

Answer	Response ID	If you would like to comment on this chapter as a whole please do so here. - Add comments about the whole chapter	Officer's Response
Robert Ian Lockey	ANON-BHRP-4H3G-2	<p>In 4.2.14 it is (correctly) stated that Bottesford is more closely related to Nottingham, Grantham and Newark. In determining the allocation of new housing to Bottesford, what consultation has taken place with these other local authorities?</p> <p>This paragraph also lists the facilities currently available in Bottesford, but not assessment has been made of how these will need to be enhanced to meet the needs of a growing population.</p>	The Council has a duty to ensure it has co-operated with neighbouring authorities, this involves consultation and liaison with those authorities about the scale and location of new development. This has been undertaken as part of preparing the plan; the Authorities are also formally consulted at each consultation stage.
Angus Smith	ANON-BHRP-4HZK-D	<p>On the whole I support the overall direction of the spatial strategy, with its relative balance of development within the main town and the rural communities. However I am sorely disappointed to see that although many villages are Specifically mentioned under the secondary rural supporter - Kirby Bellars has been totally missed out.</p> <p>Later in this draft plan it mentions the importance and need to maintain segregation between the various developed communities.</p> <p>Melton - Eye Kettleby, Melton - Asfordby Hill, Melton - Ab Kettleby, Asfordby Hill - Asfordby, Melton - Thorpe Arnold, Melton - Great Dalby</p> <p>What about Melton - Kirby Bellars or is this an "intentional oversight" that means that Kirby Bellars will get absorbed by Industrial/ housing sprawl to the west of the town - Please feedback to me on this point.</p>	Kirby Bellars is not specifically reference in this chapter as it was not identified as either a Primary or Secondary Rural Service Centre. The spatial strategy focusses new development on the town and the rural service centres. The Landscape Consultants assessed the gap between Melton Mowbray and Kirby Bellars but concluded that an Area of Separation was not necessary in this location because of the distance between each settlement. Development of the town will not be such that the village will be "absorbed" by development.
Gordon Raper	ANON-BHRP-4H3N-9	<p>The proposed increase of 368 dwellings for Bottesford represents approx 25% increase over 20 years. Whilst this is not unreasonable, there needs to be consideration towards improved transport and schooling. Bottesford is deemed a Primary Rural centre with 'good facilities'. Overall, this is fair. Apart from train and bus.</p> <p>Trains only run very 2 hours to/from Grantham on an evening meaning it is impossible to use the local service for connections to or from London, which many people use. The bus service from Grantham stops at 6pm. There is no bus service to/from Nottingham after 6pm. The last train from Nottingham to Bottesford is at 9.45pm.</p> <p>So from an environmental point of view, residents of Bottesford have to rely on their cars. The 368 owners of the new properties are likely to be very disappointed when they realise how cut-off they are.</p> <p>The primary school and possibly the high school would need to be extended.</p> <p>You mentioned the need to preserve the separation of Easthorpe from Bottesford. I question this need as most people see the two communities as one, due to the continuous build from Grantham Road through to Easthorpe.</p>	<p>See Review of Settlement hierarchy and site allocation.</p> <p>Comments regarding the connection between Easthorpe and Bottesford is noted</p>
Mr Julian Evans	ANON-BHRP-4H43-F	<p>No more houses, the Town cannot support further increases in housing without a ring road, simple.</p> <p>Over the years I have seen a huge amount of new houses built right across the Borough, all the additional Council Tax paid but where are the additional facilities to the residents??? We have lost a Leisure Centre in Town, but gained a smaller facility at the top of Burton Road. The swimming baths is very much the same, more money to prop up and old facility.</p> <p>When do the Old Meltonians start to benefit from the additional revenue?????</p>	The plan proposes both housing and employment development and the delivery of an outer relief road, much of which will be delivered by the development.
Richard Bishuty	ANON-BHRP-4H4R-E	<p>I, as a home owner and resident of Melton Mowbray for the last twenty years cannot understand why nothing concrete is being done about the absolutely awful traffic congestion that hits the town at random times of the day.</p> <p>The closure of any major road such as the A1 causes mayhem to add to the already congested roads.</p> <p>Pollution of the air, gridlock, pedestrian and cyclist's safety seem to be totally ignored and pushed under the carpet.</p>	<p>MBC is working together with LCC to produce a transport strategy for the town which will include the business case for funding for the relief road as well as additional traffic and transport measures within the town to improve connectivity.</p> <p>When a major highway such as the A1 is closed it will always have an impact on minor roads in that locality. Delays and congestion</p>

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

		How in all honesty any of the councils so called strategy can be implemented above a traffic solution is beyond me.	associated with these incidents are inevitable.
John David Smith	ANON-BHRP-4H4X-M	An interesting read. No comments.	noted
Mr John Brown	ANON-BHRP-4H4Z-P	The number of houses, suggested for development, in the Borough villages are too high. Melton Mowbray has better roads, transport links and infrastructure to cope with the growing needs of the population. Another surgery at the other end of town would make sense, as well as the building of a new school. The rural communities are having to cope with more and more cutbacks as far as public transport is concerned, whereas Melton has excellent public transport links. As Melton develops it could easily join up with Asfordby without any real detrimental effect.	Melton Mowbray is expected to accommodate the majority of growth over the plan period. However rural communities also need new development to support their needs and ensure they remain viable. The people of Asfordby may not agree with this comment about joining up with Melton Mowbray.
Lucy Flavin – Broughton and Dalby Parish Council	ANON-BHRP-4H4T-G	DPA is jargon. We assume it means dwellings per annum but it would be easier to understand if it stated this.	Noted – Clarification of DPS should be included.
Siobhan Noble	ANON-BHRP-4HED-H	I support the whole chapter - it offers a broad solution. I am not opposed to the generation of new communities, there is a place for establishing a modern village. Brownfield sites unless they can be occupied by industry are simply wasted resources. A blot on the landscape.	Support noted
John Mace	ANON-BHRP-4HEM-T	Agree with the chapter, especially the use of Great Dalby Airfield brownfield site as this area could support large scale housing with associated shops, schools etc to relieve some pressure from Melton town centre and has good links to the main employment area in Leicester	Support noted
Lesley Judith Twigg	ANON-BHRP-4HEH-N	Concentration of development in Melton is good as it is already "urban". Will also reduce necessity for car travel and the population could sustain better Public Transport. With this development also achieve a ring road to reduce the gridlock in Melton. The Airfield seems a good idea--in addition to the Melton South and North projects. The traffic from the new village could feed into the ring road, and would also attract decent bus services due to its size--which can't be achieved in the villages. The hierarchy of village development is OK as a concept--but you got the whole points assessment wrong for our village--leaving us vulnerable to much more building than we can cope with.--Again--why not the Airfield?	Support noted, although the plan does not proposed development on the old airfield site near Melton Mowbray, other than an option for future long term development.
Aidan Thatcher (on behalf of Mr Herbert Daybell)	ANON-BHRP-4HEA-E	N/A	
Mark Colin Marlow	ANON-BHRP-4HEJ-Q	I think the whole issue is misguided and will lead to elitist communities and "affordable" development communities that will ruin the village community forever. Public transport is farcical within the rural areas of MBC and travel by car is inevitable. Large developments in rural communities such as secondary rural service centres will only cause more road travel, not less. Major developments should take place within the confines of the urban areas where travel by public transport is easier.	Concerns noted
Alan Luntley	ANON-BHRP-4HEQ-X	Melton Settlement Roles are over complex and show a degree of rigidity that should be avoided. There should be:- 1 Melton Urban Area 2 Primary Rural Service Centres - Asfordby and Bottesford 3 Secondary Rural Service Centres - As detailed plus Long Clawson and Waltham 4 Rural Supporter - As detailed plus Rural settlements	See Review of Settlement hierarchy
Brian Kirkup	ANON-BHRP-4HE9-6	Your current plan to add housing to all villages is going to increase rural traffic and car journeys. None of the rural transport is convenient enough to the general public in the villages to prevent this. In your dismissal of Dalby Airfield you discuss it in the context of one of the Melton sites and dismiss it on one level that it would create more car journeys than more central Melton sites. Obviously that is correct but if you looked at Dalby airfield as an alternative to building in all the villages you would reduce the length of most journeys, which often involve going to Melton. You would also maintain the rural charm which will be blighted by the new building. Are most tourists interested in Melton town centre or the surrounding countryside? Reducing Co2 emissions is important and you refer to this often in your discussions but I think it has too high a level of	See Review of Settlement hierarchy Comments relating to Six Hills and the dependence of a rural area on the private car are noted.

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

		<p>importance and veto's some plans which otherwise have merit. What do I mean then?</p> <p>You plan a lot of houses in Rural areas, inevitably increasing car journeys. You choose 2ndry rural centres with a bus service being a significant factor in your decision. It is intellectually dishonest to suggest that this will reduce the environmental impact and car use, as you must know, as the rest of us do that people choose their car over the bus 95-99% of the time. Taking the 128 as an example it runs every 2-2/12 hours and is very little used as people find the car more convenient. Reducing Co2 emissions will come from taxation on cars, increases in engine efficiency and increase in electrical cars in the future, not from putting housing in villages with a bus service and hoping people will choose the bus. If you accept that building in villages with poor bus services will not lead to the new house owners using the bus service it leaves you much freer in your building choices.</p> <p>When considering Six hills as a development site, one of your key qualms about it is it is sited in a position which will lead to car usage. Well yes it will but equally so, siting houses in all the villages will do the same (see my comments above on rural bus use). Six Hills is not an area of great rural beauty and any beauty it may have had has recently been reduced by the new wind turbine development.. It is superbly sited next to the A46 and thus has great access for travel to Leicester and Nottingham which are both towns that a lot of our citizens go to work in. If they live in Six Hills their car journeys will not result in cars driving right across the Borough on rural roads to eventually access the very busy A607 and A606, as they would choose the A46. Six Hills looks as though it could sustain a sizeable development which would support a convenience store and a primary school and if you wish to still pay lip service to the bus, you could have commuter express buses to Leicester and Nottingham running in a morning and an evening.</p> <p>If you considered Six hills you would create a new village and could save the look of the current villages much closer to how they are and not ruin them with building which will just look like a new appendage, however sensitively it is done.</p>	
Anthony Thomas	ANON-BHRP-4HFX-6	<p>Planning permission for new housing estates should not be granted unless it is demonstrated that there are employment vacancies in the locality that remain unfilled.</p>	<p>New homes are required to meet a variety of different needs relating to population and household change. In MBC this is particularly due to an ageing population. New homes do not therefore always mean a new job.</p>
Anthea Brown	ANON-BHRP-4HE4-1	<p>I am happy that Long Clawson is included as a Primary Rural Service Centre. It is a thriving village which is very popular and much sought after by all different age groups.</p> <p>Along with more housing, it would be great if this stimulated an improved and enlarged doctors surgery and primary school plus more shops and buses to both Melton, Nottingham and Leicester.</p> <p>This would greatly benefit all village people but especially the older inhabitants, who may no longer be able to drive.</p> <p>The population of Long Clawson has been static for many years, as I understand it, and it would be of great benefit to increase this population by building new houses and continuing to bring "new blood" into the village.</p> <p>As smaller developments and infill sites tend to be larger "executive style" houses, it would be preferable to move away from this in order to keep the villages peopled by a more sustainable mix of the population.</p>	<p>Support for Long Clawson as a primary rural service centre noted</p>
Malcolm Brown	ANON-BHRP-4HEV-3	<p>As a village resident my comments are related to their spatial strategy only. I agree in the categorization of the villages in terms of development particularly Long Clawson as a Primary Village. I see no reason why the villages cannot support the targeted development as long as this is linked to infrastructure and services. In the case of Long Clawson the school and GP surgeries will have to expand. There is a large suitable site for each adjacent to the village hall. Such expansion to meet future need would also alleviate parking problems within the village centre.</p>	<p>Support for Long Clawson as a primary rural service centre noted</p>
George Breed – Persimmon Homes	ANON-BHRP-4HF3-1	<p>Concentrating residential housing to both the north and south Melton town will assist with raising the funds needed for a outer relief road, which in turn will secure the wider aspirations outlined within the plan. However it is important the relief road is engineered in such a way that it minimise construction costs. The exact alignment of the proposed relief road must have sufficient flexibility to allow for minor adjustments. Land within the SHLAA that tracks the route should therefore be</p>	<p>Support noted</p>

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

		safeguarded in the eventuality ground conditions unearth constraints which require said adjustments.	
Stephen Denman	ANON-BHRP-4HEU-2	Nearly 4,000 houses are proposed for Melton Town; I make no apology for stating again that until the correct infrastructure is in place (irrespective of whether it is funded by developers, or other means,) no large scale housing development should be commenced. What incentives will be offered to future employers that will make them want to set up a business in the Melton Town area?	New homes are required to meet a variety of different needs relating to population and household change. In MBC this is particularly due to an ageing population. The development is planned to provide the infrastructure required to support it. MBC is working together with LCC to produce a transport strategy for the town which will include the business case for funding for the relief road as well as additional traffic and transport measures within the town to improve connectivity.
David Mell	ANON-BHRP-4HF8-6	1. I believe the 65/35 split puts too much housing development into the villages (see my comment on the Vision). I do not remember its being positively supported at the reference group meetings. 2. I particularly object to the four categories in the "Settlement Roles and Relationship" Study a) Four is too many and the bands too narrow - particularly the Secondary Rural Service Centre band. b) The data used to score the villages is wrong - Stathern lost it's post office (now having basic service three mornings a week from the pub) and does not have a Bakery. Harby does have a regular Post Office. Correcting this data would mean Harby would replace Stathern as a Secondary Rural Service Centre - but such data change quite rapidly as shop keepers retire. bus routes change etc. 3. I believe the shortcomings of this four level approach are now recognised but I have another objection. However categories are chosen I believe it is wrong for the Council to "allocate individual sites" to any communities. It may suggest a "fair number of new houses" but individual sites are so sensitive and the impact on the value of sites to individual owners so great that it goes beyond the role of government to "allocate". Setting criteria for acceptability should be the role, then exercising the responsibilities to decide planning applications according to the criteria should be the role.	Comments noted, many of which will be addressed by the Settlement hierarchy review The role of the Local Plan is to provide certainty – to both developers and the community. To achieve this plan must demonstrate how the Objectively Assessed Housing need (OAN) will be met – this can only be achieved if specific deliverable sites are identified.
Dr Jerzy A Schmidt	ANON-BHRP-4H4P-C	The housing numbers required are quoted as "at least" suggesting more may be built. Why is it "at least" when the housing numbers adopted were at the maximum end of those predicted (from an earlier consultation)? If you were using the minimum number predicted, then "at least" would be justified. Using the maximum predicted should be accompanied with "at most"	National policy requires the council to demonstrate how it will meet the OAN, it also requires the plan to provide for "at least" this requirement in order that it provides flexibility. NPPF sets a requirement for a "Buffer" of 5 or 20% additional housing to ensure that the five year land supply is met.
Susan Love	ANON-BHRP-4HZP-J	4.2.3 Employment land is accounted for by use of land in Melton and Asfordby. This is good because it is more sustainable than providing it elsewhere in the Borough. 70% of new housing should be in Melton. 4.2.4 Support the definition of Bottesford as a Primary Service centre, but there is need to consider whether Bottesford is now near to its optimum size. Bottesford is constrained by flooding, has a very small retail centre with limited parking, poor vehicular access to the schools, and is considered by local people to have very poor public transport. The bus services have been considerably reduced since the 1980s and with the limits on LA funding are not likely to improve. 4.2.14 Although there are some business and employment opportunities in Bottesford it is doubtful whether most people can actually work there. Bottesford's connection with Nottingham, Newark and Grantham. The Plan should include evidence from neighbouring authorities of proposed development in these areas. Housing built outside of the Borough within these locations is more sustainable than housing in Bottesford. I support the area of separation. This is what gives Bottesford its special character. There are fields near the centre of the village, views of the castle are preserved and the nearby settlements retain their identity remaining very pleasant areas for walkers and cyclists both local and tourist. 4.2.18 Bottesford is rightly named - at the centre of the village is a ford, and a road from Normanton which quickly becomes a ford in times of heavy rainfall. There is a striking mismatch given Bottesford's flooding problem between the allocation of housing between Bottesford and Waltham on the Wolds. I have checked the EA map for Waltham - absolutely no flood risk,	Comments noted and addressed individually within the policies of this chapter

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

		<p>no flood zones, and it has a large number of preferred SHLAA sites. It may have fewer facilities than Bottesford at the moment but it does have a GP surgery etc, and more facilities could follow growth. Waltham is also near to Melton and residents are more likely to support the town economy than residents of Bottesford. I have lived in Bottesford for nearly 46 years and don't know anybody whose regular, or even irregular, shopping expedition is to Melton.</p> <p>4.2.19 A total of 300 houses should be the maximum for Bottesford. These could be accommodated on the preferred SHLAA sites, and on a small additional site near the centre of the village (providing freedom from flooding could be assured) which would provide good accommodation for elderly people who need very easy access to the centre.</p>	
Mark & Kathryn Chapman	ANON-BHRP-4HFJ-R	We support the concept of sharing housing development between the town, the primary and secondary rural service centres and the rural supporters. Agree with the percentage splits and the classification of Burton Lazars as a Rural Supporter.	Support noted. See also Settlement hierarchy review
Catherine Sinclair – Head teacher at Long Clawson CE Primary School	ANON-BHRP-4HMM-2	<p>Long Clawson School is currently in discussions regarding the maximum net capacity of the school, however, in real terms the school has the capacity to teach 109 pupils maximum. There are currently 102 on roll. 10 will move to secondary school at the end of the summer term and we have 19 first choice preferences for the new Reception intake. 16 are local so will automatically be given a place, 3 are not locals but could go to appeal and be given a place by the independent panel (there were 2 appeals last year and both were granted places). This means that next academic year we will, in all likelihood, have at least 108, with a possible 111. Birth rate figures from Leicestershire County Council show an increase to 121 by 2020. We are already struggling to accommodate pupils on the current site. ANY housing will bring more children. As Head Teacher I am more than aware of the DfE formula when working out pupil numbers generated by housing (1 house = .24 pupils). It could be argued, however, that this formula is out of date given that it was devised in 2009, prior to sharp birth rate rises and influx of external peoples. In real terms the birth rate prediction for Long Clawson CE Primary School is likely to be higher than is currently predicted, as well as the increase in numbers moving into the area for other reasons.</p> <p>The argument is that Long Clawson School does NOT have the capacity to accommodate ANY pupils generated by the building of dwellings in the village. Neither can the school be extended on its current site to take 29 pupils generated by 122 houses or 64 pupils generated by 167 houses.</p> <p>Should any housing of this size go ahead, a new school on a new site would be the only way to accommodate such an increase in pupil numbers.</p>	Clarification of the capacity of the school in Long Clawson is welcomed and will be considered as part of the Settlement Hierarchy and site allocation work.
Graham Storrie	ANON-BHRP-4HM4-9	Development of housing needs to be a steady growth in villages so that infrastructure can develop at the same pace. I believe this can only be done by the slow release of smaller land packages dispersed around and infill.	Noted.
Mr & Mrs J. Rogan	ANON-BHRP-4HMH-W	Although we have lived in Bottesford since 1983 and enjoy the comparatively good services that the village offers, as elderly people unable to run a car, we are aware that public transport links have become dramatically poorer since we moved to the village. There is no longer a direct bus service to Nottingham via Bingham, or Newark, and the service to Grantham is poor. Yes there is an occasional service to Melton Mowbray, but the long journey duration and, frankly, comparatively poor retail facilities that Melton offers, at least within the town centre, makes things very difficult. Even for the bus services that existing there is no seating and waiting shelter which is a poor response to the needs of people with infirmities. The railway station is position on the far northern edge of the village and, even if the service was reasonable (very much diminished since we first moved to the village) we would struggle to walk to the station. The lack of adequate public transport is likely to be the primary factor if we ultimately decide we can no longer remain in the village.	Comments noted. Information regarding bus services, frequency and routes will be used as part of the settlement hierarchy review. It should be noted that public transport across the Borough has been reduced and rural communities are more dependant upon private car.
Julie Moss	ANON-BHRP-4HM5-A	I don't agree that the development of Normanton airfield will create concentrated pressure on services or the impact the character of the surrounding area. It is an airfield next to the A1 - how could it possibly impact the character? Bottesford has very poor services (both bus and train) so is in the same position as Normanton airfield.	Normanton airfield is located some distance from the services and facilities, including bus and train services, within Bottesford. Accessing these would rely 100% upon private car journeys. Access to Normanton airfield would also be via Bottesford.
Geoff Platts – Environment Agency	ANON-BHRP-4HFU-3	We will comment on the individual Policies.	
Nick Farrow	ANON-BHRP-	I have been involved in a number of meetings and having looked at a number of alternatives, I agree with the development of the North and South areas of Melton but do not understand why a East and West alternative cannot be considered which	Land to the west of the town is owned and used by the Ministry of Defence – this land is not therefore available for development.

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

	4HUD-1	would hopefully totally finance the whole ring road and not rely on alternative financing. This would also take the pressure off rural communities to over develop area of natural beauty and develop tourism. I would also support the development of Great Dalby Airfield, Brooksby and Kirby Bellars developments.	Land to the east of the town, particularly between the town and Thorpe Arnold is constrained by area at high risk of flooding and topography. MBC and LCC are working together to put together the business case for future funding of the relief road to ensure it connects to the two sections of link road provided by the developments to the north and south of the town.
John A Herlihy	ANON-BHRP-4HU3-G	Its a bit repetitive. Words, words and more words. While many people within the Boro' agree that the Boro' has to grow to keep alive it appears that there is a concerted effort to choke the town in traffic congestion, poor air quality and a dire environment in which to work, rest and play !!	Comments noted
Mrs Clarissa Sally Garden	ANON-BHRP-4HUG-4	Please may I have a sticker? I did download and read it all. Am I correct to assume that the 300plus houses to be built in Bottesford will not be completed until 2036? Really? Is somebody having a laugh?	The plan covers to period to 2036, however the housing development will take place across this period of time, and it may be that some development takes place before others. A review of the settlement hierarchy may result in a change in the housing distribution.
Mark Jopling	ANON-BHRP-4HUZ-Q	Some flexibility required for in-fill development in villages - too restricted currently	noted
Craig Heaney	ANON-BHRP-4HUY-P	A full town link road needs to be in place prior to any development in the North of town. The current map of the link road proposes that it stops on Melton Spinney Road, near the entrance to Twinlakes. This is ridiculous - Melton Spinney Road is unclassified and is barely wide enough in some place for 2 cars to pass (let alone a vehicle any larger). Traffic would be brought back down towards town or through Thorpe Arnold. This would create a dangerous situation for cyclists and pedestrians and would cause even more traffic chaos than we see now. The plan needs to include the link road running through to the main Grantham Road at a point north of Thorpe Arnold.	MBC and LCC are working together to put together the business case for future funding of the relief road to ensure it connects to the two sections of link road provided by the developments to the north and south of the town. In the meantime it may be necessary to undertake some interim highway improvements to junctions affected by development.
Moira Hart	ANON-BHRP-4HU7-M	I do agree with section 4.1.1 and policy SS1 that any development in the Borough must be shown to be sustainable as required by the NPPF. However I do question 4.2.1. that 245 houses are needed in the Borough each year for the next 20 years. The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2014 (Table 85 page 186 of the conclusions) suggests 194 houses a year to cope with demographic projections and 239 to support potential, but questionable economic growth. The figure of 245 per year is the highest point of the OAN Range. The SHMA also notes that the numbers presented don't seem to consider infrastructure at all. The SHMA page 102 notes that "recommends the Midpoint Headship Rate Projections as the most realistic and reliable demographic-led projections based on historic trends. We consider this to be the most realistic projection of future population and household growth based on past population trends." This analysis gives the 194 houses per annum whilst the 245 houses per annum figure is based on speculation of economic growth until 2036. While Melton would suggest supporting economic growth it is questionable that the population will exist to purchase the higher number of properties that Melton is currently planning for. 194 houses per annum as given by the SHMA would be a much more sustainable figure.	Comments noted. The Council agreed to opt for the higher scenario within the SHMA in order to redress the Borough's demographic profile which shows an increasingly aged population with a shrinking labour force. If this pattern continues there is a real danger that our local economy will also shrink and businesses will relocate to areas where they have an appropriate aged labour force. The SHMA evidences the need for new homes based on a number of scenarios. This is evidence of population and household change as well as economic growth and change in the labour market.
CHRISTINE LARSON	ANON-BHRP-4HUU-J	I support that all development must be sustainable as defined by the current NPPF guidelines. However, the narrow and tick box approach that MBC has taken in interpreting these guidelines needs urgent review. As mentioned earlier in my comments, sustainability must take account of the way people live today, particularly in the mobility of the job market and new working patterns. The need for stability for a family and support for childcare and	See Settlement Hierarchy review

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

		<p>schooling arrangements has resulted in families choosing a place to live, close to relations, that offers a hub from which to commute to a wide area for work or to work from home. This requires excellent telecommunications, technology and road/transport hubs. Melton Mowbray is in a perfect position to offer an environment to bring up a family in a tranquil part of the country, whilst being close to mainline train stations - Melton, Loughborough, Grantham and airports - East Midlands, Doncaster and Birmingham. A recent survey of Long Clawson residents showed that 70% commute to areas over 15 miles from the village. Of the remaining 30% - half are self employed working from home, leaving only 15% working within Melton or the Vale or retired. Of those answering the survey, many had either grown up in the area and returned to bring up their family or had moved to be close to relatives for childcare support. This is by far the norm in the village and very different to the last Village Appraisal in 1976 where the majority worked within the Borough and many in the village itself. Life and work has changed over the past 40 years and the concept of sustainable travel needs considerable review.</p> <p>To support this pattern of lifestyle it is essential that the Local Plan, in testing sustainability, takes account of present and foreseeable infrastructure (much of which hasn't been improved for 40 years), including broadband, mobile networks and telecommunications, school capacity and quality, public transport and links to transport hubs, roads, social services, and flooding and drainage.</p> <p>The new Local Plan needs to take these factors into account and seize the opportunity of being seen as an attractive place to live by building a Town that can rival other centres to retain the income brought in from outside the area and provide the leisure activity for the Borough. Melton Town is an attractive market town that many say has 'seen better days'. However, it has lots of potential and the Regal Cinema is an example of what can be achieved through innovation.</p>	
Moira Hart – Clawson in Action	ANON-BHRP-4HBM-Q	<p>We agree with section 4.1.1 and policy SS1 that development must be shown to be sustainable to accord with the NPPF.</p> <p>We question the statement in 4.2.1. that the MBC area needs 245 houses each year for the next 20 years. The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2014 (Table 85 page 186 of the conclusions) identifies a need for 194 houses a year to cope with demographic projections and 239 to support potential, but impossible to prove, economic growth. The figure taken by MBC of 245 per year is the highest point of the OAN Range. The SHMA also notes that the numbers presented do not take account of development of infrastructure.</p> <p>The SHMA page 102 notes that “Although this report contains three different, demographic projections we would recommend the Midpoint Headship Rate Projections as the most realistic and reliable demographic-led projections based on historic trends. We consider this to be the most realistic projection of future population and household growth based on past population trends.” This analysis gives the 194 houses per annum figure, the 245 houses per annum figure is based on speculation of the amount of economic growth until 2036 as the SHMA points out http://www.melton.gov.uk/downloads/file/1676/leicester_and_leicestershire_strategic_housing_market_assessment_2014</p> <p>While it is laudable that Melton will support economic growth it is questionable that the population will exist to utilise or purchase the higher number of properties that Melton is currently planning for. 194 houses per annum as given by the SHMA would be the sustainable figure – taking the 245 figure is unwise. This high figure has a knock-on effect to the apportionment of building in the countryside surrounding Melton.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council agreed to opt for the higher scenario within the SHMA in order to redress the Borough’s demographic profile which shows an increasingly aged population with a shrinking labour force. If this pattern continues there is a real danger that our local economy will also shrink and businesses will relocate to areas where they have an appropriate aged labour force.</p> <p>The SHMA evidences the need for new homes based on a number of scenarios. This is evidence of population and household change as well as economic growth and change in the labour market.</p>
Kenneth Bray	ANON-BHRP-4HBX-2	<p>The target of 245 hpa was the highest possible interpretation of the data. Whilst you accept that this requires significant employment growth, which comes first? the chicken or the egg?</p> <p>The Rural Settlements concepts and hierarchy were ill thought through and (despite claims) not properly consulted on initially.</p> <p>The policy seems to be to pick a number and then share it out rather than understand the local demands and build a response.</p>	<p>Housing need is different to housing demand. The plan must make provision to meet the evidenced need, however the provision it makes must also be deliverable, therefore some regard must be given to local markets, viability and deliverability – the things which affect demand. These matters are being assessed alongside the settlement roles, capacity of services to accommodate growth and the assessment of suitability of sites for development.</p>
Deborah Caroline Adams	ANON-	<p>This is prepared on the back of insufficient and incorrect data as not all the villages had returned their "Village Facilities</p>	<p>See settlement Roles review.</p>

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

	BHRP-4H38-K	<p>table" at the time of this public consultation. We are therefore asked to comment on incorrect data (which is probably why the likes of Great Dalby are only categorised as a "Rural Supporter" and yet it has a pub, a pre-school, a primary school, a village hall, regular bus services to Melton and a bus service operating 6 days a week to Leicester, as well as good road links to Melton Mowbray (only 5 minutes away), and is in fact quite a large village.</p> <p>On page 26 bullet point 4 says that Normanton Airfield with its adjacent position to the A1 and away from the village of Normanton is not suitable for development and yet Great Dalby Airfield (Melton Airfield) which is between Great Dalby and Melton adjacent to a B road is apparently quite suitable for development. This shows a lack of consistency and the illogical thought processes which have continued all through Chapter 4.</p>	A detailed assessment of the suitability of both Normanton airfield and Great Dalby airfield has been undertaken; this considers many different factors such as access, landscape, physical constraints and sustainability assessment. Normanton airfield does not benefit from direct access to the A1 in both directions therefore cars from this location have to travel through either Bottesford or Long Bennington – this is a significant constraint to the sites development. In addition it is located a considerable distance from the nearest town which has the benefit of a full range of local services.
Anthony Paphiti	ANON-BHRP-4HBV-Z	<p>It seems to me this proposal to build houses is not to meet local demands but, rather, to conform to a national target. 245 homes per year could mean an additional 500-100 people per year, plus 200-500 extra cars, per year. We should only be building houses to meet local demand, otherwise we shall turn Melton into a commuter/satellite town for Leicester and beyond, changing its character forever. Can more be done to utilise residential properties within the town centre? Housing development must therefore inexorably link to the concept for the future of the town: will it be a manufacturing/service industry/light industry/tourist centre. As a rural community, with one of the few surviving cattle markets in the country, and the home of Stilton Cheese and the world famous pork pie, how will growing the town as a manufacturing centre, or as a satellite town, affect its rural reputation? Will people still want to come to a place that was once a charming market town but has since grown into a version of Loughborough?</p> <p>However, the parlous state of public transport links to and from the town will mean residents will have to continue to rely on the motor car, with consequent pollution and congestion problems. As I mentioned in an earlier section, the development of transport links does not lie wholly within the remit of MMBC and would, in any event, produce a funding request to central government for the relevant road/rail infrastructure to be put in place, which will, presumably, be subject to the vagaries of the Treasury. At present, for people living in a village, yet working in Leicester, or Nottingham (I have worked in both) the motor car is the only reliable transport solution. We should certainly encourage the development of the Melton-London rail link, which only provides a (incredibly expensive) direct rail link once a day, at 06:00 and returning at 18:00hrs.</p> <p>Will companies wish to locate/re-locate to a place which is remote and ill-served by good transport links? Transport is a huge issue for the future development of the town. Without it being properly addressed, the congestion which will ensue will not be solved by a ring road - certainly not if the town is to grow at the rate of 245 homes per year, adding between 500-1000 people per year.</p> <p>We have to decide first on where our future lies. Only then can we go on to develop a meaningful plan for the town and surrounding villages.</p>	<p>Housing need is different to housing demand. Housing need is evidenced by changing population and household size as well as economic factors. The plan must make provision to meet the evidenced need otherwise it will not be found sound. The provision of homes to meet need must also be shown to be deliverable, therefore some regard must be given to local markets, viability and deliverability – the things which affect demand. These matters are being assessed alongside the settlement roles, capacity of services to accommodate growth and the assessment of suitability of sites for development.</p>
Shelagh Woollard	ANON-BHRP-4HB5-Y	<p>BOTTESFORD - Whilst appreciating that more homes are required, the infrastructure of villages like Bottesford cannot cope with large scale expansion.</p> <p>Often those wishing to move into the village have no connections with the village but want to live in a village and then commute by car to Grantham, Newark or Nottingham. Few use the village shops etc. and the village is losing its "village community" identity.</p> <p>Unsustainable villages need some development - particularly for those villagers wishing to downsize. Permitting smaller dwellings would release larger homes for families and thus help to ensure the future of such villages.</p>	Noted
Clair Ingham	ANON-BHRP-4HMZ-F	We need to sympathetically retain the character of our villages by not allowing over development or housing that does not meet the needs of the residents or future residents ie not all large family homes and include some smaller homes	Noted
Mr Peter Rogers	ANON-BHRP-	No Comment	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

	4H62-G		
Valerie Lever	ANON-BHRP-4HZY-U	Bottesford is described as a Primary Rural Service Centre but the transport links which are described as necessary do not exist.	Noted. However buss and train timetables show a regular hourly bus service to Melton Mowbray and train services to both Grantham and Nottingham. In comparison to other villages in the Borough it is well served by public transport options.
Michael Cavani	ANON-BHRP-4HZ5-Q	<p>4.5 Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood. Transport</p> <p>4.5.4 Talks about how cycling connectivity will be significantly improved, however it gives no detail as to what those improvement will look like.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When we consider the housing which is proposed between Nottingham Rd and Scalford Rd how will cycle routes be built? Will they allow for safe and secure access into the centre of town and the employment land which has been earmarked to the west? • Will the upgrade to Bartholomew Way and Welby Road include separate cycling and pedestrian pathways? <p>4.5.4 Makes reference to a link road between Nottingham Rd and Scalford Rd, but makes no reference to any such link Rd between Scalford Rd and Melton Spinney Rd, why is this? Let’s assume that there will be a link road right across from Nottingham Rd and Melton Spinney Rd. There is no information in any of the consultation documents or reports that expanses on the construction of the link road.</p> <p>There is no information about the width of the link road,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it be constructed to take HGVs? • Will it have separate cycle and pedestrian paths? • Will it continue over to the A607 Grantham Rd and if not why not? <p>If not how will the Melton Spinney Road be upgraded to take the increase level of traffic including HGV while still managing the Twinlake traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the Melton Spinney Rd / Thorpe Rd junction be redeveloped to take the increased level of traffic including HGV traffic? <p>Policy SS5 Makes reference to Melton Outer Western Relief Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the time of writing no decision has been made by council as to the preferred route, be it west or east. • Policy S55 makes reference to ‘Securing a route’ this is an unfortunate turn of phrase. Are the council trying to mislead the people in a consultation of such importance? Securing a route is hugely different to constructing a route. Also the consultation gives the reader no clue as to how the Western or Eastern route will be funded, or is that the reason why the council have used the phrase ‘securing the route’ as it has no visibility as to where the funding will come from. • Policy SS5 makes reference to mitigating the impact on the existing road infrastructure while the developments are being constructed. All the traffic reports commissioned by the authorities have made it clear that due to the severity of the traffic congestion in and around Melton very little can be do in the way of mitigation. So what is the document referring too? <p>Environment</p> <p>Makes reference to Establishing a protection zone between the Country Park and any future development, but give no detail as to how that will look and what size the protection zone will be. It also talks about a wildlife corridor, but again give no detail.</p> <p>What will a wildlife corridor look like at the point where it crosses the Relief road?</p> <p>By encircling the Country park with developments it has effectively become a town park, that being the case should we now review what a town park should look like.</p> <p>Proper tarmacked cycle tracks and footpaths.</p> <p>Path lighting for safe access to the town and schools in the early mornings and late afternoons.</p> <p>Proper access from every development into the park from all developments</p>	<p>Policy SS5 deals with these issues in detail.</p> <p>MBC and LCC are working together to put together the business case for future funding of the relief road to ensure it connects to the two sections of link road provided by the developments to the north and south of the town. In the meantime it may be necessary to undertake some interim highway improvements to junctions affected by development.</p> <p>In May LCC’s cabinet decided that an Eastern connection between the two link roads was the best option and that they would be preparing the necessary evidence to determine the line of the road and to develop the business case to secure public funding for this route. Details relating to the relief road in terms of its carriage width and design are to be agreed with LCC and the developers, however it is intended that the entire route will be designed and constructed to carry HGVs, as well as meet a variety of transport choices.</p> <p>This will be updated in the next version of the plan</p> <p>Further details on these matters will be provided in the Submission plan</p>

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

		<p>Master planning and delivery</p> <p>A master plan, including a phasing and delivery plan, should be prepared and agreed in advance of, or as part of, submission of a planning application for the Melton North Sustainable Neighbourhood (NSN).The master plan should have been available for this consultation process and without question for the next round of public consultations.</p> <p>Policy SS5 Conclusion</p> <p>It is very difficult to consult on something that has so little detail I can only hope that when we get to the second round of public consultations later in the year we will have far more meat on the bones. Without any visibility of any plans or layouts it's difficult to agree to the proposal.</p> <p>If we are to have Sustainable housing developments then we must design and build within the National Policy Framework and ensure that the proper infrastructure is in place.</p> <p>Which means that funding for the Outer Relief Road needs to be secured and in place before the Local Plan is adopted.</p>	
Martin smith	ANON-BHRP-4H6A-Y	<p>Good to concentrate on new housing around Melton Mowbray to include bypass north and south of town. Should also choose development on sites like Dalby airfield and Brooksby ahead of any 5 plus dwelling developments in the villages.</p> <p>Would be ridiculous to damage our lovely villages and then to also allow building of new villages.</p>	Noted
Malcolm Anthony Grant	ANON-BHRP-4H6T-J	<p>Policy SS1 A developers pass.</p> <p>4.2.4 States that there are 5 settlement roles that are explained in Table 1 and Figure 5. There are only 4 types identified within. Where/ what is the fifth?</p> <p>The idea of listing Plungar as a Rural Supporter is a nonsense. Alongside Harby, the same listing, it has virtually no facilities. Harby has a garage, a cafe, a post office full time, a school, a shop, a village hall, a public house and a church centre. Reasonable bus services.</p> <p>Plungar has a public house, a village hall, a church and a post office 1 1/2 hours per week, poor bus services.</p> <p>Plungar is more similar to Barkestone and Redmile and should be in the same category, a rural settlement. It has NO services to meet every day needs</p> <p>4.2.8 " the general feel for a village's performance" what on earth does this mean? It points to a subjective decision being taken whereas it should be objective. One person's good feel may be another's bad feel. Planning should not be based upon feelings for goodness sake.</p> <p>All in all I object to the listing of Plungar as a Rural Supporter and when I read statements about "feel" I am left with little confidence in the objectivity of the listing.</p>	See Settlement Hierarchy review
June Grant	ANON-BHRP-4H6Y-Q	<p>4.2.8 The scoring of the villages needs to be reviewed. It is seriously flawed as far as Plungar is concerned. And who is the arbiter of the 'general feel for a village's performance'? Someone's subjective view from Melton?</p> <p>I object to the placing of Plungar as a Rural Supporter. Compared to other villages such as Harby it should be classed as a Rural Settlement. It does not have the same facilities of other Rural Supporters i.e. No school, no shop, .a post office for only one and half hours a week and minimal public transport.</p> <p>Harby has a school, a garage, a cafe, a shop, a church centre, a village hall and a post office full time. .</p>	See Settlement Hierarchy review
Russell Pride	ANON-BHRP-4H6H-6	<p>Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – The Spatial Strategy</p> <p>Bullet point 4 on Page 26</p>	<p>This is the section "you said" and is a summary of the comments received to the Issues and Options consultation.</p> <p>The Local Plan is not proposing development in this location.</p>

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth of the Borough to be provided by a few larger developments makes reference to Great Dalby Airfield. <p>Great Dalby Airfield is hardly an appropriate place to build houses and it is questionable that it should be referred to as a brown-field site. This terminology was strongly disputed when Kettleby Magna was proposed. Planning approval was rejected previously for a host of good reasons, and there is no justification presented that might suggest that any of those reasons are no longer valid. It would be a bleak, exposed and inhospitable location perched as it is at high elevation and subject to the greatest extremes of local weather. Remember that snow poles were the norm until quite recently and now weather patterns are far more highly unpredictable. It would also be highly visible from Burrough Hill and would create rat run traffic commuting to Leicester that would seriously impact Great Dalby. Therefore there is absolutely no justification for presenting it yet again.</p>	
Nicola Desmond	ANON-BHRP-4H6E-3	sounds good	Support noted
Christopher Fisher	ANON-BHRP-4HM2-7	<p>I would have appreciated a map of the whole of Melton Mowbray with an overview of how the proposed roads all fit together.</p> <p>From a parochial Somerby perspective, the availability of regular 1 hour public transport would mean that Somerby would not fit the criteria of a secondary service centre..</p> <p>I was pleased to see recognition of the need to look at cycling and walking routes in the new developments in Melton. I thought the plan could be stronger on looking at the need to develop a comprehensive approach to cycling and walking across the district.</p> <p>Again in terms of Somerby and environmental issues, I wonder whether the opportunities provided by the Burrough Hill Country Park could be developed further.</p>	Comments noted. The submission plan will be accompanied by a map of the district. However there is no definitive route of the relief route as yet. This can only be shown if a final route has been determined.
Sheryl Smart	ANON-BHRP-4H1G-Z	<p>Agree that most of the development should be within Melton as that is where all the facilities are. Not sure why the option of creating a new large development or town to accommodate the new homes required with the infrastructure in place and new schools, doctors etc. The reason given is that it would create pressure on services but any development is going to create pressure on current services which have already been subject to government cutbacks so why not use the money from developers of a new town to provide these services.</p> <p>Do not agree with much development in rural areas. People move to a rural area to get away from living in a largely developed area and pay considerably for that in terms of house prices and council tax and accept a loss of access to many local amenities provided by towns. All villages need new people but normal turnover of housing as people move on or downsize keeps homes circulating. Transport links are not good and many people have to use their car to travel to and from work - building more homes is going to encourage more vehicles on the road as there are not, nor should be, the employment opportunities of a town.</p>	noted
Richard Simon – Bottesford Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	ANON-BHRP-4HUB-Y	CHAPTER 4 GROWING MELTON BOROUGH – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY Spatial strategy - Object	noted
James & Amanda Sparrow	ANON-BHRP-4H6U-K	No	noted
Richard Simon	ANON-BHRP-4HZC-5	<p>Primary and Secondary Rural Service Centres should be combined in one group as Rural Service Centres. Otherwise in 2036 Asfordby, Bottesford, Long Clawson and Waltham will still be the primary centres and there will not be a more even spread of Service centres to aid the move toward 'sustainability'.</p> <p>Some of the secondary centres may well wish to extend the facilities in their villages so they can become more sustainable and provide a better service for the smaller villages around them.</p>	See Settlement Hierarchy review

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

		<p>You should look at the Borough and see where it is sensible to improve facilities at all the centres and even perhaps some of the rural supporter locations if they can provide a centre to service local settlements. Car mileages can be reduced perhaps bus services enhanced 4.2.11</p> <p>The only truly sustainable location is Melton Mowbray as you infer several times so the development should be centred in and around there. Bottesford will add little to Melton's move forward other than a site to place houses. I imagine very few people in Bottesford work in Melton and most will be Nottingham or Grantham. Sustainability surely comes from building close to Melton</p> <p>The Secondary Rural Service Centres have a large potential for development and the advantages that could bring and yet options for development aren't being followed with only 39 out of a potential 121 homes being allocated at Asfordby Hill, 45/119 at Croxton Kerrial and 37 /186 at Wymondham, only Frisby seems to be requiring all its development to take place. With the Primary centres only Asfordby and Bottesford are fully committed and both have flood issues whilst Long Clawson 122/267 and Waltham 67/294 have little in way of a flood problem.</p> <p>Regarding Melton Mowbray a higher proportion of housing should be placed there where there are the vast majority of the Borough's services. Consideration should be given to maximising this opportunity to make MM compete with neighbouring towns and the increase in development will permit greater infrastructure improvements , even completing the ring road. With a population of about 26000 it is hardly a large town and it could be made such an attraction. Start planning the western development to occur late in the Plan.</p> <p>I also suggest that the Rural Supporter and Rural settlements be combined so there are 3 categories</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Melton Mowbray 2) Rural Service Centres (comprising your Primary and Secondary Rural Service Centres) 3) Rural Settlements (comprising your Rural Supporter Villages and Rural Settlements) <p>This courser classification will limit villages changing categories due to minor changes in services over time.</p> <p>The Strategy for sustainability should be</p> <p>A) Focussing building at Melton Mowbray</p> <p>B Developing villages across the Borough to provide an evenly distributed spread of Service Centres to minimise travel for those living in small villages</p>	
Richard Simon – Bottesford Parish Council	ANON-BHRP-4H1W-G	None - comments included in subsections	
JOHN RUST	ANON-BHRP-4HUV-K	<p>I agree with section 4.1.1 and policy SS1 that development must be shown to be sustainable to accord with the NPPF.</p> <p>Extract:</p> <p>We question the statement in 4.2.1. that the MBC area needs 245 houses each year for the next 20 years. The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2014 (Table 85 page 186 of the conclusions) identifies a need for 194 houses a year to cope with demographic projections and 239 to support potential, but impossible to prove, economic growth. The figure taken by MBC of 245 per year is the highest point of the OAN Range. The SHMA also notes that the numbers presented do not take account of development of infrastructure.</p> <p>The SHMA page 102 notes that “Although this report contains three different, demographic projections we would recommend the Midpoint Headship Rate Projections as the most realistic and reliable demographic-led projections based on historic trends. We consider this to be the most realistic projection of future population and household growth based on past population trends.” This analysis gives the 194 houses per annum figure, the 245 houses per annum figure is based on speculation of the amount of economic growth until 2036 as the SHMA points out</p>	Comments noted and addressed in relation to individual policies

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

		<p>http://www.melton.gov.uk/downloads/file/1676/leicester_and_leicestershire_strategic_housing_market_assessment_2014</p> <p>While it is laudable that Melton will support economic growth it is questionable that the population will exist to utilise or purchase the higher number of properties that Melton is currently planning for. 194 houses per annum as given by the SHMA would be the sustainable figure taking the 245 figure is unwise. This high figure has a knock on effect to the apportionment of building in the countryside surrounding Melton.</p> <p>The tick box approach that MBC has taken in interpreting their guidelines needs urgent review.</p> <p>Each village is unique and should be treated as so and must be assessed as to its ability to sustain more development. In Long Clawson the non major through road with it's 14 right angle bends is blocked by park cars and at maximum safe capacity. Parking in the center of the village is nearly impossible especially during surgery opening times, The Primary School is over subscribed, The flood prevention infrastructure was proven not fit for purpose in 2000 and no remedial work was done also it is not being maintained so how can it be expected that proposed SuDS systems will be maintained, The rural character of the village and its heritage setting will be ruined by large developments of urban styled housing.</p> <p>Extract:</p> <p>Sustainability must take account of the way people live today, particularly in the mobility of the job market and new working patterns. The need for stability for a family and support for childcare and schooling arrangements has resulted in families choosing a place to live, close to relations, that offers a hub from which to commute to a wide area for work or to work from home. This requires excellent telecommunications, technology and road/transport hubs. Melton Mowbray is in a perfect position to offer an environment to bring up a family in a tranquil part of the country, whilst being close to mainline train stations - Melton, Loughborough, Grantham and airports -East Midlands, Doncaster and Birmingham. A recent survey of Long Clawson residents showed that 70% commute to areas over 15 miles from the village. Of the remaining 30% - half are self employed working from home, leaving only 15% working within Melton or the Vale or retired. Of those answering the survey, many had either grown up in the area and returned to bring up their family or had moved to be close to relatives for childcare support. This is by far the norm in the village and very different to the last Village Appraisal in 1976 where the majority worked within the Borough and many in the village itself. Life and work has changed over the past 40 years and the concept of sustainable travel needs considerable review. To support this pattern of lifestyle it is essential that the Local Plan, in testing sustainability, takes account of present and foreseeable infrastructure (much of which hasn't been improved for 40 years), including broadband, mobile networks and telecommunications, school capacity and quality, public transport and links to transport hubs, roads, social services, and flooding and drainage. The new Local Plan needs to take these factors into account and seize the opportunity of being seen as an attractive place to live by building a Town that can rival other centres to retain the income brought in from outside the area and provide the leisure activity for the Borough. Melton Town is an attractive market town that many say has 'seen better days'. However, it has lots of potential and the Regal Cinema is an example of what can be achieved through innovation.</p>	
<p>Debbie Adams – Melton North Action Group</p>	<p>ANON-BHRP-4H1Z-K</p>	<p>(Melton North Action Group (MNAG) is a fully constituted body representing hundreds of residents in the north of Melton Mowbray).</p> <p>The Melton Local Plan Emerging Options (Draft Plan) states in point 4.3.1 that development in Melton Mowbray will be focussed in two new large scale 'sustainable neighbourhoods', one in the north and one in the south of the town. This was discussed as part of an exercise to find potential development sites across the Borough in one of the Reference Group sessions. There was some agreement that large-scale development was the solution to the housing requirement for Melton</p>	<p>Comments of MNAG are noted and addressed in detail in relation to policy SS5.</p> <p>The Council intends to prepare a CIL to ensure that development makes an appropriate contribution to the delivery of the necessary infrastructure to support it. It should be noted that this is not just the relief road but includes schools, healthcare and open space.</p>

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

	<p>Mowbray but it was also agreed that for this to happen "transport infrastructure needs to be in place" (page 26 of Draft Local Plan).</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that "Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised." (point 34 of NPPF).</p> <p>MNAG believes that the North Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood (NMSN) is unsustainable as the main employment areas in Melton Mowbray are in the west and south west of the town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no direct bus links to the employment areas from the north of the town, and although there is a limited bus service along parts of Scafford Road and Nottingham Road, these do not continue into the evenings. • Leicestershire County Council (LCC) withdrew its funding for the Centrebus Service no.18 in February 2016. There is now no town bus service for residents living in the Thorpe Road and Melton Spinney Road area. • The arterial roads into Melton Mowbray from the north of the town are narrow and congested. There is no room for a dedicated cycle way on any of the roads. • The only safe area to cycle from the north of the town into the town centre is through the Country Park, but there is no lighting provided in the Country Park which severely impacts on the use of the Country Park as a cycle way after dark. • The individual developments which would make up the NMSN would all be more than one mile from the centre of town where the doctor's surgery, dentists, leisure facilities and the town shopping area are located. Walking therefore would not be considered a favourable option. <p>The NPPF states in point 32 that "Plans and decisions should take account of whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure; • safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and • improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe." <p>MNAG believes that the NMSN has only one opportunity for sustainable transport modes and that is to make use of the Country Park as a cycle and/or pedestrian route to the town centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However the Country Park has areas of habitat which are of a highly sensitive nature and encroachment of those areas (which are predominantly in the northern area of the Country Park) would adversely affect the flora and fauna of those areas. • Access to the NMSN off the Scafford Road would be in an area very close to John Ferneley School. There are already problems in that area due to the narrowness of the road and the inability of the existing footpaths to cope with upwards of 1,000 school children at the start and end of school time. There have been several accidents on the road involving school children, and to exacerbate the situation by introducing many more vehicles onto the Scafford Road would make it unsafe, unsuitable, dangerous and undesirable. • On Melton Spinney Road the site access would be very close to the Twinlakes Park entrance. During school holidays, 	<p>The CIL rate must also be appropriate to ensure that new development remains viable – in this context the sum referenced in the representation to meet the cost of the relief road may not be appropriate.</p> <p>Delivery of sections of the road which are required to access development sites will however reduce the amount of road which requires additional funding.</p>
--	---	--

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

	<p>several thousand people visit the Park each day and the vast majority of visitors arrive by car. This causes daily road congestion both going into the Park from 10.00 a.m. and coming out of it from 4.00 p.m. to 7.00p.m.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The distance from the Melton Spinney Road site entrance to the town centre would be at least 1.5 miles so not a reasonable walking distance. Much of the walk would be along a road where cars are parked half on the pavement, half on the road, leaving insufficient pavement width for buggies, trolleys or wheelchairs. • Neither Melton Spinney Road nor A607 Thorpe Road has any space for cyclists (in several places there is not room for two coaches or HGVs to pass each other). The only reasonable mode of transport therefore would be the car. Several hundred cars converging on Melton Spinney Road and the A607 Thorpe Road on top of the high number of vehicles already using the roads, would give unacceptable levels of congestion in and around those roads. The other 'opportunity' for sustainable travel (public transport) was taken away from the Melton Spinney Road/A607 Thorpe Road area due to cutbacks in funding the service by LCC in February of this year. <p>Taking the above into account, MNAG believes that the residual cumulative impacts of the development of the NMSN would be so severe as to make it unsustainable, and that the only sensible option would be to reject the Plan in its current state.</p> <p>Since the demise of the Core Strategy in 2013, Melton Borough Council (MBC) and LCC have commissioned Jacobs U.K. Limited to prepare a Melton Mowbray Cumulative Development Transport Impact Study looking at options to alleviate the growing congestion problems in Melton Mowbray. The findings of the study recommended an "Outer Bypass" running from Scalford Road in the north, across to the A606 Nottingham Road, the A6006 Asfordby Road, the A607 Leicester Road, the B6047 Dalby Road and finally linking with the A606 Oakham Road. The costs of such a bypass were estimated to be in excess of £50 million (Jacobs' report of 29.4.2015, page 10). According to Jacobs this would mean that the cost of the outer bypass per dwelling, based on 2,550 dwellings, would be £18,500.</p> <p>MNAG believes that this should come out of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which would then enable the 6,000+ homes in the Town and Borough to contribute to the Melton Outer Bypass.</p> <p>It is evident that this will have a detrimental impact on the contributions from developers to other forms of infrastructure and the percentage of affordable homes they will be prepared to build.</p> <p>It says in the draft Emerging Options Local Plan on page 147 point 8.1.4 that:</p> <p>"It should be remembered that new development cannot be used to fund an existing lack of infrastructure or address current shortfalls in provision but is solely required to address its own needs."</p> <p>MNAG are concerned that if this is the case, then developers will only be obliged to build an estate link road for their particular development. An estate link road will not be of sufficiently high standard to become part of an Outer Bypass which would be expected to accommodate HGVs and be an attractive alternative to the current route through the Town Centre.</p> <p>In a report of the House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee session to review the operation of the NPPF published on 16th December 2014, it was reported that "In our view, development can only be sustainable if it is accompanied by the infrastructure necessary to support it." Also "It is important that infrastructure provision takes place at the same time as housing development, or the development will be unsustainable."</p> <p>MNAG is concerned that there is no commitment in the draft Emerging Options Local Plan to force developers to agree to the development of the Melton bypass at the same time as housing development. Therefore the proposed NMSN is unsustainable.</p>	
--	--	--

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

	<p>The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which was brought into force in 2010 enables councils to charge developers of new development in their areas and use the proceeds to fund infrastructure. Under regulations made in 2013, parish and town councils receiving new development are allocated a proportion (15% or, if a neighbourhood plan is in place, 25%) of the CIL collected in their area. (An extract from a report of the House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee session published on 16th December 2014).</p> <p>MNAG is concerned that: (a) whilst a number of villages in the Borough have been putting together their own neighbourhood plans, no attempt was made to create a neighbourhood plan for Melton Mowbray; (b) a CIL has not been put in place to-date, and apparently will not appear until the final draft version of the Local Plan; (c) projected costs of the various infrastructure requirements for the Town and Borough have not appeared in this latest draft of the Local Plan. Without these projected costs it is difficult to comprehend how MBC can hope to secure the correct level of funding to deliver the necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>Anomalies and contradictory/confusing terminology/data</p> <p>There is a lack of consistency in the draft Emerging Options Local Plan with regards to the NMSN. For example on pages 47 and 50 of the draft, there is mention of the "link road" from Scalford Road to Nottingham Road, whereas on page 49 there is a picture of the proposed "link road" going across the north of Melton to Melton Spinney Road. The Jacobs report of 29.4.2015 on the "Melton Western Bypass Options Testing" did not deal with a link from Scalford Road to Melton Spinney Road. In fact the Jacobs report was based on a different plan of residential development for Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>The Jacobs reports of 13.10.2014 and 29.4.2015 plus the Melton Mowbray Transport and New Development Position Statement issued by MBC and LCC in February 2015 all worked on the basis of there being a development of 150 dwellings off Melton Spinney Road (not the 200 in the Draft Local Plan with a further possible 400 after 2036); 950 between Nottingham Road and Scalford Road (no mention at all of the several hundred homes between Scalford Road and the north of the Country Park which appear in the Draft Local Plan, plus the two Persimmon developments). In the south of Melton the reports were based on 800 dwellings west of the Oakham Road and 650 dwellings off the Leicester Road. All three reports were therefore based on there being a total of 2,550 new dwellings in Melton Mowbray as opposed to the 4,000 proposed in the Draft Local Plan. All three reports are therefore of no use as supporting documentation for the Draft Local Plan as they are based on incorrect and out-of-date data.</p> <p>However MNAG consider it is worth pointing out that even though Jacobs were working on the assumption of 2,550 dwellings as opposed to the now proposed 4,000 dwellings for Melton Mowbray, Jacobs still concluded that:</p> <p>"...any development coming forward in the town - irrespective of size - requires a detailed transport assessment undertaken to ensure that suitable mitigation is proposed." Jacobs go on to say:</p> <p>"Given the limited spare capacity, and amount of development proposed, this mitigation needs to be of demonstrably sufficient magnitude to not only mitigate the impacts of the development itself, but also contribute to a wider benefit for residents and as part of the overall growth strategy for the town.</p> <p>If this is not achieved, then the evidence within this document shows that the development cannot be considered sustainable."</p> <p>There is a lack of consistency in the draft Emerging Options Local Plan with regards to the Melton Bypass. It has been referred to as a "bypass" (page 19), a "Melton Outer Western Relief Route" (page 51), a "Melton Outer Relief Road" (page 149), a "Melton Outer Relief Route - a series of the strategic road links which connect the A606 (Burton Road) to the A607 Nottingham Road" (page 150), the "North Melton Strategic Road Link -a strategic connection between the A607 (Nottingham Road), Scalford Road and Melton Spinney Road" (page 150), a "strategic road link connecting Scalford Road to</p>	
--	--	--

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

	<p>A606 Nottingham Road" (page 50), and a "new link road connecting the Scalford Road with Nottingham Road as part of the wider Melton Outer Relief Route".</p> <p>MNAG is concerned that with such inconsistency, how can residents take MBC seriously when the council talks of providing a bypass for Melton. The variation in names does indicate a variation in the standards required for the road. A "link road" does not have the same high standard requirement that a "bypass" does. There are a number of questions to be asked:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • first and foremost, exactly what sort of road is MBC aiming for across the north and south of the town? It must surely be of a bypass standard, to take HGVs, and have separate cycle and pedestrian paths, anything short of that standard will not do the job of diverting traffic away from the town centre or mitigate against the effects of the development; • there is an assumption that all developers will contribute to or build their portion of the bypass. What happens if a developer refuses to comply? Will they be refused planning permission, and what happens to their 'stretch' of the road as a result? • what procedures will be put in place so as to ensure that the bypass will be complete with an east or west connection linking the north and south routes before 2036? In the absence of any development in either the east or the west one assumes there will be no developer contribution for this connecting stretch of road. Without the certainty of an (albeit delayed) bypass it is difficult to comprehend how the proposed developments in and around Melton envisaged by the draft Local Plan can be considered remotely sustainable. • it has been pointed out time and time again by local residents that to have a bypass that stops at Melton Spinney Road is a "road to nowhere". When will MBC start to listen to the residents? Why does MBC insist that the final section from Melton Spinney Road to the A607 Grantham Road is not needed when it is obvious that: (a) Melton Spinney Road will not be able to cope with HGVs at its junction with the A607; (b) no sensible driver will use the bypass if it means joining a long queue of Twinlakes Park traffic to get out on to the A607 Grantham Road; (c) it doesn't matter if you turn left or right out of Melton Spinney Road on to the A607 Grantham Road at the bottom of Thorpe Arnold Hill as in both directions the road narrows and is hazardous to negotiate particularly with HGVs; (d) on a significant number of occasions each year when the A1 is closed or partially closed between Grantham and Stamford, traffic is diverted through Melton specifically using the A607 Grantham Road. <p>Finally, it can be assumed that one of the reasons behind the decision to develop a Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy is that the Strategy "would best ensure the necessary coordination of potential future transport investments in the town. It would also provide a robust basis to underpin bids to secure funding from public and private sources." (minutes of LCC Cabinet meeting on 11.09.2015)</p> <p>The Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy was discussed at a special meeting of the Full MBC Council on 24th September 2015. The Strategy was deemed necessary as evidence of the need for an "Outer Relief Road" for Melton Mowbray. "The cost of a Transport Strategy that would include a definitive corridor for an 'outer' route is currently estimated in the region of £1.5m." (report to Special Meeting of Full MBC Council on 24th September 2015 para. 3.10). LCC, who would undertake the Study, agreed at an LCC Cabinet meeting on 11th September 2015 to commit £0.5m to the exercise, and on 24th September MBC committed £0.4m. There was still a shortfall of £0.6m which has not been forthcoming/funded. The estimated cost comprised £1m in connection with the development of a preferred corridor for an "Outer Relief Road", and £0.5m for developing a full Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy (para. 3.10 ibid). MNAG have been informed that LCC were willing to progress on the "former element" (the development of the preferred corridor) despite the shortfall of funding. In an email from the Head of Regulatory Services to the Secretary of MNAG, Mr. Worley said that "The focus of this work is to determine the most advantageous route for the bypass including whether the link between the northern and southern stretches indicated in the draft Emerging Options Local Plan would be most feasibly and effectively joined either to the east or to the west of Melton Mowbray." He said that the work was underway and MBC expected to be in receipt shortly.</p>	
--	--	--

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

		MNAG would like to know whether MBC agree with the comments of the LCC Cabinet in connection with the Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy. LCC as quoted above stated that the full Strategy, inter alia, provides a robust basis to underpin bids to secure funding from public and private sources. Presumably the absence of a full Strategy reduces the prospects of securing such funding and eliminates the prospect of a bypass. As a result any future large-scale development in Melton Mowbray would be considered by the NPPF as unsustainable.	
Colin Wilkinson – Planit-X Town & Country Planning Services (on behalf of Mr G Bryan)	ANON-BHRP-4H19-J	<p>Great Dalby Airfield is not a brownfield site. Previously developed (brownfield) land is defined in the NPPF Glossary as land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. Land that was previously-developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape in the process of time is excluded. Most of the airfield is in agricultural use or otherwise green and to some extent the site has blended into the landscape. Notwithstanding whether the site can be regarded as previously developed land, the NPPF does not support a ‘brownfield first’ approach to the release of housing sites.</p> <p>The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment is being updated and should take account of the Local Plans Expert Group's (LPEG) detailed recommendations for a standard methodology for SHMAs.</p>	Noted
Sharon Gustard	ANON-BHRP-4H6K-9	<p>When Bottesford has already seen the largest growth rate since 1994, why should the same rate be applied to create an exponential growth for one village rather than increasing the size of the other Primary Rural Service Centres or invest in another village to balance the impact on the Vale of Belvoir. The proposed 40% increase in growth over the next 20 years is in addition to the 40% growth already encountered. This means the village will have been developed to almost twice in size when local services have been diminished.</p> <p>The internal road infrastructure around the village centre and schools could not sustain such a further increase in traffic as a result, not to mention the impact of access onto the A52 at the west of the village and increased traffic on an already busy and dangerous road which often sees accidents. This chapter has more description about the impact of the development to the north and south of Melton but not on how they will achieve the development in the villages (primarily the 4 x Primary Rural Service Centres), in particular the impact on community facilities and transport.</p> <p>With regards to Bottesford, the report acknowledges its location is more closely related to the City of Nottingham as well as the towns of Grantham and Newark. Bottesford has already witnessed an increase in commuters and families moving in from Nottingham to seek out the better schooling facilities available to the east of the city. There is no evidence in the document of what communications have taken place with the neighbouring councils, in particular Rushcliffe or Nottinghamshire to deal with the holistic impact of other large scale developments at Cotgrave and Newton as well as the continued development within Bingham. Bottesford by virtue of 1 mile geographically just falls into Melton's Borough Council. Its geographic location is therefore impacted not only by Melton's decisions but also considerably by those it is so closely located near to but have no representation in their decision making.</p>	<p>See Settlement Hierarchy review</p> <p>MBC is required to work with its neighbouring councils. This “co-operation” is ongoing with all our neighbouring councils. In addition these neighbouring authorities are formal consultees to the plan at each consultation stage.</p>
Colin Wilkinson – Planit-X Town & Country Planning Services (on behalf of Mrs G Moore)	ANON-BHRP-4H15-E	<p>Great Dalby Airfield is not a brownfield site. Previously developed (brownfield) land is defined in the NPPF Glossary as land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. Land that was previously-developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape in the process of time is excluded. Most of the airfield is in agricultural use or otherwise green and to some extent the site has blended into the landscape. Notwithstanding whether the site can be regarded as previously developed land, the NPPF does not support a ‘brownfield first’ approach to the release of housing sites.</p> <p>The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment is being updated and should take account of the Local Plans Expert Group's (LPEG) detailed recommendations for a standard methodology for SHMAs. The Local plan needs to take this into account.</p>	noted
Tom Parry – Barkestone,	ANON-	We gather from Reference group meetings, direct discussions with Melton Borough Council and comments made at the	See Settlement Hierarchy review

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

<p>Plungar & Redmile Parish Council</p>	<p>BHRP-4H1P-9</p>	<p>Parish meetings we have held, that it is agreed that the Spatial Strategy as set out is based to some extent on incorrect evidence, and that major changes are expected to be made. We are asked however for comment on the plan as provided for consultation.</p> <p>We disagree with the criteria used to arrive at the split of housing between Melton and the rural area, and with the allocation of housing in the rural area to Rural Supporters and Rural Settlements, both fundamental aspects of the strategy. We believe that the current strategy is unrealistic in terms of the required housing proposed to be built in these villages in a sustainable manner, and that it is not supported by the comments in the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report, which recognises that higher housing development in Melton would enhance the growth objectives of the town and the viability of the bypass, while development in the smaller settlements would be unlikely to create new infrastructure or sustainability. Other recent Local Plans in nearby boroughs/districts have taken a different approach, directing new development towards sustainable locations, which we consider to be much more robust and realistic in the context of the NPPF.</p>	
<p>Colin Love</p>	<p>ANON-BHRP-4HBR-V</p>	<p>I have to question some of the basic assumptions in the NPPF. It is difficult to challenge these - but they should not be understood as the only way to develop a cohesive society for the future. For example, why does it have to be a COMPETITIVE economy rather than a COOPERATIVE economy incorporating social values leading to cohesion rather than division?</p> <p>This relates to all of the seemingly largely unchallenged assertions (rather than assumptions) that Growth is Good. Growth is not necessarily good - encouraging globally quite unsustainable production and consumption along with the associated effluence of waste. Thus 'strong, vibrant and healthy communities' are not built on competitive consumption. This is confirmed by all of the major research into the so-called 'indexes of happiness'</p> <p>Thus the NPPF must be understood as being driven by a pernicious ideology that is counter to meaningful social and sustainable well-being. .</p>	<p>noted</p>
<p>Alan and Heather Woodhouse</p>	<p>ANON-BHRP-4HMQ-6</p>	<p>Reclassify Long Clawson as a Secondary Rural Service Centre. Make it's target 50 dwellings, NOT 150.</p> <p>Put more of the target development, outside of Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area, into the development of all new villages on land near major transport links. ie Normanton Airfield, Dalby Airfield and Six Hills</p> <p>The classification of Long Clawson as a Primary Rural Service is fundamentally flawed.</p> <p>Of the 4 villages identified as PRSC's Long Clawson is the only village NOT served by a classified road. It is by nature long and thin. It does not have good, direct connections to major roads. Any significant development, not on the outskirts will fundamentally impact on it's already inadequate 'main' road.</p> <p>Traffic - In addition to the above, the road through Clawson is narrow and the whole of East End and The Sands and parts of West End subject to 'semi permanent' parking causing the carriageway to be reduced to a single width road. Current conditions have worsened significantly in the last 5 years. It seems likely that further 'inherent' deterioration will continue. LC is still a working agricultural village and has regular use, through it's centre, by large agricultural and dairy vehicles. The addition of a significant number of vehicles as a result of significant (PRSC) development with result in virtually permanent gridlock.</p> <p>Bus services - Currently sparse and non existent at times outside of Mon - Fri core times. Why is there not the same requirement for LC as SS4 (MM SSN) - eg Public transport? "A minimum 20 minute frequency bus service from the site into Melton Mowbray Town Centre and local employment opportunities with accessible bus stops which are less than 400 metres walk from all new residents"</p> <p>School - Currently struggling to cope in outdated premises. Currently oversubscribed. Where are the plans to bring the</p>	<p>See Settlement Hierarchy review</p>

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

		<p>school into the 21st century? The adjacent greenfield site - 'The Mungy' would be ideal for a new school and could take advantage of the adjacent Recreation Ground - subject to appropriate arrangements being made.</p> <p>Doctors - Currently oversubscribed. Are we to suffer a significant deterioration in a unique level of local Health care because of the flawed and unquantified notion 'It exists, therefore the box is ticked'</p> <p>Recreational facilities - Which Recreational facilities? If this refers to LC Recreation Ground - these are private facilities, run by volunteers. Costs and inadequate support currently threaten this facility.</p> <p>Flooding - Already a major problem in Clawson. With no plans to alleviate the existing problems of flooding in the centre of the village and elsewhere - it clear that additional development will continue to exasperate the problem.</p> <p>All of this issues require attention. Any development will make matters worse. Development on the scale proposed by the ill considered and erroneous PRSC classification will be intolerable.</p>	
Anthony Edward Maher	ANON-BHRP-4HUS-G	<p>Policy SS1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development. The rural centres and services centres need to have an allocation of housing in sufficient numbers to ensure that they add the required infrastructure to that centre. and not just bolt on blocks of housing.</p> <p>Sustainable communities ? 4.3 Growing Melton Through Large Scale Development Sites.</p> <p>TRANSPORT:: The sites to the North and South show link roads / bypass potential. Only the Southern development links main A roads but on Appendix 3 Point 6 and 10 though they are marked as 'critical' there is no proposed dates as in other items? With foresight and support this could form a functional section of bypass.</p> <p>The Northern proposed Development MUST have a link to the Grantham Road north of Thorpe Arnold.</p> <p>Linking the A606 to Salford and Melton Spinney Road only is NOT sustainable and as indicated in the recent Jacobs 'Cumulative Transport Impact Study' as to de detrimental to an already at capacity road network section. This Northern development should not go ahead without firm and funded plans to extend this to the A607 Grantham Road. Also recent reduction in bus services including the cancellation of the No. 18 services to Thorpe Park adds to the transport impact.</p> <p>Policy SS5 ENVIRONMENT: This talks about protection and creation of wildlife corridors and establishing protection zones between future development.</p> <p>ECOLOGY: The Country park contains approximately 30% of species on the 'At Risk' register of the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. It is essential that wildlife corridors should be adequate and development impact kept to a minimum. The NPPF States that 'the planning system should contribute and enhance the natural and local environment.'</p> <p>LANDSCAPE: The NPPF states 'The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing local landscapes geological conservation interests and soils' The proposed development could have a huge impact on the country Park with Buildings built on some of the highest points in the area towering over the park. There would also be a loss of very high grade agricultural land off Melton Spinney Road.</p> <p>As part of the planning inspectors summary from the previous Core Strategy He was unable to support development in this area due to the impact on Landscape, Agricultural land and biodiversity.</p> <p>FLOODING: There are concerns about the impact of building off Spinney road as the area lower down i.e. Culvert that currently goes under Spinney road floods the road and adjacent gardens under prolonged periods of rain. The effect further downstream is flooding of Tesco's access road and car park and petrol station area which did happen as recently as 09.03.16</p>	Noted. Comments considered in detail in relation to individual policies
Mick Jones	ANON-	I am very concerned that Rural Settlements such as Thorpe Satchville have been classed as unsustainable by the borough	See Settlement Hierarchy review

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

	BHRP-4H6N-C	<p>council. It should state that where new development could be identified that does not destroy the nature of the village but adds to it's diversity should be allowed. There is a need to attract young families to add vitality to these villages. It is only in this way that the villages will develop and not become an outpost for retirees withering away with no facilities.</p> <p>Policy SS6 – Alternative Development Strategies and Local Plan Review</p> <p>This policy should be amended before adoption unless the borough council wishes to face challenges from developers during the plan period. To state that where monitoring identifies a shortfall, the options given under Policy SS6, could open up the floodgates were a challenge to be successful. Four thousand houses on the Dalby Airfield would leave your plan process in tatters with little strategic development to complement the rest of the plan.</p>	<p>Concern noted. Policy SS6 will be refined in the next plan, to address issues arising within the HMA and to align the end date.</p>
Mark Brend	ANON-BHRP-4HGD-K	<p>The plans for extension of the Melton Mowbray built up area are well thought out and include the provision of the necessary additional services/employment to support such growth. The focus on maintaining separation between the built up area and existing communities deserves particular commendation.</p> <p>The designations of settlements based upon their amenities is appropriate, considered and well thought out. The growth targets for the smaller communities however may prove excessive and may result in a change to the character of settlements and reduce their sustainability. The small villages and hamlets, which the Melton Borough has the fortune of having retained a unique community spirit, largely owing to their size. Within the smaller settlements, community spirit and wellbeing is greatly increased by the fact that "everybody knows everybody". This spirit is further enhanced in areas with a degree of isolation, which promotes the spontaneous formation of support networks in times of need. Larger settlements offer a degree of anonymity and the opportunity of isolation, not present within a small community. The growth of rural settlements (and perhaps some of the smaller rural supporters) will almost certainly give rise to an attrition of this community spirit and so undermine the social role currently delivering the communities sustainability.</p>	<p>Support noted</p> <p>Concern about the scale of development in smaller settlements noted – this will be addressed by the Settlement Hierarchy review</p>
Suzanne Taylor	ANON-BHRP-4HG4-3	<p>I would like to know why Bottesford has been allocated 40% of all the Rural allocation, the village has already had a 40% increase in size in the last 20 years and we have had no further facilities to accommodate the already over populated area. The character of the "village" has been dramatically changed from a quiet rural village to a semi-town like area, more houses will increase the level of traffic and put a huge strain on the village facilities.</p>	<p>Bottesford has the best range of local services and facilities and is relatively well served by public transport. Next to Melton Mowbray it is the most sustainable settlement in the Borough. National planning policy promotes development and growth in the most sustainable locations, therefore Bottesford is likely to need and be able to accommodate the next highest amount of new homes</p>
David A Haston (on behalf of Mr Richard Chandler, Highfield Farm, Long Clawson)	ANON-BHRP-4HG5-4	<p>The Settlement hierarchy and the Development Strategy are in principle supported.</p> <p>The identification of Asfordby, Bottesford, Long Clawson and Waltham on the Wolds as Primary Service Centres is considered justified and is supported. It also reflects the observations of the Inspector who Examined the previous plan.</p> <p>The target of at least 920 dwellings on allocated sites within the Primary Service Centres is supported..</p> <p>The provision for the development of unallocated sites of up to 10 dwellings at Primary Service Centres is supported.</p>	<p>Support noted - however see Settlement Hierarchy review</p>
Elizabeth Ann Johnson	ANON-BHRP-4HGR-1	<p>I do not agree with the growth figure of 245 dwellings p.a.</p> <p>The Leicester & Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies an objectively assessed need as a range between 195 (Demographic led) and 245 (Economic growth led) new homes a year in Melton borough.</p> <p>The Emerging Options Draft Plan has chosen the very top of that range despite the SHMA expressing doubt that the economic growth potential is achievable.</p> <p>"Experian forecasting also appears pessimistic in that it suggests that overall jobs growth in Melton over the next 25 years will be far lower than the growth that has been achieved since 1997." (para.11.21 Employment Land Study Melton Borough Council M94(e)/Final Report/June 2015, BE Group 245)</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Housing need is evidenced by changing population and household size as well as economic factors. The plan must make provision to meet the evidenced need otherwise it will not be found sound. The provision of homes to meet need must also be shown to be deliverable; therefore some regard must be given to local markets, viability and deliverability – the things which affect demand. These matters are being assessed alongside the settlement roles, capacity of services to accommodate growth and the assessment of suitability of sites for development.</p>

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

		<p>Therefore, if the economic growth is in question and high figure is based on aspiration rather than need.</p> <p>The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) has explored the way in which inflated housing targets threaten the countryside and essential character of rural areas:</p> <p>"According to Government data, 242,000 houses were given planning permission in the year up to June 2015. Housing starts and completions, however, show no sign of coming close to matching this number. In fact, quarterly statistics on how many new homes have started construction shows that building rates have been static since the beginning of 2014 (around 136,000 per year) whilst the latter data shows completions are currently at 131,000. So more and more planning permissions are being granted on greenfield sites, but housebuilding rates remain the same. The housebuilders simply build houses as they always have but with increased housing targets now have more sites to choose from in the countryside, where profits are larger...</p> <p>...The research also shows that environmental constraints are not being taken into account when determining housing targets – even though ministers insist they should be. In a letter this year Minister of State for Housing and Planning</p> <p>Brandon Lewis said: “plans and decisions should take into account the different roles and character of different areas, and recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside – to ensure that development is suitable for the local context.” The statistics, however, clearly show this is not happening: just seven of the 54 plans (13%) contain housing targets that are in part determined by environmental factors." ('Set up to fail', CPRE, November 2015)</p>	
Joanne Belcher	ANON-BHRP-4HHM-W	<p>I have great concerns reading this that lessons from the previous development plans have not been fully considered and ignored. Will infrastructures be put in before development?</p> <p>The road and transport systems cannot cope.</p> <p>Valuable green belt and environmental areas will be destroyed.</p> <p>It appears areas will be developed regardless of previous studies and planning inspector reports.</p>	<p>The plan proposes development and infrastructure, including the link roads required to access them and a strategy to address traffic congestion in the town.</p> <p>There is no green belt in the Borough.</p> <p>This plan will be subject to examination in the same way as the previous plan.</p>
Cllr Martin Lusty – Waltham on the Wolds & Thorpe Arnold Parish Council and Neighbourhood Planning Group	ANON-BHRP-4HBZ-4	<p>The plan has stated that, based on the Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market assessment, we will need to build 245 houses per year until 2036. It is clear, however, that MBC had options: firstly - supporting maximum economic growth (245 dwellings pa); secondly - mid range (220 dwellings pa) and thirdly - demographic based (195 dwellings pa)</p> <p>The latter would have reduced the building requirement by about 1000 by 2036. There is no evidence to support this decision and we believe that the growth requirement should be 195 dwellings pa only.</p>	<p>Housing need is evidenced by changing population and household size as well as economic factors. The plan must make provision to meet the evidenced need otherwise it will not be found sound. The provision of homes to meet need must also be shown to be deliverable; therefore some regard must be given to local markets, viability and deliverability – the things which affect demand. These matters are being assessed alongside the settlement roles, capacity of services to accommodate growth and the assessment of suitability of sites for development.</p>
Nicholas John Walker	ANON-BHRP-4HGC-J	<p>Secondary Rural Service Centres</p> <p>Somerby Parish is classed as SRSC, in relation to the other centres it has not got the infrastructure to support the 50no know, but likely to be more, housing.</p> <p>The Parish has supported the MBC over the last 20 years with a steady supply of housing in mainly infill locations. There is still development to take place and brownfield sites which could be utilised for housing ie,</p>	<p>see Settlement Hierarchy review</p>

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

		<p>1.Nesbits Coach Hire - Burrough Road Somerby relocate to Melton/Burrough Court.</p> <p>2.Council Farm - Pickwell Road Somerby, built new Farm on Council land and develop the site.</p> <p>3.Playground Main Street, relocate to council land or approach Cooke Trust</p> <p>This approach would not mean the use of green open space land being used for housing if the housing need is proven to be required.</p>	
Ros Freeman	ANON-BHRP-4HF2-Z	<p>"Small scale development" in terms of Melton town may be small but in a village, 30+ houses is Large scale development!</p> <p>"Small allocations", in Somerby 60 houses are proposed on 2 sites that is not a small allocation!</p> <p>I do not agree with a presumption of sustainable development, it should be a presumption of no development unless it can be proven as sustainable. I think this has been misinterpreted.</p> <p>Settlement Roles - Somerby is wrongly categorised as Secondary Rural Service Centre, it is 7 miles from Towns, it does not have an hourly bus service, the shop does not provide essential service, too small and expensive. Car ownership is essential. Somerby should be a Rural Supporter. Somerby is the furthest away from Melton and any Primary Service centre</p> <p>The school has limited space to grow even if it had money from developers</p> <p>The Drs surgery is under pressure already, high turnover of Drs due to this.</p> <p>Somerby's historical housebuilding is probably greater than those other villages in the group. 2011 - 2016 22 built, 17 approved or awaiting decision.</p> <p>Sites in Somerby are on open countryside, they are not necessary and not appropriate!</p> <p>Somerby registered for Neighbourhood plan, these sites should not be developed until NP has been adopted and they are agreed</p> <p>Developing on this scale in the villages will not help social cohesion, it will split villages and wreck community</p> <p>You have policies to protect landscape, and settlement character EN1 EN4 and EN6 so the Somerby sites should NOT be developed. Developing the Oakham road site WILL increase the risk of flooding without doubt, so in accordance with EN11 it should not be developed.</p>	see Settlement Hierarchy review
Mike Plumb	ANON-BHRP-4HH2-2	<p>As a member of the Barkestone-le-Vale community having attended the Parish Council meetings I wish to underline the position represented to you in their response, namely: We gather from Reference group meetings, direct discussions with Melton Borough Council and comments made at the Parish meetings we have held, that it is agreed that the Spatial Strategy as set out is based to some extent on incorrect evidence, and that major changes are expected to be made. We are asked however for comment on the plan as provided for consultation.</p> <p>We disagree with the criteria used to arrive at the split of housing between Melton and the rural area, and with the allocation of housing in the rural area to Rural Supporters and Rural Settlements, both fundamental aspects of the strategy. We believe that the current strategy is unrealistic in terms of the required housing being built in these villages in a sustainable manner, and that it is not supported by the comments in the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report, which recognises that higher housing development in Melton would enhance the growth objectives of the town and the viability of the bypass, while development in the smaller settlements would be unlikely to create new infrastructure or</p>	see Settlement Hierarchy review

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

		sustainability. Other recent Local Plans in nearby boroughs have taken a different approach which we consider to be much more robust and realistic in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).	
Richard Laurence John LING (on behalf of Mr Bob Sparham, 58 Bowbridge Gardens, Bottesford and 22 other residents of Bottesford)	ANON-BHRP-4HHH-R	<p>The residents of Bottesford whom I represent are concerned that paragraph 4.2.14 whilst mentioning issues relating to flooding and flood risk does not mention problems and issues relating to traffic and highway matters in the village. The High Street is now often congested through the village centre. Traffic problems on Queen Street are almost as bad with the local car park often full to overflowing particularly when the surgery is open. Slow moving or stationary vehicles in the village adversely impact local businesses, the appearance of the village, air quality and noise levels.</p> <p>Whilst the village is a local service centre, the local primary school is already 36 to a class and there is no room on this site to expand unless the children are deprived of play space and sports areas. Similarly, GPs in the village are also overloaded.</p> <p>It is already recognised that public transport services - bus links and train services which stop at the local station - are not satisfactory for the current population. Local residents are subject to low water pressure in the height of summer and the local sewerage system is also under stress to cope with current demand.</p> <p>Objection is raised to the section in the Chapter - in particular paragraphs 4.2.18 -20 - which allocate a proportion of the housing need to Bottesford. This mathematical exercise produces a high housing requirement for the village - 370 dwellings - when compared to past development rates within the settlement and makes no account of the availability and suitability of sites in the village. This scale of housing requires action to cover the issues set out above and in 4.2.14 before any major site allocations are proposed.</p> <p>Also the Chapter correctly states that Bottesford is more in the housing market areas associated with the A52 corridor - Grantham-Nottingham - rather than the Leicester/Melton housing market areas so that placing more housing in Bottesford does not necessarily solve housing requirements in the rest of the Borough and the County. Surely it would be more sustainable to provide the housing in Grantham and Nottingham if it relates more directly to those housing market areas.</p>	<p>see Settlement Hierarchy review which will consider the capacity of schools and the GPs</p> <p>The site assessment process is being undertaken together with the settlement role review to allow consideration to be given to the suitability of sites to meet the housing requirement identified for each settlement</p> <p>It must be recognised that the need for additional homes across the Borough is proven by evidence. This number must be distributed to the most sustainable locations.</p> <p>Grantham and Nottingham have their own housing requirements to meet and are proposing significant developments within their own areas. There is no justification for these areas to meet the housing need of Melton Borough.</p>
John William Coleman	ANON-BHRP-4H6C-1	<p>I think the overall approach to the strategy is reasonable, but the target for 6125 additional houses (at a building rate of 245 per year) is unrealistic. The historic building rate (1996-2004) averaged 184 per year.</p> <p>Table 13 shows employment in the Borough increasing by 3400 (15%) between 2011 and 2036. So why do we need 6125 additional houses (an increase of almost 29%)? Are we expecting a much lower occupancy than at present (currently around 2.3 per household) or a higher proportion of retired/unemployed residents? If so these outcomes would have significant implications for the type/size of houses built. Or are we expecting a big increase in people living in the Borough but working elsewhere? This would place significant additional demands on the transport links.</p> <p>These issues should be addressed before we accept such a major increase in house-building.</p>	<p>Support noted. Past years building rates are significantly lower than the evidence of need set out in the SHMA. This will require a step change in delivery rates. Such a change can only be achieved with the identification of suitable sites to accommodate a significant number of homes. This is the approach to allocating two SUEs in Melton Mowbray, however there will be a long lead in time before homes are delivered on these sites. This reality will need to be recognised in the plan.</p> <p>The need for homes is based on evidence of population and household change. In particular in MBC there is a rapidly increasing population of older people whilst the economically active “workforce” is decreasing dramatically. If this situation is not addressed the local economy will be affected and businesses may be forced to relocate.</p>
Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger & Co (on behalf of various landowner clients)	ANON-BHRP-4HHB-J	<p>We are firmly of the opinion that Rural Supporters are sustainable settlements, which provide a good level of service provision. The policy in the Emerging Options Draft Plan outlines that Rural Supporters will accommodate 10% of the Borough's housing need in the form of at least 615 new homes. We support the wording of 'at least 615 new homes' as this allows for flexibility and the provision for further delivery of homes to meet future generations needs. However, we do not believe that this level of growth can be delivered in the form of small sites of 5 dwellings or less and would be surprised if the opportunities for this type of development within village limits exists to such an extent as to deliver circa 34 new homes per Rural Supporter. In addition, it would be surprising if this approach delivered the required affordable housing throughout the District.</p>	<p>Support noted but see Settlement Hierarchy review</p>

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

		<p>We propose that the policy be changed to allow for this level of growth (at least 615 homes) to be delivered on larger sites, which are well related to the existing settlements and in keeping with the built character. Currently the policy suggests building out 7 or more sites per Rural Supporter to deliver 615 new homes on a basis of sites of 5 dwellings or less. This would have significantly more impact on existing villages than building out one larger site along with one or two other small sites in addition.</p> <p>Long term viability of existing services, which are under threat at present, relies on the delivery of new homes in these locations to support shops, cafes, primary schools etc. Therefore, the release of larger sites (10, 15, 25 dwellings) will assist in delivering a mix of dwellings (types, tenures and sizes) to support local services.</p>	
Mr Steve Beard (on behalf of Sport England)	ANON-BHRP-4HGE-M	<p>Growth needs to be informed by the Built Facility Strategy (BFS) and Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) on a site specific basis, clearly referencing the evidence base and identifying what specific projects/improvements need to be delivered by specific allocations/developments. Sport England does not support the use of standards where a robust BFS and PPS have been undertaken.</p> <p>We would seek that growth in Melton is properly informed and clearly articulated so as to reflect the outcomes of the strategic evidence base. If investment is to be secured and delivered via development proposals the need for infrastructure has to be robustly justified and clearly linked to that development otherwise it will be challenged and not delivered.</p>	Comments noted and addressed in detail in relation to policies SS4 and SS5
Colin Wilkinson – Planit-X Town & Country Planning Services (on behalf of Belvoir Estate)	ANON-BHRP-4HHZ-A	<p>Belvoir Castle has been the home of the Manners family for five hundred years and seat of the Dukes of Rutland for over three centuries. Today the fine Grade I listed Belvoir Castle is the focal point of the Belvoir Estate, dominating skylines across the Vale of Belvoir and providing an attraction for tourists and business alike. However, the Estate is much more than an impressive Castle and it is evident that this single landowner has shaped the surrounding countryside, the built environment and the community.</p> <p>The Belvoir Estate plays a vital role in the sustainability of Melton Borough - as providers of employment and housing and as protectors of built and natural environments. The Estate's longevity, commitment to land and people and long-term view gives it a unique perspective. This custodial approach to the whole, and to individual sites, makes the Estate a sympathetic developer who focuses on long-term security and the future of the estate.</p> <p>A significant barrier to progressing projects within rural estates is the planning process. The planning process is of significance to the Belvoir Estate as it lies within the countryside and have a significant proportion of historic resources which can both acts as constraints to development.</p> <p>In recognition of their role in shaping the character and sustainability of Melton Borough, there should be a separate policy which enables Melton's country estates to continue to help contribute to the economy, environment and social fabric of the area.</p>	Comments noted, however it is considered inappropriate to a specific policy applying to country estates. All of the policies within the plan are relevant to development whether it is in an individual, business or estate ownership.
Christopher Green – Andrew Granger & Co (on behalf of a local landowner)	ANON-BHRP-4HHJ-T	<p>We firmly believe that the Secondary Rural Service Centres are fully sustainable settlements, providing a good level of 'essential' service provision as well as strong links to services in neighbouring communities.</p> <p>We support the provision within Policy SS2 for 'at least 300 new homes' and strongly feel that this should be the bare minimum, with settlements such as Wymondham able to deliver significant housing growth.</p> <p>However, we do not believe that this level of growth can be delivered through the preferred method, in the form of small sites of 10 dwellings or less and would be surprised if the opportunities for this type of development exists in each settlement. Currently the policy suggests building out approx. 5 or more sites per settlement to deliver the 300 new homes on a basis of sites of 10 dwellings or less. We propose that the policy be changed to allow for this level of growth to be delivered on larger sites, which are well related to the existing settlements and in keeping with the built character.</p> <p>Long term viability of existing services, which are under threat at present, relies on the delivery of new homes in these locations to support shops, cafes, primary schools etc. Therefore, the release of larger sites (10, 15, 25 dwellings) will assist</p>	Noted, see Settlement Hierarchy review

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

		in delivering a mix of dwellings (types, tenures and sizes) to support local services.	
Linda Irena Adams	ANON-BHRP-4HHY-9	Any development in villages needs to take account of the character of those villages and be sustainable in terms of the facilities and infrastructure in the villages. The existence of one particular facility in a village (e.g. a doctor's surgery) should not determine its suitability for development without taking account of both its capacity and that of all other specific facilities. The infrastructure should be closely examined in terms of road capacity and safety and also the suitability of available public transport for reaching a variety of local centres for employment etc.	Noted, see Settlement Hierarchy review
Christopher John Noakes	ANON-BHRP-4HBK-N	<p>Para 4.2.3: The amount and location of new employment land appears appropriate in terms of (potential) accessibility and relationship to the principal settlement of Melton Mowbray. It also provides for the re-use of the former Asfordby/Holwell sites.</p> <p>Para 4.2.4 et seq: It is understood that the settlement categorisation is already under review (partly based on revisions and/or discrepancies in the 'scoring' system for services/facilities) ? (para 4.2.9 refers to possible re-assessment).</p> <p>Reference the background Settlement Roles and Relationship Study 2015:</p> <p>The introduction of weighting criteria is welcomed (as previously recommended), but there are some concerns about the 'values' given to comparable factors (namely: primary school should be valued above other '3s' ; a post office should = a 'full-time' facilities (not just a 2-hour/week opportunity); no score for broadband facilities ? ; increase score for sports/leisure facilities ; increase score for secondary school - 5 ? ; differentiate between village hall with 'good' off-road parking facilities and those without). It is acknowledged that the scoring system cannot be a precise science, but certain changes in values may be justified.</p> <p>Para 4.2.12 Reference to housing targets for individual settlements set out in SS3 ? Not so</p> <p>See further details in following individual responses.</p>	Noted
Kerstin Hartmann	ANON-BHRP-4HGW-6	<p>For my overall opinion on this please refer to the Somerby parish council response letter</p> <p>Transport is crucial and as long as Melton Mowbray has not got a fast ring road in place it will not cope with increased traffic. Also as long as traffic issues are not solved industry and new business will be unlikely to find Melton Mowbray an attractive location. In contrast Grantham is winning over Melton Mowbray with the A1 and train links for it's industry. Industry has to come first creating employment for people who can then buy a new house in Melton.</p>	noted
Anthony Barber	ANON-BHRP-4H6R-G	<p>The emerging options appear to ignore what was said in previous consultation feedback (p26 - "You Said":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - focus of development should be in Melton Mowbray with SMALL-SCALE (my caps) development in rural settlements. However CONCERN WAS RAISED OVER TRANSPORT (my caps) - No explicit explanation is given as to why the option of developing the brownfield Great Dalby airfield site was not further pursued. 	Development is focussed on Melton Mowbray. 35% of the housing requirement spread across the 74 villages is considered to represent small scale
Julian Parker	ANON-BHRP-4HHP-Z	<p>You have indicated some good areas but it does not seem to be backed up in the main documents (from what I managed to read).</p> <p>Developing brown field areas should be considered first as these will have less impact on agricultural land and the environment.</p> <p>You have mentioned that transport infrastructure is required but I did not see anywhere in the docs for an actual bypass, it was more of a number of link roads that would need to cater for the existing traffic load and the transportation for an additional circa 4000 homes. Melton needs a bypass, to think otherwise is ludicrous. It needs to be properly funded and not</p>	<p>National policy requires consideration of brownfield sites before greenfield sites.</p> <p>At this stage there is no definitive route for a relief road. Much of it will be provided by the development of the two SUEs in Melton Mowbray. MBC continues to work closely with LCC to define the route of the connecting link and to seek funding for its delivery.</p>

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

		"we will look to", it should not be a number of link roads that dont seem to actually go anywhere and in fact seemed to stop somewhere around Twinlakes which is a huge mistake given the amount of traffic passing thru the area on bank holidays (I was there on Good Friday, the transportation access turned it into a bit of a joke and anyone visiting Melton would have not been happy.	
Margaret Jean Bowen	ANON-BHRP-4HHV-6	There should be a limit on the on the size of the total development which results from the 'grouping (of) developments'	Noted and addressed in policy SS3
Sue Booth – Frisby on the Wreake Parish Council	BHLF-BHRP-4HDB-E	The Parish Council does not currently have a 'village view'; this will emerge from the NP process and we will endeavour to feed into the MLP as soon as possible once we have begun to develop the NP; it is the Parish Council and the NP Group's understanding that the MLP is a working document and as such will be subject to amendment to take into account the wishes of local communities once these have been formalised in the NP.	Noted
Chris Hill – Scalford Parish Council	BHLF-BHRP-4HQE-X	<p>Were the proposal to be carried through Scalford would no longer be a rural village, but an urban development, as a satellite to Melton. A loss to its long-time residents and the whole rural environment within which the Village is located.</p> <p>Due to its unique location close to Melton Mowbray, Scalford should be considered as an entity and not just within the general grouping, due to its particular position and restrictions.</p> <p>The Parish Council request most strongly that these views should be given serious consideration.</p>	Comments noted, however, Scalford is located some distance from Melton Mowbray and will continue to be so once the Northern SUE is built. This development will not change the nature and character of Scalford as a village.
Phil Bamford – Gladman Developments	BHLF-BHRP-4H8J-A	<p>The process of undertaking an OAN is clearly set out in the Framework principally in §14, §47, §152 and §159 and should be undertaken in a systematic and transparent way to ensure that the plan is based on a robust evidence base.</p> <p>The starting point for this assessment requires local planning authorities to have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. This involves the preparation of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative areas as detailed in §159 of the Framework. The Framework goes on to set out the factors that should be included in a SHMA including identifying</p> <p>“the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets household and population projections taking account of migration and demographic change; • Addresses the need for all types of housing including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and • Caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand.” <p>Key points that are worth noting from the above is that the objective assessment should identify the full need for housing before the Council consider undertaking any process of assessing the ability to deliver this figure. In addition, §159 specifically relates to catering for both housing need and housing demand within the authority area. It is worth pointing out that any assessment of housing need and demand within a SHMA must also consider the following factors; falling household formation rates, net inward migration, the need to address the under provision of housing from the previous local plan period, the results of the Census 2011, housing vacancy rates including the need to factor in a housing vacancy rate for churn in the housing market, economic factors to ensure that the economic forecasts for an area are supported by sufficient housing to deliver economic growth, off-setting a falling working age population by providing enough housing to ensure retiring workers can be replaced by incoming residents, addressing affordability and delivering the full need for affordable housing in an area.</p> <p>5.1.4 Of particular importance is the need to consider market signals. The consideration of market signals is one of the core</p>	The SHMA was prepared in accordance with the guidance at the time it was prepared. A new HEDNA has been commissioned for Leicestershire which is being prepared in accordance with the latest advice and guidance.

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

	<p>planning principles considered in §17 of the Framework, which states:</p> <p>‘..Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities.’</p> <p>Of critical importance is what the Framework goes onto say in §158 in the section discussing Plan Making. It states here:</p> <p>‘Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.’</p> <p>Market signals are therefore at the very core of what the Framework is trying to achieve in promoting sustainable development and boosting the supply of housing land.</p> <p>The formal publication of the Planning Practice Guidance in March 2014 gives further explanation to what the Framework means with regard to market signals, and sets out, in a range of paragraphs, the way in which local planning authorities should go about factoring in relevant market signals in arriving at their OAN. §19 and §20 of the PPG gives guidance on what market signals should be taken into account and how plan makers should respond to these market signals. The below extracts identify some particularly pertinent points.</p> <p>‘The housing need number suggested by household projections (the starting point) should be adjusted to reflect appropriate market signals, as well as other market indicators of the balance between the demand for and supply of dwellings. Prices of rents rising faster than the national/local average may well indicate particular market undersupply relative to demand.’</p> <p>The paragraph goes on to indicate that these factors would include, but should not be limited to, land prices, house prices, rents, affordability, rates of development and overcrowding. However, given what the Framework says at §17, quoted above, it seems clear that particular consideration should be given to affordability.</p> <p>In order to consider how market signals should be taken forward §20 identifies some key concepts:</p> <p>‘Appropriate comparisons of indicators should be made. This includes comparison with longer term trends (both in absolute levels and rates of change) in the: housing market area; similar demographic and economic areas; and nationally. A worsening trend in any of these indicators will require upward adjustment to planned housing numbers compared to ones based solely on household projections.’</p> <p>It is therefore clear that where market signals are apparent (in any of the indicators assessed) there is an absolute and clear direction that an upward adjustment to housing numbers is required. It is also clear that both the absolute level of change and the rates of change are considerations, and that local planning authorities need to carefully bench mark themselves against other areas. This should not simply be a case of considering neighbouring authorities but should look at, as well as these, local authorities on a national basis, if the demographic and economic indicators are relevant. Gladman are firmly of the view that considering comparisons purely against neighbouring authorities is not sufficiently robust and does not address the underlying issues which both the Framework and PPG are trying to tackle with regard to housing.</p> <p>What is of further importance when considering these issues is the period of time analysed when considering both relative and absolute change. It has become apparent, in our consideration of a number of plans that many local authorities choose to look at periods of time which are not fully representative of the depth of the housing crisis which we are currently within.</p> <p>The problems are noted in Fixing the Foundations: Creating a more prosperous nation published by HM Treasury in July 2015. In paragraph 9.7 the report states:</p>	
--	---	--

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

	<p>'There remains more to do. As the London School of Economics (LSE) Growth Commission found, 'under supply of housing, especially in high-growth areas of the country has pushed up house prices. The UK has been incapable of building enough homes to keep up with growing demand.'</p> <p>Gladman are therefore of the view that local planning authorities must take a long term view when considering affordability and consider the relative and absolute change over a long term 15-20 year period, which coincides with the normal time span of a Local Plan. Authorities should assess, as a constituent part of their OAN, how they can improve affordability over the life time of a plan to a point where affordability is more in line with average earnings and affordable mortgage lending rates. They should assess a level of housing over the 15-20 year plan period which would enable this step change and consider its deliverability in the plan. Only through planning for significant housing growth can local authorities realistically tackle market signals in the way advocated by the PPG and tackle the affordability and housing crisis.</p> <p>The need to identify the full OAN before considering any issues with the ability of a Local Planning Authority to accommodate that level of development has been confirmed in the High Court. Most notably in Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council v (1) Gallagher Homes Limited (2) Lioncourt Homes Limited where it was considered that arriving at a housing requirement was a two stage process and that first the unconstrained OAN must be arrived at. In the judgement it was stated:</p> <p>"The NPPF indeed effected a radical change. It consisted in the two-step approach which paragraph 47 enjoined. The previous policy's methodology was essentially the striking of a balance. By contrast paragraph 47 required the OAN [objectively assessed need] to be made first, and to be given effect in the Local Plan save only to the extent that that would be inconsistent with other NPPF policies. [...] The two-step approach is by no means barren or technical. It means that housing need is clearly and cleanly ascertained. And as the judge said at paragraph 94, "[h]ere, numbers matter; because the larger the need, the more pressure will or might be applied to [impinge] on other inconsistent policies".</p> <p>Therefore following the exercise to identify the full, OAN for housing in an area,</p> <p>"Local planning authorities should seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and net gains across all three. Significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate." (NPPF §152)</p> <p>This statement clearly sets out that local planning authorities should seek to deliver the full OAN and that this should be tested through the evidence base. Only where the evidence shows that this is not achievable should they then test other options to see if any significant adverse impacts could be reduced or eliminated by pursuing these options. If this is not possible then they should test if the significant adverse impacts could be mitigated and where this is not possible, where compensatory measures may be appropriate.</p> <p>The final stage of the process is outlined in §14 and involves a planning judgement as to whether, following all of the stages of the process outlined above,</p> <p>"Local Plans should meet OAN, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole; or • specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted." 	
--	---	--

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

		<p>It is also worth noting that the final part of this sentence refers to footnote 9 of the Framework which sets out the types of policies that the Government consider to be restrictive. These include:</p> <p>“sites protected under the Birds and Habitat Directive (see paragraph 119) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast or within a National Park (or the Broads Authority); designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion”.</p> <p>Although this list is not exhaustive it is clear that local landscape designations, intrinsic value of the countryside, the character of areas, green gaps etc. are not specifically mentioned as constraints by the Framework.</p> <p>The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) contains guidance to support local authorities in objectively assessing and evidencing development needs for housing (both market and affordable) and economic development. This document supports and provides further guidance on the process of undertaking such assessments, in addition to what is set out in the Framework</p>	
<p>Brown & Co – Property & Business Consultants LLP (on behalf of landowners M Hill, P Hill, M Hyde and P Pickup)</p>	<p>BHLF- BHRP- 4HA9-2</p>	<p>In our opinion the Plan proposed does not derive sustainable development for reasons previously articulated and later in our comments. In particular, it does not fulfil the “environmental role”. The diverse distribution of development proposed does not contribute to sustainable development and places further unnecessary demands on the infrastructure that cannot be adequately accommodated. This has adverse environmental consequences.</p> <p>4.2.8</p> <p>There needs to be an objective assessment of how sites are compared and, therefore, we disagree with the statement that the exact score for a place is considered to be less important than the general feel for a village’s performance and how it compares to other settlements. There needs to be an objectively assessed scoring system in place to make sure that assessments undertaken are ‘reasonable and accountable’.</p> <p>4.2.9</p> <p>A comment that it is possible that there could be a future update of issues relating to Primary and Secondary Rural Service Centres and indeed Rural Supporters is welcomed as in view of comments contained in our response.</p> <p>4.2.11</p> <p>Provided our clients’ site MBC/049/13 is included, we would have no reservations about the statement that there should be two new sustainable neighbourhoods. However, for reasons previously given and other comments supplied, we feel our clients’ site should be allocated in preference to Melton North or the general allocation of the distribution of growth should be more in favour of Melton than the villages which will facilitate both, i.e. including our clients’ site in the Melton South SUE as well as allowing Melton North to be retained – see later comments however. Change to Site MBC/049/13 being an allocated part of the Melton South SUE.</p> <p>4.2.12</p> <p>The period on the second line should be stated as 2011 – 2036?</p> <p>4.2.20</p> <p>The distribution should be changed to reflect our earlier comments on Policy SS2. Change the table to reflect the different percentages needed to arrive at the Borough total of 6,125.</p>	<p>see Settlement Hierarchy review and assessment of sites for allocation</p> <p>Site ref MBC/049/13 is land at Sprecklys Farm to the south east of Melton Mowbray. The site was assessed as part of the Large Site Development Options work . This concluded that this site was less suitable for development as an SUE than both the Melton North and the Melton South SUEs. The two allocated SUEs provide sufficient land to meet the housing requirement for the town, therefor no additional large scale sites are considered necessary or appropriate for allocation in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Agree – this should be corrected</p>

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Comments on Chapter as a Whole

	<p>4.4.2</p> <p>The figures need to be changed to make sure that it accommodates the increased size of the SSN to reflect the addition of Site MBC/049/13.</p> <p>Because if Site MBC/049/13 is included, it will help facilitate the important connection between the A607 to the north east to link the whole of the southern area of Melton through to the A607 to the west heading to Leicester.</p>	
--	--	--