

Chapter 8: Managing the Delivery of Development – Overall Comments

Chapter 8 – Managing the Delivery of Development				
Overall Comments				
Name	Response ID	Comment or Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
Robert Ian Lockey	ANON-BHRP-4H3G-2	<p>Not specific enough. How are the Council going to get more trains to stop in Bottesford, as the residents wish?</p> <p>Where are the numbers for new school place provision? The plan is so precise on the number of houses to be built, that surely this figure is known?</p> <p>In general these are key issues of Council responsibility, and it is regrettable that the coverage of them is so sketchy.</p> <p>How much of the CIL money will be at the discretion of the communities in which new housing provision will be located?</p>	<p>The Council is liaising with the County Council on school numbers and an updated Infrastructure Delivery Schedule will be published alongside the Pre-Submission Plan.</p> <p>Communities are entitled to a proportion of CIL to be spent on infrastructure. 15% can be received by Parish Councils and where a Neighbourhood Plan is in place this can rise to 25%.</p>	
Angus Smith	ANON-BHRP-4HZK-D	<p>This is a vital area for successful implementation and growth of the Borough through the Melton Plan.</p> <p>The town is being throttled by the inability for traffic to move successfully through it. Without support from developers financial input to the infrastructure of the town and borough future business and industrial investors will keep clear of the town and existing manufacturers will consider relocating beyond the limitations that Melton gives.</p> <p>Melton as a town grew due to its position as a suitable cross roads for trade both on agricultural and industrial opportunities, however it is evident by any visitors it did not continue to develop in a strategic fashion merely allowing expansion of the industrial and domestic units without properly investing in the transport and supporting systems infrastructure such as water, sewage, drainage and energy networks.</p> <p>As current businesses and housing residents can spend literally hours of wasted time passing from ones side to the other of a town that measures principally 4 miles across, it is a driver to move out rather than invest in. Some developers have expanded housing taking the cream without having to put any support into the road networks or other supporting networks of the town that now are heavily overloaded making the burden heavier on those wishing to develop the future, however it is essential that this cannot continue.</p> <p>Having the general plan for a bypass system around town is great and needs to implemented as fast as possible, recognising that it cannot be done in one act but merely as a building of a jigsaw, however for it to hold true, the complete circle around the town need to be scoped - even if it is only aspirational at this time, in order that it will eventually be completed.</p>	<p>Noted. The delivery of the Melton Outer Relief Route is a priority for the Council.</p> <p>Melton Borough Council and Leicestershire County Council are working together to deliver a Transport Strategy for the town. This will combine delivery of the MORR together with a package of measures such as junction improvements, bus, cycle and walkways. The Transport Strategy will include a business case which will support funding bids for delivery of parts of the strategy which cannot be provided by development. Development including the North and South Sustainable Neighbourhoods will deliver elements of the Transport Strategy either directly or by contributions being sought from development proposals.</p>	

Chapter 8: Managing the Delivery of Development – Overall Comments

		Whether chinese proverb or just common sense - a difficult journey begins with a single step then adding another to it. Anything that supports transport systems around and through the town are supported by myself and the improvement of cycle ways and open spaces to enhance healthy living also.		
Gordon Raper	ANON-BHRP-4H3N-9	Transport issues need to be urgently addressed within Bottesford parish. The strategy needs to link with neighbouring local authorities - particularly Lincolnshire (main line station at Grantham) and Nottinghamshire (mainline stations at Nottingham and Newark). Our local primary school will need to be increased considerable to deal with an extra 300 properties by 2036.	A Transport Strategy is being developed alongside the Local Plan. Consultation with the County Council on school places is on-going. However, Bottesford schools both have surpass capacity to accommodate growth.	
John David Smith	ANON-BHRP-4H4X-M	Most interesting and informative.	Noted.	
Mr John Brown	ANON-BHRP-4H4Z-P	You mention energy and water - what about the sewerage infrastructure? Some systems cannot cope now, without any further development. Public transport in the Borough is very important. Housing (e.g. bungalow and sheltered accommodation) for the elderly population is important as it is growing at a rapid rate. Village boundaries should be protected. We need more green spaces, play areas and allotments throughout the Borough. Recycling should be a high priority. Wildlife and the environment should be a high priority. If a builder cuts down a tree, they should have to plant another one nearby to replace it - a native variety of course.	Consultation between the Council and water companies is on-going. Housing mix, including that for a growing elderly population is dealt with in Chapter 5 of the Plan. The decision not to take village envelopes forward into the new Local Plan was made in order to reduce the development pressure on open areas within villages and allow sustainable growth. Outside of new allocations in villages, Policy SS3 allows for additional development subject to it meeting criteria which promote sustainability. Open space provision is dealt with by Policy EN7. Wildlife is covered by policy EN2.	
John Mace	ANON-BHRP-4HEM-T	The North Melton strategic link road linking the A607 Nottingham Road to Melton Spinney Road will only benefit Twin Lakes for its customers travelling from the Nottingham area. It will have no benefit whatsoever for the local community. Assuming that the Melton Outer Relief Road is in place to take Nottingham traffic (A607) onto the A606 towards Oakham, and vice versa, there appears to be no provision for handling all the through traffic from Leicester towards Grantham and vice versa. All four major routes approaching Melton must be linked to remove all through traffic from the town centre. Only then can you start to resolve the town's horrendous traffic issues.	Traffic travelling from Leicester towards Grantham will be able to use the link road associated with the Melton South Sustainable Neighbourhood. Leicestershire County Council has decided that the remaining section of the MORR would provide most benefit if it went to the east where it would connect to Grantham Road and Melton Spinney Road.	
Lesley Judith Twigg	ANON-BHRP-4HEH-N	Bypass essential. You will never get Public Transport to be frequent enough to the villages for it to be used regularly. Therefore concentrate on great transport in and around Melton. If Dalby Airfield developed could have a Park and Ride?	Noted.	
Mark Colin Marlow	ANON-BHRP-4HEJ-Q	Developers should be expected to provide more towards infrastructure. New developments should be expected to upgrade complete drainage, water, electrical, etc systems rather than just the immediate area surrounding the development	Developers can only be required to provide the infrastructure which makes their development acceptable in planning terms. A Community Infrastructure Levy will be developed to ensure a standard levy on new development.	
brian kirkup	ANON-BHRP-4HE9-6	Most cycling done in countryside on quiet rural roads. Don't build more in countryside as this becomes more unsafe and threatened and cycling as all exercise is the best health provision we can give ourselves.	The Local Plan proposes that the most sustainable villages will be required to take 35% of the Borough's growth.	
Malcolm Brown	ANON-BHRP-4HEV-3	I agree with the priorities.	Noted.	

Chapter 8: Managing the Delivery of Development – Overall Comments

Persimmon Homes	ANON-BHRP-4HF3-1	8.13 - Developer contributions via s106 is one route to secure contributions however in light of changes to the CIL Regs 1.22 1.23 which took effect in April 2015 placing caps on the quantum of pooled contribution, I suggest it may prove to be more expeditious for Melton to agree a specific CIL schedule for items such as the relief road so that developments can continue to come forwards independent of one another whilst securing the capital required for the relief road.	Noted. The Council is committed to adopting a CIL Charging Schedule.	
Susan Love	ANON-BHRP-4HZP-J	8.3.5 I support these ideals but I think in the current political context of private wealth and public austerity not very much will be achieved. If the amount of money spent on new road construction was spent on good public transport we could have an excellent system.	Noted.	
Nick Farrow	ANON-BHRP-4HUD-1	Bus services are being reduced in rural communities and a number of people are becoming isolated because they do not have the facility of being able to commute to Melton due to this. When developing the plan it is essential that we encompass rural bus services in the scheme and put modern buses on to encourage the use of them not the old boneshaker they currently have.	The Council can work in partnership with Leicestershire County Council and developers to achieve public transport solutions. However it has little direct impact on bus provision.	
John A Herlihy	ANON-BHRP-4HU3-G	Traffic and cross town travel must be improved and brought into the 21st Century. Lorry weights and lengths continue to increase. most of our town roads were designed when the serfs had a pony or three. MMBC must address the roads situation and ACT SOON.	The delivery of the Melton Outer Relief Route is a priority for the Council. Melton Borough Council and Leicestershire County Council are working together to deliver a Transport Strategy for the town. This will combine delivery of the MORR together with a package of measures such as junction improvements, bus, cycle and walkways. The Transport Strategy will include a business case which will support funding bids for delivery of parts of the strategy which cannot be provided by development. Development including the North and South Sustainable Neighbourhoods will deliver elements of the Transport Strategy either directly or by contributions being sought from development proposals.	
Moira Hart	ANON-BHRP-4HU7-M	Section 8.11 notes that “New development in Melton Borough will need to be supported by an appropriate level of infrastructureincluding transport, schools... “Large scale development in Long Clawson is NOT sustainable because our facilities and infrastructure will not cope. Section 8.3.3 notes that “transport considerations form an important part in determining the spatial distribution of development, focussing new development in locations where there are sustainable travel options and the need to travel by car is reduced is an important element in the Spatial Strategy set out in policy SS2. This approach will also ensure that development is located where it can make the best use of existing services and facilities.” This statement appears to have been ignored with respect to Long Clawson and the suggestion that the village should be a site for expansion as a Primary Rural Service Centre does not accord with this ethos. Development in Long Clawson goes against Section 8.3.5 which aims to have “A transport system that helps reduce the carbon footprint of Leicestershire”. Development in Long Clawson goes against Policy IN1 Development in Long Clawson will not contribute significantly to Infrastructure IN2 and is unlikely to be enough to facilitate a new school which would be needed as the present school is full and has no room for expansion. Furthermore, if a new school was built it	Noted. The implications of infrastructure constraints for Long Clawson are being addressed by the Council and the settlement hierarchy is being reviewed.	

Chapter 8: Managing the Delivery of Development – Overall Comments

		would probably mean that other nearby villages would lose their schools and detract from the viability of those villages.		
CHRISTINE LARSON	ANON-BHRP-4HUU-J	<p>Section 8.1.1 notes that “New development in Melton Borough will need to be supported by an appropriate level of infrastructureincluding transport, schools...” Reading the Infrastructure Appendix - all this Infrastructure development is primarily focused on Melton Town, with some for Asfordby and Bottesford. Nowhere is Infrastructure development mentioned for Long Clawson, despite the village being suggested as a Primary Development Centre. Indeed there is very little infrastructure mentioned at all for rural areas, despite the recommendation that 35% of new houses be built there. I can only speak for my own village but large scale development in Long Clawson is just not sustainable because the current infrastructure is already not coping - for example the school, road, parking and drainage. (The Melton Local Plan Issues and Options: Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that Long Clawson School is at capacity. LCC state that it is already over capacity and new children to the village have to travel elsewhere to primary school).</p> <p>Section 8.3.1 states that 'the rural nature of the Borough and its dispersed pattern of villages, coupled with limited public transport services, have meant an increased reliance on the private car.' It is therefore puzzling why so much development is recommended for the villages when virtually all services require transport by car to Melton or other higher level centres? Except perhaps Asfordby and Bottesford. Building more housing, especially for young people and young families, who are less likely to have a private car, is counter intuitive or productive when all children's and social services are either in Melton or Bottesford.</p> <p>Section 8.3.3 also notes that “transport considerations form an important part in determining the spatial distribution of development, focusing new development in locations where there are sustainable travel options and the need to travel by car is reduced is an important element in the Spatial Strategy set out in policy SS2. This approach will also ensure that development is located where it can make the best use of existing services and facilities.” This statement appears to have been ignored with respect to Long Clawson, which has a limited bus service to Melton Mowbray and is 2.8 miles from the nearest A road. A car is essential in Long Clawson and other Vale villages and the suggestion that Long Clawson should be a site for expansion as a Primary Development Centre does not accord with this ethos, when its amenities and facilities are considered.</p> <p>Development in Long Clawson goes against Section 8.3.5 which aims to have “A transport system that helps reduce the carbon footprint of Leicestershire”.</p> <p>Development in Long Clawson goes against Policy IN1 Development in Long Clawson will not contribute significantly to Infrastructure IN2 and is unlikely to be enough to facilitate a new school which would be needed as the present school is full and has no room for expansion. Furthermore, if a new school was built it</p>	Noted. The implications of infrastructure constraints for Long Clawson are being addressed by the Council and the settlement hierarchy is being reviewed.	

Chapter 8: Managing the Delivery of Development – Overall Comments

		would probably mean that other nearby villages would lose their schools and detract from the viability of those villages.		
Clawson in Action - residents' group set up to Keep Clawson Long and Rural and working to support the production of a Long Clawson Neighbourhood Plan	ANON-BHRP-4HBM-Q	<p>Clawson in Action comments on whole chapter: Section 8.11 notes that “New development in Melton Borough will need to be supported by an appropriate level of infrastructureincluding transport, schools...” Large scale development in Long Clawson is not sustainable because the school, road and drainage infrastructure will not cope (The Melton Local Plan Issues and Options: Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that Long Clawson School is at capacity). Section 8.3.3 notes that “transport considerations form an important part in determining the spatial distribution of development, focussing new development in locations where there are sustainable travel options and the need to travel by car is reduced is an important element in the Spatial Strategy set out in policy SS2. This approach will also ensure that development is located where it can make the best use of existing services and facilities.” This statement appears to have been ignored with respect to Long Clawson and the suggestion that the village should be a site for expansion as a Primary Rural Centre does not accord with this ethos. Development in Long Clawson goes against Section 8.3.5 which aims to have “A transport system that helps reduce the carbon footprint of Leicestershire”. Development in Long Clawson goes against Policy IN1 Development in Long Clawson will not contribute significantly to Infrastructure IN2 and is unlikely to be enough to facilitate a new school which would be needed as the present school is full and has no room for expansion. Furthermore, if a new school was built it would probably mean that other nearby villages would lose their schools and detract from the viability of those villages.</p>	Noted. The implications of infrastructure constraints for Long Clawson are being addressed by the Council and the settlement hierarchy is being reviewed.	
Deborah Caroline Adams	ANON-BHRP-4H38-K	<p>On page 147 of the Draft Local Plan point 8.1.4. says that developers are only obliged to address their impact, not any current problems. This means that they only need to build or fund estate link roads, not a bypass or "outer relief road". This flies in the face of the Jacobs' report "Melton Mowbray Transport Study Cumulative Development Impact Study" issued about 18 months ago which concluded: "The LLITM model analysis has shown that under current traffic levels congestion is having an impact on the town centre road network. Even without any development these problems are exacerbated and require further study to identify proportionate mitigation, which may or may not focus on infrastructure measures at junctions. Furthermore the analysis suggests that any development (whether those proposed or adopted as part of a growth strategy) would have a notable impact in further deteriorating traffic conditions in the town (whether by congestion, delay or travel times). It finishes: "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</p>	<p>The Melton Outer Relief Route is required if Melton Mowbray is to expand and will be funded through a variety of public and private funding mechanisms and CIL which will be levied from most development in the Borough.</p> <p>The link roads are necessary for the North and South Sustainable Neighbourhoods as they cannot achieve appropriate access without them. Hence the provision of these sections by the development which will address their own impact.</p>	

Chapter 8: Managing the Delivery of Development – Overall Comments

		<p>overall growth strategy for the town. If this is not achieved, then the evidence within this document shows that the development cannot be considered sustainable."</p> <p>Since then MBC and LCC have agreed to produce a Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy (MMTS) costing £1.5m. MBC agreed on 24th September 2015 to provide £0.4m, the LCC had already agreed to provide £0.5m towards the cost. This left a shortfall of £0.6m which has not been met. At the Special Meeting of the MBC on 24th September a report was submitted by Head of Regulatory Services regarding the proposed MMTS and it says in 3.10 of the report: "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. This work is composed of the development of a preferred corridor for an outer relief road which is likely to cost in the region of £1m, with the cost of developing a full Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy, including other supporting transportation measures, likely to cost a further £0.5m."</p> <p>I was advised by the Head of Regulatory Services in an email to me dated 2nd March 2016 that: "The position is that the County Council were willing to progress on the former element despite the shortfall of funding (for the avoidance of doubt I would confirm that Melton Borough Council has not assigned further financial support as 'top up')."</p> <p>This means that only a part MMTS will be produced. If funding cannot be found for the initial Transport Strategy, how is MBC expecting to fund the second stage which includes the completion of all necessary planning and Compulsory Purchase Order procedures estimated to cost an additional £2m to £2.5m, never mind the completion of the bypass itself which is estimated to cost between £50m and £100m at today's prices?</p>		
Shelagh Woollard	ANON-BHRP-4HB5-Y	Water butts should be compulsory, but again, they are only of use where people will use them on their gardens. If they don't, they will just fill up and then overflow or be disconnected with all excess water then running off onto the land.	Noted. Water butts are encouraged in Policy EN9.	
Clair Ingham	ANON-BHRP-4HMZ-F	I agree infrastructure and additional facilities need to be considered with the proposed increase in developments in order to cater for everyone and not overload the town and current facilities	Noted.	
Bottesford Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	ANON-BHRP-4HUB-Y	It would have been better to use a picture of the station with some people using it.	Noted.	The photo will be re-considered for the published Plan.
Richard Simon	ANON-BHRP-4HZC-5	The picture of the station would have been better if people were on the platforms.	Noted.	
Bottesford Parish Council	ANON-BHRP-4H1W-G	It would have been better to use a picture of the station with some people using it.	Noted.	

Chapter 8: Managing the Delivery of Development – Overall Comments

JOHN RUST	ANON-BHRP-4HUV-K	<p>Support extract: Section 8.11 notes that “New development in Melton Borough will need to be supported by an appropriate level of infrastructureincluding transport, schools...” Large scale development in Long Clawson is not sustainable because the school, road and drainage infrastructure will not cope (The Melton Local Plan Issues and Options: Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that Long Clawson School is at capacity). Section 8.3.3 notes that “transport considerations form an important part in determining the spatial distribution of development, focussing new development in locations where there are sustainable travel options and the need to travel by car is reduced is an important element in the Spatial Strategy set out in policy SS2. This approach will also ensure that development is located where it can make the best use of existing services and facilities.” This statement appears to have been ignored with respect to Long Clawson and the suggestion that the village should be a site for expansion as a Primary Rural Centre does not accord with this ethos. Development in Long Clawson goes against Section 8.3.5 which aims to have “A transport system that helps reduce the carbon footprint of Leicestershire”. Development in Long Clawson goes against Policy IN1 Development in Long Clawson will not contribute significantly to Infrastructure IN2 and is unlikely to be enough to facilitate a new school which would be needed as the present school is full and has no room for expansion. Furthermore, if a new school was built it would probably mean that other nearby villages would loose their schools and detract from the viability of those villages. Support Extract: Section 8.1.1 notes that “New development in Melton Borough will need to be supported by an appropriate level of infrastructureincluding transport, schools...” Reading the Infrastructure Appendix 3 - all this Infrastructure development is primarily focused on Melton Town, with some for Asfordby and Bottesford. Nowhere is Infrastructure development mentioned for any village, especially Long Clawson, despite the village being suggested as a Primary Rural Service Centre . Indeed there is very little infrastructure mentioned at all for rural areas, despite the recommendation that 35% of new houses be built there.I can only speak for my own village but large scale development in Long Clawson is just not sustainable because the current infrastructure is already not coping - for example the school, road, parking and drainage. (The Melton Local Plan Issues and Options: Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that Long Clawson School is at capacity. LCC state that it is already over capacity and new children to the village have to travel elsewhere to primary school). Section 8.3.1 states that 'the rural nature of the Borough and its dispersed pattern of villages, coupled with limited public transport services, have meant an increased reliance on the private car.' It is therefore puzzling why so much development is recommended for the villages when virtually all services require transport by car to</p>	<p>Noted. The implications of infrastructure constraints for Long Clawson are being addressed by the Council and the settlement hierarchy is being reviewed.</p>	
-----------	------------------	---	--	--

Chapter 8: Managing the Delivery of Development – Overall Comments

		<p>Melton or other higher level centres? Except perhaps Asfordby and Bottesford. Building more housing, especially for young people and young families, who are less likely to have a private car, is counter intuitive or productive when all children's and social services are either in Melton or Bottesford.</p> <p>Section 8.3.3 also notes that “transport considerations form an important part in determining the spatial distribution of development, focusing new development in locations where there are sustainable travel options and the need to travel by car is reduced is an important element in the Spatial Strategy set out in policy SS2. This approach will also ensure that development is located where it can make the best use of existing services and facilities.” This statement appears to have been ignored with respect to Long Clawson, which has a limited bus service to Melton Mowbray and is 2.8 miles from the nearest A road. A car is essential in Long Clawson and other Vale villages and the suggestion that Long Clawson should be a site for expansion as a Primary Development Centre does not accord with this ethos, when its amenities and facilities are considered.</p> <p>Development in Long Clawson goes against Section 8.3.5 which aims to have “A transport system that helps reduce the carbon footprint of Leicestershire”. Development in Long Clawson goes against Policy IN1 Development in Long Clawson will not contribute significantly to Infrastructure IN2 and is unlikely to be enough to facilitate a new school which would be needed as the present school is full and has no room for expansion. Furthermore, if a new school was built it would probably mean that other nearby villages would lose their schools and detract from the viability of those villages.</p>		
Sharon Gustard	ANON-BHRP-4H6K-9	Ref IN1 - the new development at Rectory Farm of 250-300 houses does not have regard to points 1-4 and there is nowhere within the village centre which could support parking provision as it has already been inbuilt. This location does not achieve these requirements where other sites do.	Noted.	
Mick Jones	ANON-BHRP-4H6N-C	<p>My comments relate to traffic, congestion and air pollution. I am well aware that currently, during peak periods, traffic is standing for very long periods at junctions within the town. The traffic light sequence needs to be altered to allow flows rapidly through junctions, especially those junctions that are used by through traffic. This is a throw back to the 1974 fuel crisis when the government of the day restricted the flow to save fuel. The County Council, currently responsible for highways, through its traffic modelling continues to employ old principles that exacerbate the situation. This needs to be resolved. Once done, pollution levels around the town will fall rapidly.</p> <p>The new north and south proposed bypasses need to be linked by east and west sections to enable flow completely round the bypass thus illuminating the need to enter the town.</p>	Leicestershire County Council has decided that the remaining section of the MORR would provide most benefit if it went to the east where it would connect to Grantham Road and Melton Spinney Road.	
Waltham on the Wolds & Thorpe Arnold Parish Council	ANON-BHRP-4HBZ-4	See individual comments re IN1 & IN2.	Noted.	

Chapter 8: Managing the Delivery of Development – Overall Comments

and Neighbourhood Planning Group				
Nicholas John Walker	ANON-BHRP-4HGC-J	<p>The consultation process is flawed.</p> <p>The roadshow to villages had no substance and validity, no notes taken or responses given to residents questions either at the show or later. That's not consultation, that's telling residents what MBC are going to do.</p> <p>This on line system is also very time consuming and beyond the spoke of many people.</p>	<p>It was not the purpose of the consultation events for officers to take notes, but to answer questions on the Draft Plan.</p> <p>A printed comment form was also made available to allow residents to submit comments alongside the online consultation.</p>	
Christopher John Noakes	ANON-BHRP-4HBK-N	<p>Policy IN1: erroneous reference to A607 Nottingham Road ? should read A606 Nottingham Road</p> <p>Policy IN2: Developer contributions can be justified for other types of developments (i.e. in addition to housing and employment uses - as strictly defined in the Use classes Order). Should not the policy refer to these as well (e.g. retail; leisure development), and thence be covered by the CIL criteria ?</p> <p>The commendable objectives set out in this chapter (to achieve the sustainable transportation solutions to the location of new development) would seem to offer significant support for a greater proportional emphasis of new development at Melton Mowbray - which would more fully achieve said objectives. Hence amend the 65-35 split of new housing distribution to (say 70-30 or more appropriately 75-25)?</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>A 65/35% split for housing distribution is justified by evidence and will provide for flexibility and choice in the housing market, as required by the NPPF.</p>	Correction of road numbers.
Kerstin Hartmann	ANON-BHRP-4HGW-6	<p>Good cycle paths/ways would be very very welcome, especially alongside the busy and dangerous A roads into Melton. It would be great if there were cyclepaths next to the road and this would enable more people to cycle in and out of Melton. At the moment those roads are way too dangerous to cycle on for the average person. Maybe allright for cyclists who cycle at a completely different speed.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
Richard Botterill	BHLF-BHRP-4H22-C	<p>The fact that this has all been gone through before and has been thrown out by the government inspector proves how much of a waste of time "local" politics is, unless that is the majority of work undertaken is reinstated so saving a large amount of money that could be put back into the local community.</p>	<p>A part of the original evidence base for the Core Strategy is still relevant and in place, however as a number of years have passed, evidence has had to be updated.</p>	
Marrons Planning	BHLF-BHRP-4H8Y-S	<p>We note that it is the Council's aim, as expressed in paragraphs 8.9.2 and 8.9.3, respectively, to progress the preparation of a Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · "Melton Borough Council is committed to preparing a CIL and will consult on a draft charging schedule in 2016. The preparation of a CIL must be in accordance with the statutory process set out in the Regulations" · "A policy will therefore be included in the Publication Local Plan which reflects the requirements of the CIL and to ensure that the CIL regulations are properly addressed" <p>The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a key tool in delivering essential infrastructure within the Borough. The Council have recognised in Policy IN1 that 'in accordance with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and transport evidence base new development in Melton Mowbray will be expected to contribute</p>	<p>Noted. The Council is committed to adopting a CIL Charging Schedule and is intending to consult on a Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule alongside the consultation on the Pre-Submission Plan.</p> <p>Preparation of CIL will be in accordance with the CIL Regulations.</p>	

Chapter 8: Managing the Delivery of Development – Overall Comments

	<p>towards and / or deliver parts of a number of town wide strategic transport infrastructure including:</p> <p>I. The Melton Outer Relief Route- a series of the strategic road links”</p> <p>It is also recognised within the document that transport is a top infrastructure priority, and that the plan will be infrastructure led, with the provision of a bypass to be at the forefront of housing development. It is understood that the bypass, described as critical for the delivery of the Melton Sustainable Neighbourhoods in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, has been costed by the Borough Council at a figure of circa £50 million.</p> <p>CIL is intended to provide infrastructure to support the development of an area, to support growth, and benefit the local community. CIL is a charge on new buildings that the Borough Council will be able to set and which is designed to help fund local and sub-regional infrastructure identified in the development plan. It represents a tariff based approach to provide the best framework to fund new infrastructure to unlock land for growth. CIL is paid primarily by Owners or Developers of land that is developed and based on a formula that relates the size and character of development to the amount charged. In order to collect the levy, charging authorities, of whom the Borough Council could become one, must prepare and adopt a charging schedule (which sets out the levy's rates for the area). There is no liability to pay CIL unless there is a charging schedule in effect on the day planning permission for CIL liable development is granted. Until such a time a charging schedule has been adopted, local planning authorities must continue to rely on the current regime of planning obligations.</p> <p>From April 2015 Local Planning Authorities are restricted in their use of Section 106 planning obligations by virtue of some of the CIL regulations known as pooling restrictions coming into force. CIL Regulation 123 has the effect of restricting the use of pooled contributions. If there are agreements in place for more than 5 section 106 contributions (that have been entered into since April 2010) for a project or type of infrastructure, a Local Planning Authority will not be able to collect anymore contributions for that purpose. This means that for a local planning authority that hasn't yet adopted a charging schedule, no more than 5 obligations can be pooled from section 106 agreements in respect of a specific infrastructure project or a type of infrastructure, where it is a type of infrastructure that is capable of being funded by the levy. Given the pooling restrictions are now in effect, this paper seeks to highlight the significant advantages to the Council in progressing CIL and adopting a charging schedule which would enable the Council to take a comprehensive approach to the hugely problematic highway issues that currently affect Melton Mowbray town centre, and to seek to secure and enable the long term strategic growth of Melton Borough as a whole.</p>		
--	--	--	--

Chapter 8: Managing the Delivery of Development – Overall Comments

	<p>The Council's approach to CIL to date</p> <p>The Report of the Head of Regulatory Services to the Special Meeting of the Full Council of 24 September 2015 sets out that initial traffic modelling suggests a relief road would be a 'sensible proportionate backbone to an integrated package of measures for Melton'. Further, that an 'Outer' option offers an appropriate and longer term solution to the town. It is understood the cost of the work is circa £50 million.</p> <p>The report recommends, amongst other matters relating to funding the work, the Council, in conjunction with the County Council be:</p> <p>'[Mindful] of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations and CIL tests, discussions to take place to explore whether and how it might be possible to secure developer contributions towards the costs of developing and delivering the strategy, including from current planning applications'.</p> <p>It is important to note, in the context of the above recommendation, and in the context of the Council wishing to include the provision of the bypass in the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan, that now the pooling restrictions are in force, it is only possible to collect section 106 contributions from 5 sites towards a single item of infrastructure. It is very unlikely that the much needed Melton bypass, which as set out above is costed at circa £50 million could be funded through developer contributions from 5 sites being brought through the development control process in the absence of CIL. The Council have not set out in the emerging Local Plan how the bypass (and other associated infrastructure) would be paid for. In our view, the bypass can only realistically be delivered by the Borough Council bringing forward CIL. With a charging schedule in place, the delivery of the bypass need not only be funded by development within Melton itself but could also be contributed towards via CIL contributions from other developments within the Borough.</p> <p>The Garden Village that is being promoted at Six Hills for a mixed use scheme, including the delivery of approximately 2500 dwellings is an example of a scheme that could make a real and early contribution towards the delivery of the bypass.</p> <p>With a charging schedule in place, the proposed development could contribute in a significant and meaningful way to the housing and infrastructure needs of the Borough in the coming decades.</p> <p>The experience of several local authorities is the timescale for the adoption of a CIL charging schedule can be in excess of two years, and so it is essential that the Council pursues the charging schedule as a priority so the funding for the much needed infrastructure required can be brought forward.</p> <p>The other broad advantages of CIL that we would commend to the Council in consideration of this issue are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The levy is the Government's preferred vehicle for the collection of pooled contributions, and once a charging schedule is in place, it is very simple to administer 		
--	--	--	--

Chapter 8: Managing the Delivery of Development – Overall Comments

		<p>2. Delivers additional funding to carry out a wide range of local and strategic infrastructure projects (not limited purely to the bypass) that supports growth and benefits the local community</p> <p>3. Gives flexibility and freedom to set the chosen priorities for what money should be spent on, as well as a predictable funding stream that allows effective planning ahead</p> <p>4. Provides developers and landowners with much more certainty 'up front' about how much money they will be expected to contribute, which in turn encourages greater confidence and higher levels of inward investment</p> <p>5. Ensures greater transparency for local people because they will be able to understand how new development is contributing to their community</p> <p>6. Enables local authorities to allocate a share of the levy raised in a neighbourhood to deliver infrastructure the neighbourhood wants</p> <p>7. Is charged at a flat rate so applying and collecting it is an administrative process. It can help improve development management performance, because a reason for major planning applications missing their 13 week decision making target can be time consuming negotiation over S106 agreements.</p> <p>In summary, given the significant level of development that is proposed for Melton Borough to 2036, and given the infrastructure that will be required to deliver those homes in a sustainable way needs to be secured in a comprehensive manner (that is not prohibited by the pooling restrictions now in effect pursuant to CIL regulation 123), it seems an entirely appropriate and indeed essential time for the Council to progress the CIL process. The Council recognises the importance of CIL, given it has set out a commitment to progressing this in the Emerging Options. We strongly advise the Council that a CIL Charging Schedule be treated as a priority in the Publication Draft of the Local Plan, and as a standalone issue to be progressed at the same time as, and alongside the Local Plan Process. This would be a more comprehensive and certain method of obtaining contributions to infrastructure than proposed policy IN2, which should be deleted in favour of a CIL charging schedule.</p>		
Somerby Parish Council	BHLF-BHRP-4HKH-U	<p>The summary of the above is that in building 6,000+ houses in the borough the traffic will have to be better managed in order to avoid further or increased chaos both in the town and in the surrounding villages. Therefore the construction of relief roads and all necessary infrastructure must be put in place whilst at the same time protecting our green spaces.</p>	<p>Noted. The delivery of the Melton Outer Relief Route is a priority for the Council. Melton Borough Council and Leicestershire County Council are working together to deliver a Transport Strategy for the town. This will combine delivery of the MORR together with a package of measures such as junction improvements, bus, cycle and walkways. The Transport Strategy will include a business case which will support funding bids for delivery of parts of the strategy which cannot be provided by development. Development including the North and South Sustainable Neighbourhoods will deliver elements of the Transport Strategy either directly or by contributions being sought from development proposals.</p>	
Leicestershire Police	BHLF-BHRP-4H7S-J	<p>Turning to Chapter 8 I note that you quote R 122 which police infrastructures meet on all occasions and which leads me to ask again how the content in appendix 3 can be justified? We have supplied background to local policing and yet none of this</p>	<p>The Council has instructed Arup to carry out an Infrastructure Assessment which includes the production of a fully costed Infrastructure Delivery Schedule. The consultants will consider the information supplied by Leicestershire Police and be in contact with Leicestershire Police as part of</p>	

Chapter 8: Managing the Delivery of Development – Overall Comments

		appears in this chapter and in my view this omission is almost glaring in comparison to what appears on transport, education or electricity. It's also clear from this content that MBC have been in contact with these providers and so I ask why not police also? On a more general point why is most of this chapter and a bespoke policy dedicated to transport?	this process if necessary. The delivery of sustainable transport infrastructure is essential to the delivery of the Local Plan and a separate policy is justified.	
--	--	--	---	--