north, since employment is to the SW/E.
19 4	8	Access and Travel	Woodcock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More time needed to consider the document. • Incorrect reference to John Ferneley as a 'new' school. • The school cannot cope with 1000 more houses. • Grantham Road to Leicester Road link road need; otherwise there will be town centre gridlock. • More brownfield sites within the town should be developed first. • Illogical to have houses in the north and employment in the west. • Extra 3000 people will not benefit the town because of the impact on services, e.g. doctors. • The whole SUE should be re-thought. • <i>NB identical comments made on Introduction, Vision, and Access and Travel Chapters.</i>
21 4	8	Access and Travel	Mr John Gibbs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decisions based on out of date data. • No evidence to support the view that cycling, walking and buses will reduce potential gridlock from 1000 new homes.
23 1	8	Access and Travel	Mr Donald Cottingham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision in para 8.20 ignores residents' needs and travel patterns, with more trips towards the south as shown by relative bus services. • Northern link road will involve a costly bridge over the Country Park/ wildlife corridor. Unrealistic to expect a developer to fund this.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
23 4	8	Access and Travel M David Turner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cuts in rural bus services go against the strategy. • Cycling and walking will be more dangerous. • Cycle Route 64 merging with Melton Spinney Road will be even more dangerous. • Expecting new facilities will not guarantee them, so there will be more short car trips. • Sustainable journeys to work only possible within Melton. • Aspirations for modal shift unlikely given bus service cuts. • New development without relief for through traffic will lead to gridlock and diminish attraction of Melton for visitors and businesses.
27 1	8	Access and Travel Mrs Susan Marshall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modal shift cannot be achieved with reductions in bus services. • Without funding to implement ideas the CS is unsound. • Does not agree that number of car trips can be contained if SUE is in the north, given location of employment. • No funding for infrastructure – should be in place before build.
27 4	8	Access and Travel Mr John Gaunt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing in the plan to increase walking and cycling and budget for bus services being cut. • Walking and cycling will be more dangerous without more cycle lanes and pedestrianised areas. • Focusing growth away from villages will increase traffic flow into town. • Sustainable travel is easy to promise but difficult to substantiate- but traffic flows through town will not be reduced so just planning jargon. • Business growth requires a bypass around town to the south, but not to the north. • Employers want better roads, not footpaths and cycleways. • Queries claims about pedestrianisation and restrictions on use of disused railway line. • Rail service to Leicester is overcrowded. • Without a viable by-pass sustainability will count for nothing. By-pass should have been built years ago.
28 2	8	Access and Travel Melton North Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenges soundness on basis of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Credibility of evidence base because the planning assumptions have changed ▪ Failure to conduct consultation on N SUE Masterplan in accord with the SCI because LLITM report assumes Option 3 (ie. all access off Scalford Rd) ▪ No evidence of Duty to Cooperate. ▪ Other documents in support of Ch8 are out of date or inaccurate. • How will MBC be held to account to meet objectives in CS10? • No funding for link road. • Scalford Road already over capacity and traffic reports indicate congestion here will be inevitable. • 6%modal shift target is inconsistent with a northern SUE, since MVA's Sustainable Transport Strategy

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
				<p>states that congestion relief from medium cost schemes is higher than for southern SUE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycling and walking to work (as opposed to recreation) will not increase because of topography and unsuitability of Scalford Road. • Northern SUE also a poor choice in relation to accessibility to stated destinations and public transport, according to SA Addendum Report 2011. • Option 3 for SUE does not provide links to Nottingham or Grantham Roads and so no access to bus routes, which are also too far away to walk to. • Congestion in town will get much worse with the SUE. The link road will not help and there are no resources for it. • Average housing occupancy used in LLTIM is less than the basis for the CS. Difference in household size between northern and southern SUE would negate minor differences in forecast traffic levels. • New road required to accommodate the CS, but little hope of this in the foreseeable future. • Vital link in the ring road (Leicester-Oakham Roads) is no longer proposed. According to Ptolemy Report this would have provided greatest relief from congestion and through traffic and greater strategic reassignment on to routes around the town. Decision to go north prioritises minimising reassignment over reducing congestion. • Cannot assume northern SUE will contain more trips within the town, because of the location of employment. Higher trips within the town will lead to more congestion. • Statement about reducing emissions in Leicestershire is also open to challenge based on the LLITM. This shows the 1-3 bypass associated with the southern SUE will reduce emissions. • No plans, targets or resources to achieve the modal shift. • The phrase “evidence suggests” means that it is inconclusive. • Infrastructure Delivery group does not exist and has no terms of Reference. There should be a contingency plan in view of the risk of no funding for the roads. • Monitoring framework target for housing delivery is ill-defined and spurious. What, where, when, how and by whom will the road infrastructure / mitigation measures be delivered?
29 3	8	Access and Travel	Broughton and Dalby Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks consideration of rural issues and how they will be addressed, e.g. para 8.4 • Rural bus services under threat- CS10 will be too late. • National cycle route 48 should be referred to in para 8.7 • Damage to roads by HGVs not covered: better management of heavy traffic on rural roads would improve quality of life.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
313	8	Access and Travel Mrs Debbie Adams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SUE will include local facilities but Sainsbury’s and Latham Medical centre are 1.5 miles away. • Cars will be used for journeys – buses too expensive, cycling too hazardous, walking not possible for shopping trips. • Nottingham Road to Melton Spinney Road as a solution to traffic problems is illogical, because the latter and Thorpe Road are too narrow. Junction and road width problems on Thorpe Road. The sound solution is to build a full by-pass before the SUE.
342	8	Access and Travel Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes engagement with LCC throughout the process. • Supports aspiration to reduce car travel and recognises this is best achieved through concentrating 80% growth in town. • Strengthen the text to show that the highway infrastructure requirement is evidenced. • LPA should continue engagement with the Highways Authority to ensure master-planning and delivery of the SUE. • High modal shift targets are extremely challenging in a rural district without more investment to alternatives to the private car, especially with reduced subsidy for rural bus services. • Aspirations on public transport supported but no real specifics on how they will be achieved. • Welcome references to cycling but a more detailed policy on supporting cycling is needed.
345	8	Access and Travel Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Better” bus services needs definition. • Travel Plans required for all significant developments. Add bullet point to 8.13 to this effect. • Welcome private car reduction strategy and focus of town centre development, which maximises modal shift potential. • Unclear what 6% modal shift target refers to. • Support prioritisation of new road links to the north.
359	8	Access and Travel Melton Mowbray & District Civic Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title should be Integrated Transport • Changes made to road junctions since 2006/7 when congestion was rated as in need of improvement. These measures need to be assessed before case for bypass is made. • HGVs should be diverted around Melton on main roads. • Priority needed for traffic management plans. • Impact of Sat Navs on small towns should be assessed. • Not realistic to expect housing to pay for a bypass; it must come first, paid for by public money. • Melton bypass is the only one in TIP for 3 Cities Sub-Area to be part funded privately. • Cost of all facilities will make housing even less affordable. • Cost of road will increase and will not be built before many more cars on the roads. • Bus services have declined and are not frequent enough for most purposes. Any residents housebound

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
			<p>after 5pm leading to social exclusion and loneliness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People in 70 small villages must use cars, so not realistic to assume it will cease to be a major mode. • Strategic car-parks needed, plus a transport interchange at the station, which should be made aesthetically more pleasing and useful.
37 6	8	Access and Travel	<p>Mr John E Clark</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient reference to traffic congestion. • “Exploring” opportunities is not enough; 20 years of discussion has led to nothing. • Traffic on some routes not taken into account. • Housing and industrial development leaves no land for a ring road. • Two thirds of lorries are passing through; Melton has highest accident rate according to a recent newspaper survey; easier to drive through Guildford. • MBC should be lobbying Government for a by-pass, as have ASfordby, Rearsby and Oakham.
39 6	8	Access and Travel	<p>Mr Patrick Belcher</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Putting one large development to the north will not provide the better transport and reduced congestion that people want. • Large scale housing development should pay for a full bypass. • Bottleneck of Scalford Road not addressed. • No funding for an east-west link.
39 9	8	Access and Travel	<p>Mr Steve Morris</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS acknowledges that congestion is already an issue without 1000 more homes whose residents need to cross town . • Evidence states that link to Thorpe Rd is needed but only Nottingham Rd to Spinney Rd is expected, not required. • Even if built this road will not be enough to remove increased levels of traffic on already overcrowded roads. • Only a full bypass would allow a concentrated large scale development without detrimental impact. • Scalford Road already struggles to cope with traffic at certain times of weekdays. • Congestion is a barrier to reaching the town centre, to be made worse by 1000 more houses, regardless of buses.
43 6	8	Access and Travel	<p>Joanne Belcher</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New residents in north will have to travel through town to work. Town centre often gridlocked and stationary now. • Traffic studies by MNAG show Scalford Road to be above capacity. Queuing regularly occurs at St Johns Road in a.m., especially on market days. • Link road is not the direction of travel for vehicles. • Melton Spinney road too narrow. • No developer or LCC funding, which is being ignored by MBC. • MBC have ignored previous reports which recommend southern SUE as the most viable.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
47 4	8	Access and Travel	South Melton Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desirability of a SUE is based on infrastructure being delivered as part of development. But impact is uncertain with no commitment to additional roads or services from MBC/ LCC etc. CS will fail to reduce congestion.
49 9	8	Access and Travel	Bottesford Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reference to rural services, e.g. bus route 24 and rail services in Bottesford.
39	8	Access and Travel	Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not anticipated that the CS will have a significant effect on the Strategic Road network.
47	CS 10	Sustainable Travel	Mr M Howard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MBC forcing population to travel across town to work, increasing congestion on gridlocked roads.
67	CS 10	Sustainable Travel	Dr Andy Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population will have to travel across town to work, increasing congestion and not reducing car travel.
17 1	CS 10	Sustainable Travel	Mr Alastair McQuillan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6% modal shift target is unsound because the bicycle priority routes would be needed. Current cycling provision is poor and identified potential to improve Route 64 lacks clarity and would only serve a few SUE residents, with the rest using main roads with little or dangerous cycle priority. Previous attempts at cycle priority were inadequate. LCC's areas for cycle infrastructure exclude Melton Mowbray. MBC should set out how it will achieve its 6% target with plans and funding streams. Current plan shows complacency.
20 5	CS 10	Sustainable Travel	Mrs Margaret Glancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of disused railway line for a pedestrian and cycle route will affect its status as a proposed Local Wildlife Site. It will be difficult to encourage walking, cycling and public transport use with housing in the north and commercial development in the SW or SE. SUE too far out for walking to be practical. Developers have admitted there is little funding for the "wish list" and so the CS is questionable. More development should be proposed in rural area to increase viability of rural bus services. Claim for containing trips in town is not justified. Insufficient jobs in Melton Mowbray and location of employment growth area will increase travel through town centre.
30 3	CS 10	Sustainable Travel	Broughton and Dalby PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public transport improvements require large continued subsidies – so unachievable. Need clearer description of public transport improvements.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
306	CS 10	Sustainable Travel	Mrs Philippa Beech	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of the disused railway as a cycleway will cause ecological damage, undermining CS14. • Scalford Road not wide enough for cycle lanes and pavements too hazardous especially at school times. It cannot be widened and is over capacity. • No joined up thinking in the CS; so transport proposals are unsound.
347	CS 10	Sustainable Travel	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about the deliverability of the levels of modal shift in view of the levels of car use in the rural area. • Additional bullet-point should require a Travel Plan for all new development likely to generate traffic, in line with NPPF. • Unclear what the 6% and 20% targets mean, how realistic they are and where funding would come from to achieve them. • In Sustainable Demonstration Towns, £1m a year delivered a 9% reduction in car driver trips, following highly targeted programmes. • No consideration of how modal shift will be monitored.
390	CS 10	Sustainable Travel	Buckminster Trust Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6% modal shift target is laudable but there is no evidence of achievability. Rural east not well served by public transport and roads not suited to cycling. • 6% should not be a fixed obligation.
25	CS 11	Strategic Road Infrastructure at Melton Mowbray	Mr Robert Wells	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased traffic on Scalford and Nottingham Roads will increase emissions downwind. • Previous traffic survey was faulty.
68	CS 11	Strategic Road Infrastructure at Melton Mowbray	Dr Andy Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should not be exploring opportunities for funding roads- identify how it will be secured. • There will no bypass for decades, so no houses should be built, or split them more evenly between rural and urban areas. • Update traffic survey.
185	CS 11	Strategic Road Infrastructure at Melton Mowbray	Friends of Melton Country Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link road will drastically harm Melton Country Park, especially wildlife and habitat, as referred to in Biodiversity Study. • Recommendations of the study on encroachment and buffer zone have been disregarded.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
24 3	CS 11	Strategic Road Infrastructure at Melton Mowbray	English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be significant environmental impacts from the roads around Melton Mowbray; previous comments not taken on board. • Criteria should make reference to heritage assets; without this policy CS11 is unsound. • SA states that CS11 has no clear link with sustainability objective relating to enhancement of the built and historic environment. • Summary fails to identify landscape/ environmental issues, which is a significant omission; addressing this at planning application stage is not adequate in relation to strategic infrastructure. • In the absence of specific historic environment policies, suggest inclusion of environmental criteria.
32 4	CS 11	Strategic Road Infrastructure at Melton Mowbray	Mr Mark Twitney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MLDF Task Group's chosen by-pass was a full route, but this is now reduced by dropping the A606 Burton Lazars to A607 Leicester road section. This should be reinstated. • Although no funding available, it should be included in the CS to enable bids to be made. • Issues raised by Burton and Dalby Parish Council in relation to the working of the MLDF Task Group and the decision to recommend the northern Option should be addressed by the Inspector.
33 4 /7	CS 11	Strategic Road Infrastructure at Melton M	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to assess sand and gravel minerals in relation to parts of strategic road infrastructure.
34 8	CS 11	Strategic Road Infrastructure at Melton M	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to ensure that proposals are realistic and achievable.
42 2	CS 11	Strategic Road Infrastructure at Melton Mowbray	Northern SUE Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome the recognition that a significant contribution will be made towards funding the road infrastructure and that a variety of potential funding sources are being explored. • Seeks clarity between supporting text at 8.25 and Policy CS11 in relation to which part of the link road will be funded by the SUE and what road infrastructure may be subject to contribution by the SUE. • Also need to clearly evidence this. • Support flexibility of 2026 as end date for delivery.

CHAPTER 9 – IMPROVING MELTON MOWBRAY TOWN CENTRE

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
283	9	Improving Melton Mowbray Town Centre	Melton North Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern over ability of MBC to monitor objectives. AAP should be part of CS in order to ensure deliverability and meet duty to cooperate. No resources are identified for delivery in the face of cost savings; no mention of BID income.
314	9	Improving Melton Mowbray Town Centre	Mrs Debbie Adams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recent development and Norman Way have restricted the town centre. Opposed to redevelopment of car-park (Burton Rd?) for retail. Absence of public toilets. Need better traffic flows, easy parking and varied shops and facilities to encourage visitors.
358	9	Improving Melton Mowbray Town Centre	Melton Mowbray & District Civic Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Melton cannot compete with larger centres for national retailers. Full advantage should be taken of heritage assets and other features, e.g. no mention of importance of river for leisure or of better pedestrian access from the station to encourage more diverse use of town centre. Shoppers' survey now out of date. Internet shopping will be 40% sales by 2020. Small independent retailers and quality shops should be the aim. No discussion of Melton's rich heritage, e.g. archaeology and St Mary's Hospital. This should be made accessible to future generations.
370	9	Improving Melton M Town Centre	Leicestershire Local Access Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add reference to cycling to para 9.10
467	9	Improving Melton M Town Centre	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend to emphasise historic centre and buildings.
26	CS 12	Melton Mowbray Town Centre	Mr Robert Wells	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leisure facilities attract people into the town centre and so should not be closed.
128	CS 12	Melton Mowbray Town Centre	Ms Helen Chadwick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need policies for Snow Hill. Retail is too spread out. Sainsbury's will adversely impact the town centre. Need clear gateways as well as development areas. Sympathetic development of the market site needed.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
206	CS 12 Melton Mowbray Town Centre	Mrs Margaret Glancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBC should work closely with other parties, especially the Town Estate.
246	CS 12 Melton Mowbray Town Centre	English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS12 should include reference to the historic environment
379	CS 12 Melton Mowbray Town Centre	Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sainsbury's retail consent should be recognised in CS as well as Town Centre AAP. • Add "for retail" to 4th bullet point. • Put Nottingham Road site to top of list to reflect consent.
444	CS 12 Melton Mowbray Town Centre	Peter Brett Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports policy to enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre. • There should be no requirement for evidence of need for NPPF- defined town centre uses. • NPPF does not require demonstration of quantitative need, irrespective of location, so amendment required to omit need and refer to sequential test and impact assessment.
468	CS 12 Melton Mowbray Town Centre	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add "and Heritage Strategy" to last bullet point.

CHAPTER 10 - OUR ENVIRONMENT

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
92	10	Our Environment	Mr Mike Powderly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to analysis of landscape in Study for the Vale of Belvoir Coal Mining proposals. • NPFA standards met due to Town Estates and MBC action. • Surrounding countryside is particularly attractive; 1,000 dwellings on the north will have a huge impact on open gradually rising countryside. • Better to consider modest increments of housing through rounding off with developers still contributing to infrastructure.
124	10	Our Environment	Mr Phil John	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SUE contradicts para 10.4 • Para 10.8- need more detail on mitigation for development. • Claimed contribution from SUE to Country Park is unjustified. • No green wedges identified to the north.
247	10	Our Environment	English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to lack of a formal core policy for the historic environment – a significant flaw which renders the CS unsound in relation to justification, effectiveness and consistency with national policy.
284	10	Our Environment	Melton North Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All options to deliver SUE not considered- S and W options not fully explored with owners. • Failed in duty to cooperate. • Siting of SUE near listed building at Sysonby Lodge is unsound- fails to protect historic assets as stated in 10.14 • MBC acted against Landscape Character Assessment when selecting the northern growth. It was subordinated to the subjective assessment of unqualified Councillors in relation to the impact of John Ferneley College. • Agricultural Land Quality higher in the south than the north. • SUE will have a traffic impact throughout the borough, including rural areas. • No guaranteed employment increase to match the new housing, leading to increased commuting. Potential for MM to become a dormitory town and lose its character. • Principle of locating development on land with least environmental value not applied to the SUE. • Holwell reserves are 2-3 kms from the proposed SUE • A designated hedgerow is located in the NW corner of the proposed SUE. • Use of disused railway line for a pedestrian and cycle route from the SUE will affect its status as a proposed Local Wildlife Site. • CS23 is incompatible with CS14 making the CS unsound.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No surprise that Biodiversity and Geodiversity Report states wildlife has declined probably at a greater rate than in almost any other area of Britain. • Protecting and enhancing ecologically sensitive areas. conflicts with the identification of the SUE in the very location where this protection is proposed. • Failure to take account of Great Crested Newt in the school grounds affects conclusions of the Biodiversity study. • Use of disused railway line for a pedestrian and cycle route from the SUE will affect its status as a proposed Local Wildlife Site. • Proposed extension to Country Park is not contiguous as is desirable for wildlife. • Deliverability of the Country Park extension is questionable on viability grounds. • No provision for athletics or cycling/BMX. • Unsound in the absence of management plans and investment strategy. • Seeking recreational / community facilities is aspirational and undeliverable.
360	10	Our Environment	Melton Mowbray & District Civic Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directions of housing growth Options A and B conflict with special protection for countryside at Burton Lazars and Thorpe. • Need separation between Melton and Asfordby Hill
371	10	Our Environment	Leicestershire Local Access Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add to para 10.4 reference to creating additional access for non-motorised travel. • Add to para 10.35 reference to encouraging more do-it yourself sporting use of parks.
437	10	Our Environment	Joanne Belcher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SUE to the North will destroy attractive countryside and wildlife corridors. • Developers say environmental works / green spaces not affordable for 1000dwellings.
451	10	Our Environment	Mr James Sparrow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eye Kettleby should be separately protected as an individual hamlet. Not clear what the strategy is for Eye Kettleby.
458	10	Our Environment	Mr Peter Casewell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic landscape, especially around Belvoir Castle, must be protected against intrusive development, particularly wind-farms.
491	10	Our Environment	Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not clear what evidence has led to the designation of new green wedges. • Recommend that MBC undertake a macro scale assessment of the proposed green wedges using the Leicester and Leicestershire Green Wedge Joint Methodology (July 2011) to ensure that the proposed green wedges are robust, justified and consistent.
35	CS 13	Countryside	National Farmers Union	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support 1st bullet point.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
186	CS 13	Countryside	Friends of Melton Country Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about impact of SUE on Listed Building at Sysonby Lodge. • Protecting the countryside is contradicted by allocating SUE on land regarded in the ADAS report as of highest landscape quality. • Land to the south is of lower quality. • SUE will destroy tranquillity, impacting on the Country Park, cutting it from the countryside and surrounding it with a road and houses. Also using it for footpaths/ cycleways. • Principle of development on land of least environmental value should be applied around the town. • SUE is contrary to Biodiversity and Geodiversity Study which recommends a buffer around the north & east of the CP.
207	CS 13	Countryside	Mrs Margaret Glancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about impact of SUE on Listed Building at Sysonby Lodge. • Protecting the countryside is contradicted by allocating SUE on land regarded in the ADAS report as of highest landscape quality. • Intentions in para 10.17 undermined by the SUE. • SUE will destroy tranquillity, impacting on the Country Park, cutting it from the countryside and surrounding it with a road and houses. Also using it for footpaths/ cycleways. • Principle of development on land of least environmental value should be applied around the town. • SUE is contrary to Biodiversity and Geodiversity Study which recommends a buffer around the north and east of the CP. • A designated hedgerow is located in the NW corner of the proposed SUE. • Use of disused railway line for a pedestrian and cycle route from the SUE will affect its status as a proposed Local Wildlife Site. • CS23 is incompatible with CS14 making the CS unsound. • No surprise that Biodiversity and Geodiversity Report states wildlife has declined probably at a greater rate than in almost any other area of Britain. • Many unsubstantiated comments about protecting and enhancing ecologically sensitive areas.
224	CS 13	Countryside	Mrs Anne Meek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country Park's wildlife will suffer badly from being totally surrounded by housing.
391	CS 13	Countryside	Buckminster Trust Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS unsound because CS13 is contradicted by Policies CS3, CS7 and CS9. • Additional bullet point in CS13 should allow development in accordance with CS3, CS7 and CS9.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
187	CS 14	Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Friends of Melton Country Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holwell reserves are 2-3 kms from the proposed SUE • A designated hedgerow is located in the NW corner of the proposed SUE. • Use of disused railway line for a pedestrian and cycle route from the SUE will affect its status as a proposed Local Wildlife Site. • CS23 is incompatible with CS14 making the CS unsound. • No surprise that Biodiversity and Geodiversity Report states wildlife has declined probably at a greater rate than in almost any other area of Britain. • Many unsubstantiated comments about protecting and enhancing ecologically sensitive areas. These conflict with the identification of the SUE in the very location where this protection is proposed.
227	CS 14	Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Mr Richard Kendall <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS ignores key environmental reports, e.g. ADAS. • MLDF Task Force arbitrarily dismissed ADAS report on the basis of a site visit.
248	CS 14	Biodiversity & Geodiversity	English Heritage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference should also be made within the policy to the Historic Landscape Character Assessment for this area.
264	CS 14	Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Peel Energy Limited <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS14 does not adequately reflect the NPPF. The final bullet point is inconsistent with para 113 of the NPPF. 'Any other sites which have the potential to be designated' should be deleted.
501	CS 14	Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Bottesford PC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy not strong enough to protect SSSIs and SPAs.
145	CS 15	Strategic Green Infrastructure	Mrs Denise Krzeczowski <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBC have ignored their own study which showed development to the north to have a severe impact on landscape and cultural heritage. • SUE will have an adverse impact on wildlife and biodiversity and spoil countryside walks.
188	CS 15	Strategic Green Infrastructure	Friends of Melton Country Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBC have ignored their own study which showed development to the north to have a severe impact on landscape and the setting of the historic village of Thorpe Arnold. • Difficult to understand the rationale behind the choice of the north over the south, placing a challenge on the CS 's soundness. • Also contrary to the Revised Melton Biodiversity & Geodiversity Study.
249	CS 15	Strategic Green Infrastructure	English Heritage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over lack of recognition of historic environment in CS15. Amendments suggested accordingly. • Reference to archaeological value is too narrow, contrary to NPPF. Amendment requested.
294	CS	Strategic	Broughton <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Infrastructure is to Melton-centric, focussing on green wedges around the town.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
	15	Green Infrastructure	and Dalby PC	
349	CS 15	Strategic Green Infrastructure	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be a greater emphasis on GI infrastructure as access corridors for people. • Use the Rights of Way network to develop access corridors through and beyond the site. • New development to maximise opportunities for non motorised travel.
423	CS 15	Strategic Green Infrastructure	Northern SUE Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GI is an essential part of a SUE, but CS15 makes only fleeting references which are vague and incomplete. • Diagrammatic plan not helpful- GI appears to wash over large extents of development land. • Amend to improve clarity of the policy and suggest that GI is to be in accordance with Policy CS23. • Improve diagram on p38.
470	CS 15	Strategic Green Infrastructure	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insert “heritage” in CS15
189	CS 16	Strategic Open Space	Friends of Melton Country Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main lake already used as a balancing lake for houses in the area and cannot cope with more without affecting nests. • Provision of cycle/ footpaths will have a detrimental effect on wildlife. • Proposed extension to Country Park will not be in the right location and there are doubts over viability as more land needed for housing. • Proper site plans should have preceded CS.
250	CS 16	Strategic Open Space	English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome policy, especially 2nd bullet point relating to management and investment plans. Open land is often valuable in terms of historic environment.
424	CS 16	Strategic Open Space	Northern SUE Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome proposals to include open spaces in SUE, but should refer to exact size, location and phasing being decided through the AAP. Amend to refer to this. • Extension to Country Park should also be cross-referred to Policy CS15 for consistency.
500	CS 16	Strategic Open Space	Bottesford Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asks where a formal park for Bottesford is to be provided. • Would prefer the funding to be directed towards better green infrastructure and existing and new sporting facilities
97	CS 18	Indoor Sport & Recreation Facilities	Leicestershire and Rutland Sport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently a large under-supply of indoor sports facilities and synthetic grass pitches for Melton. Village halls and school sports provision is restricted.
425	CS 18	Indoor Sport & Recreation Facilities	Northern SUE Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome proposal for recreation facility as part of primary school/ community facility at the SUE. • Refer to SUE AAP as mechanism for size, location and phasing.

CHAPTER 11 – TACKLING CLIMATE CHANGE

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
9	11	Tackling Climate Change	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Para 11.27 - 'dependent' rather than 'dependant'.
37	11	Tackling Climate Change	National Farmers Union	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Para 11.27. Melton is also good for wet biomass.
95	12	Better Design	Mr Dermot Daly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of reference to conservation and listed buildings is wholly inadequate. Expects a statement defining the heritage and the method and resources for governance.
296	11	Tackling Climate Change	Broughton and Dalby Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not all sites in the 2008 report have been highlighted in the document. What is the reason for excluding Saltby Airfield? Omit table 11.1 as none of the sites have progressed and they are generically covered in para 11.24 Add up to date assessment of current levels of renewable energy production.
336	11	Tackling Climate Change	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Para 11.27 - 'dependent' rather than 'dependant'.
344	11	Tackling Climate Change	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11.7 provide more detail regarding greenhouse gases. 11.9 include in statement of sustainability the predicted carbon implications of all generated travel and what is to be done to minimise trips.
361	11	Tackling Climate Change	Melton Mowbray & District Civic Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood relief schemes at Brentingby and Scalford Brook Dam were put in place to cope with flooding risks. Increased hard standing contributes to run-off creating flooding and water shortages. Queries provision for large increase in foul water. Conflict between wind turbines and tranquillity.
372	11	Tackling Climate Change	Leicestershire Local Access Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add to para 11.7 "...to access schools, shops and places of work and the wider recreational rights of way network"
518	11	Tackling Climate Change	Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support but the "Code for Sustainable Homes" should be mentioned.
8	CS 19	Sustainable Development & Construction	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> second bullet point - replace the word 'effective' with 'efficient'.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
190	CS 19	Sustainable Development & Construction	Friends of Melton Country Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistency between CS19 and SUE in relation to flooding – risk to Country Park and existing properties.
251	CS 19	Sustainable Development & Construction	English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome reference to historic environment.
335	CS 19	Sustainable Development & Construction	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> second bullet point replace the word 'effective' with 'efficient'.
350	CS 19	Sustainable Development & Construction	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should require "Statements of Sustainability"
411	CS 19	Sustainable Development & Construction	Anglian Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support minimisation of water usage.
426	CS 19	Sustainable Development & Construction	Northern SUE Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome and support CS19. Supporting text should refer to partnership working.
502	CS 19	Sustainable Development & Construction	Bottesford Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong support.
517	CS 19	Sustainable Development & Construction	Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to efficient as well as effective use in 2nd and 8th bullet points. Suggests additional 3 points relating to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> choice of building materials with respect to repair, and decommissioning Recycled/ recyclable material. Multiple benefits, including zero carbon development.
38	CS 20	Energy Supply	National Farmers Union	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 45 MW should be a minimum Amend 2nd sentence to help allow, rather than prevent, new schemes.
56	CS 20	Energy Supply	William Davis Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10% renewable energy requirement will undermine the viability of development, contrary to para 173 of the NPPF. Evidence base does not consider the impact on viability. Without proof of viability with this target, the plan is unsound. All local standards such as this should be kept under review in line with NPPF (para 177)

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
129	CS 20	Energy Supply	Ms Helen Chadwick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selected sites for wind development are questionable and entirely different from those identified by developers. • Need clearer policy / guidelines to assess alternative sites and to enable sites to come forward. • Include recent regional studies in the evidence base. • Targets are low and should be a range, allowing for some technologies not coming forward. • 10% target out of date and inflexible- should be able to take account of energy efficiency of developments and changes in national policy.
215	CS 20	Energy Supply	Peel Environmental Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of bio-mass is too narrow, ignoring content of Municipal Solid Waste and Commercial & Industrial Waste. Para 11.27 fails to recognise their contribution to energy supply. • Evidence base is out of date- more recent information and the NPPF should be reflected. • Additional text suggested for para 11.27 and Policy CS20.
252	CS 20	Energy Supply	English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome reference to the historic environment. • Replace “respect” with “protect” in Policy CS20.
266	CS 20	Energy Supply	Peel Energy Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend text to clarify that the targets are based on “Planning for Climate Change: Renewable Energy Options Study May 2008”. This report is relatively old. The approach is much too broad brush to allow any meaningful calculation of potential wind energy generation. • The contribution that the borough is able to make to renewable energy generation is likely to have been grossly underestimated. • The Study advises that other sites should not be precluded and recognises that more detailed investigations are needed. • Policy CS20 would suppress the Borough’s contribution, contrary to NPPF. Amend to clarify that these figures are not ceilings and that the Council will support appropriately located renewable energy schemes even when the ‘target’ has been reached.
295	CS 20	Energy Supply	Broughton and Dalby PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify whether targets take account of existing and approved schemes.
297	CS 20	Energy Supply	Broughton and Dalby PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add sustainability and access to criteria
427	CS 20	Energy Supply	Northern SUE Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viability should also be referenced in the policy.
412	CS 21	Flood Risk	Anglian Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend to ensure the policy references ‘all forms of flooding’

CHAPTER 12 – BETTER DESIGN

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
378	12	Better Design	Mr John E Clark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statements about better design are contradicted by the Council offices, which is out of scale with the vicinity and conceals the station.
403	12	Better Design	Susan Love	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes commitment to good design.
57	CS 22	Better Design	William Davis Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support in principle. • But Building for Life criteria are not an effective means of ensuring high quality design.
130	CS 22	Better Design	Ms Helen Chadwick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good design is part of sustainable development and does not involve additional cost. Use master-planning and community involvement.
253	CS 22	Better Design	English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy fails to give sufficient emphasis to the historic environment in accordance with NPPF. • Final bullet point should refer to historic environment as a whole, not just heritage assets. • Should refer to setting of assets. • Amend last bullet point to read: "Protect the historic environment, including important heritage assets located within the Borough and their setting." • See comments under Ch. 10 about a separate historic environment policy.
351	CS 22	Better Design	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to the adverse effects of excessive parking and highways access.

CHAPTER 14 – MANAGING INVESTMENT

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
20	14	Managing Investment	Mr Lawrence Dryell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extension to Country Park must mean an increase in size.
44	14	Managing Investment	Mr & Mrs Shipman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guarantees needed on infrastructure provision. Doubts whether houses are needed in the current economic climate. Has infill been taken into account?
104	14	Managing Investment	Dr Leslie Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uncertainties mean that viability must be further investigated. Council Tax payer should not fund any shortfall. Since developers cannot fund all infrastructures, it calls into doubt the soundness off the plan. Lack of definite investment and funding is not a basis to proceed.
137	14	Managing Investment	Dr Andy Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A work of fiction and fantasy backed up by out of date reports. Too many uncertainties. New studies needed to identify what will be provided. Without funding for the by-pass from LCC/ MBC/ Government, the SUE will fail. Without a by-pass traffic will cripple an already congested system. More transparency needed about what will be delivered.
157	14	Managing Investment	Mr Ken Lucas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uncertain finances mean CS is flawed. More houses needed by developers for financial viability, so infrastructure, especially the roads, will not be delivered.
160	14	Managing Investment	Leicester, Leics and Rutland PCT Cluster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PCT will work with MBC to mitigate impact of population increase on healthcare.
176	14	Managing Investment	Mr Anthony Maher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1000 houses not enough to provide facilities and infrastructure. Financial failings will mean insufficient road improvements. Financial foundation is unsound.
217	14	Managing Investment	Mr John Gibbs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Badly thought through, based on old data, guesswork and lack of vision. Will lead to gridlock.
237	14	Managing Investment	Mr David Turner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investment in infrastructure is under threat. Developers likely to draw back from their initial contribution proposals. Will leave an isolated outpost of 1000 houses 25 minutes from the town centre.
245	14	Managing	Mr Richard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No robust financial plan with costs and funding sources.

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
	Investment	Kendall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over-dependence on developer contributions. The CS does not identify in detail the information required for good infrastructure planning (as in HM Treasury's CSR07 Policy Review on Supporting Housing Growth)
275	14	Managing Investment	Mrs Susan Marshall <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CS unsound because developers state that 1000 houses would not be viable and there is no confirmed funding.
286	14	Managing Investment	Melton North Action Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base It is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives It does not have regard to national policy Essential infrastructure funding to mitigate the SUE is mostly dependent on developer contributions. Developers have questioned the Masterplan options as not delivering the by-pass. Option 3 will concentrate the development into a few hands and risk the fragile consortium breaking up. This risk makes the CS unsound. Developers' unawareness of the council's preference (for Option 3) indicates a failure in duty to cooperate. Claims that out of all the comments on the Masterplan options, none supported Option 3.
340	14	Managing Investment	Leicestershire County Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcomes allocation of waste disposal and recycling centre as essential infrastructure. But should be referenced to Policies CS23 and CS25, not CS24.
394	14	Managing Investment	Leicestershire Constabulary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Despite recognition of crime levels and their concentration in the town centre, and Key Objective on crime and community safety/ASB, policing infrastructure is not included in meeting needs for development, nor in community facilities/services or in funding infrastructure. Infrastructure Plan does not reflect consultation response. As a result significant growth is envisaged with no provision for police service needs. This will result in pressure on the service and unsustainable growth, contrary to NPPF and community wishes. As a result CS is unsound. Offers to work with MBC prior to Examination.
431	14	Managing Investment	Northern SUE Consortium <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding necessary infrastructure will be challenging, but this would be the case whatever the strategy. Welcome the sensible, pragmatic approach to infrastructure needs and phasing. Welcome recognition of potential for CIL to secure wider funding for strategic infrastructure. Welcome recognition of impact on development viability when setting CIL rate. Welcome consistency with NPPF para 173 in relation to deliverability. Welcome open book appraisal.
478	14	Managing	South Melton <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure funding too uncertain .

Annexe B: MELTON LDF CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION) DPD: REPRESENTATIONS

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
	Investment	Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnership funding with developers uncertain in economic circumstances. Assumption of growth is flawed.
50	CS 25	Delivering Infrastructure Mr M Howard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Viability is questionable because of the uncertainties. 1000 houses not enough to provide necessary infrastructure and facilities. Worst possible outcome will be 1000 houses with no improvements to roads. No confirmed investment so only possible outcomes, making the CS questionable.
192	CS 25	Delivering Infrastructure Friends of Melton Country Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Viability is questionable because of the uncertainties. 1000 houses not enough to provide necessary infrastructure and facilities. Worst possible outcome will be 1000 houses with no improvements to roads. No confirmed investment so only possible outcomes, making the CS unsound.
210	CS 25	Delivering Infrastructure Mrs Margaret Glancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Viability is questionable because of the uncertainties. 1000 houses not enough to provide necessary infrastructure and facilities. Worst possible outcome will be 1000 houses with no improvements to roads. No confirmed investment so only possible outcomes.
226	CS 25	Delivering Infrastructure Mr Richard Kendall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence that the CS and the SUE is substantiated by a financial plan. Over-dependence on developer contributions. All costs not identified, e.g. road upgrades at Spinney road. LCC funding will not be forthcoming. Major risk that there will be only a partial road. No risk assessment of alternative strategies.
352	CS 25	Delivering Infrastructure Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcomes policy and clarification that agreements will be needed for mitigation over and above CIL.
503	CS 25	Delivering Infrastructure Bottesford Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inquires how CIL will work in Bottesford –what influence will the community have?

CHAPTER 15 – MONITORING OUR STRATEGY

ID	Chapter/ Policy	Name	Summary of Main Issues
82	15 Monitoring our Strategy	Ashwood Property Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS not effective in that it is not flexible and is inconsistent with national policy. • No contingency measures in the event of delays in delivery of the SUE. • Alternative strategy should be set out with triggers for it. • Criteria for intervention on Policy CS1 will not enable significant shortfall in housing supply to be addressed in a timely manner. • Also contrary to 5 year housing supply requirement. • Alternative strategy should include preferred sites to be released to meet shortfall.
126	15 Monitoring our Strategy	Mr Phil John	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All building development does not need to be in one spot.
168	15 Monitoring our Strategy	Mr Michael Cavani	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little detail behind the Vision • How does MBC reconcile opposition to greenfield development in Bottesford with proposal for Melton? • 1500 homes needed to make it viable if they are to contribute to infrastructure. • Building on highest point will increase flooding. • Development will be death sentence for the park and its wildlife. • Sustainable travel will not be achieved by 1500 houses in the north and employment in the SW. • Without a bypass a SUE will not be achieved.
218	15 Monitoring our Strategy	Mr John Gibbs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No justification for all development taking place in one area
256	15 Monitoring our Strategy	English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No monitoring indices for the historic environment- CS unsound without this.
287	15 Monitoring our Strategy	Melton North Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsound because Framework fails to provide a robust and audible methodology to monitor delivery. • Very few targets are SMART. • CS monitoring framework should contain clear objectives, indicators, targets, trajectories, triggers and contingencies. Also major risks. • Employment trajectory should be provided. • Does not deal with strategic waste disposal issues, especially construction waste. • No reference to minerals requirements and minerals planning. • Monitoring framework is unfit for purpose- alarming attitude from MBC on accuracy and evidence base.
504	15 Monitoring our Strategy	Bottesford Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish Council can help monitor strategy.

APPENDIX 1 –MELTON HOUSING TRAJECTORY

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
81	APPENDIX 1:	MELTON HOUSING TRAJECTORY	Ashwood Property Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sound because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not founded on robust evidence and is not flexible. ○ Not consistent with national policy • Timescale for completions from the SUE is unduly optimistic, given broad location and amount is still subject to the CS process and AAP is to be prepared to determine boundaries. • AAP not likely to be adopted before Nov 2013 and outline planning permission unlikely before early 2014. Given need for RM and condition discharge, completions unlikely to occur until 2015/16. • 5 year land supply rightly doesn't include SUE.
261	APPENDIX 1:	MELTON HOUSING TRAJECTORY	Melton North Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trajectory based on 170pa is unjustified, top down and not evidence based. • Does not take account of brownfield sites. • SHLA dismisses sites that are not adjoining settlements where development is to be allowed by the CS – catch 22 situation. • Significant number of SHLAA sites dismissed for policy reasons. • Questions decline in broad locations (small sites) from 65 to 45- not justified since the 65 trend has persisted for 10 years.
105	APPENDIX 1:	MELTON HOUSING TRAJECTORY	Dr Leslie Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeks explanation of difference between 1000 homes at the SUE and planned development of 3605 in Appendix 1. • Appendix 1 states affordable housing as 66, whereas MBC have led the community to believe there will be 700 affordable homes within the 1000

APPENDIX 2 – MELTON POLICY MONITORING FRAMEWORK

ID	Chapter/ Policy		Name	Summary of Main Issues
105	Appendix 2:	Melton Policy Monitoring Framework	Dr Leslie Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Split between town and rural area should be more balanced, say 55:45 • 1000 homes will put services in town under pressure. • CS is biased towards rural areas. • Brownfield sites should be used before greenfield- suspects this is because of LCC owned land. • CS4 allows dwellings in flood risk area - not sound planning. • Radon ingress on land to north will cause health problems. • SUE will have serious environmental effects on wildlife, hedgerows, trees and Melton Country Park. • Why plan housing development in the north separate from employment development in the south? • CS should not progress unless firm funding is in place for new roads. • Up to date traffic survey required with computer predictions of traffic scenarios with northern SUE and employment development to the south. • SUE will not be integrated into the landscape. • Required facilities , especially primary school and recreation, will not be delivered. • Proposed road link goes nowhere and will cause problems at Melton Spinney/ Thorpe Road and Scafford Road/ Norman Way junctions. • Employment growth area is in opposite direction to the SUE leading to more congestion, possibly gridlock.
432	Appendix 2:	Melton Policy Monitoring Framework	Northern SUE Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome positive approach to monitoring 5 year supply. • Sentence under Policy CS23, p65 should be reworded to ensure land is additional to the established figures.