


Summary



Answer	Response ID	Do you support this policy? - Opinion on C1	Do you support this policy? - Comments	What changes would you like to see made to this policy? - Comments	Officer's response	Councils recommended action
Robert Ian Lockey	ANON-BHRP-4H3G-2	Other	'High quality design' and 'energy efficiency' while laudable in themselves should be at the expense of affordability.	Less rigid allocations, with a range given for each settlement, and priority given to affordability including housing for owner occupation.	Noted.	
Nicholas Taylor	ANON-BHRP-4H31-C	Object	We would like to raise our objections to the classification of Long Clawson as a primary rural centre and to the large number of planned house in the draft plan that have been allocated to the village. The council may have used their marking criteria to tick all their boxes on paper but the reality does not match up. Yes we have a good surgery it covers a wide area. So at 7.45am large queues have already formed. The roads are clogged with dangerous parking and	We would like to see the village re classified to the realistic status of secondary rural centre. We would like to see a big reduction in the scale of development. Yes the council has a need to build more housing. However we feel as usual in this country the impact on the residents will not be taken in to consideration. People as you are well aware, move to a small village like Long Clawson because that is exactly what it is, a small friendly rural community. If all the proposed development happens the	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlements Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

			<p>near misses occur on a regular basis. There is precious little parking for the residents as it is.</p> <p>Yes we have a school but it is full. Parking issues are a recurring theme there also.</p> <p>Yes we have a bus service but it is not convenient and provides no easy access to the big cities.</p> <p>Several of the proposed developments are located on dangerous bends. If we had an existing property on one of these bends and applied for access the planning department would reject it on the grounds of safety.</p> <p>There are of course concerns about the flood risk to the village which has several pockets where this happens already and the ancient sewage and storm drain system struggles to cope as it is.</p> <p>Increased traffic is really a major concern the narrow lanes cannot be maintained effectively as it is. We have a large number of traffic coming in to the village to the Dairy and KS Composites which have seriously affected the roads and parking around the edge of the village. These are narrow lanes not built to service large communities.</p>	<p>dynamic of the village changes forever. Commuters move in and don't use the services. I grew up in neighbouring village and this is exactly what happened. Many friends and acquaintances moved as the community they loved had gone forever.</p>		
Gordon Raper	ANON-BHRP-4H3N-9	Support with observations	You are detailing 300 for Bottesford. In other questions you state 370. Can you clarify please?	See above	This is being revised in the new Local Plan.	
Mr John Brown	ANON-BHRP-4H4Z-P	Object	All new builds should blend in seamlessly. Materials, style, size, price band etc.	See above. The environment should be protected at all costs. We only have one chance to get this right.	Environmental policies address this issue.	
Lucy Flavin	ANON-BHRP-4H4T-G	Support with observations	Long Clawson does not have the infrastructure to support this number of houses.		The new Settlement Roles study looks at the updated information of the services and facilities in the villages.	
David Boyd	ANON-BHRP-4HEX-5	Object		The 1 proposed area for building in Frisby is an agricultural area of natural beauty. The proposed number of houses is far too large and will blight the village from a great distance away. I would like to see more areas put forward for development so the houses can be	This is being looked at through the Revised Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

				allocated to a number of sites in smaller numbers.		
Siobhan Noble	ANON-BHRP-4HED-H	Support		None, just adherence to the rural figures	Noted.	
Lesley Judith Twigg	ANON-BHRP-4HEH-N	Support with observations	Only as said before--prefer more in the big developments plus possibly the airfields and Six Hills	as above	These have been included in the Review Policy (SS6) in the draft Local Plan.	
Aidan Thatcher	ANON-BHRP-4HEA-E	Support with observations	The site details have not been populated and thus the policy is incomplete and difficult to comment on.	The Daybell Barns site should be an allocation for Bottesford.	This is work in progress. Site allocations work will address this work.	Update information in the table in the Policy.
Dr Leonard Richard Newton	ANON-BHRP-4HET-1	Object	For Frisby, to allocate 48 additional houses would represent a 20% increase in housing. This will radically alter the character of the village and put strain on local services and schooling. The access roads to the village are narrow and of low quality Increased housing will bring increase in traffic and greater safety risks	Allocations to small rural communities should be very small and should support retain young people in village communities.	This is being looked at through the Revised Settlement Roles and the site assessment work. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	
Mark Colin Marlow	ANON-BHRP-4HEJ-Q	Object		Development should not be thrust upon anywhere.	There has been an identified need for the housing in the future and this will be distributed in the most sustainable places through local planning process.	
Alan Luntley	ANON-BHRP-4HEQ-X	Support with observations	Long Clawson/Waltham to be designated Secondary Centres		The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the Revised Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.
Brian Kirkup	ANON-BHRP-4HE9-6	Object	already discussed above		Noted.	
Anthony Thomas	ANON-BHRP-4HFX-6	Not Answered	Only will support the above if numbers of houses quoted and conditions outlined above are strictly adhered to.	Only will support the above if numbers of houses quoted and conditions outlined above are strictly adhered to.	Noted.	
Malcolm Brown	ANON-BHRP-4HEV-3	Support with observations	In each case the development should address the needs of the potential market.		Noted.	
George Breed	ANON-BHRP-4HF3-1	Support with observations	The quantum of houses proposed to the north is low given the extent of link road needed, increasing the quantum to 2000 units would increase revenues needed to fund this vital infrastructure and reduce the overall £ levied per household. Reducing the levy will increase the likelihood of affordable product being secured while improving the	Increase Melton North units to 2000 units, with inclusion of MBC/030/13 to complete link road. And introduce greater flexibility regarding the relief roads alignment.	Largely this will depend upon the deliverability of the sites.	

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

			deliverability of the northern Sue.			
David Mell	ANON-BHRP-4HF8-6	Object	<p>See previous comments on four categories being too many and the arbitrary nature of the boundaries - particularly between Secondary Rural Settlements and Rural Supporters.</p> <p>Hence 37 for Stathern while Harby get no specific quota is unreasonable and seen by many as perverse.</p> <p>N.B The numbers per village in the C1 table (page 65) seem different from the indicative requirement numbers in Table 8 on page 63.</p>	See previous comments	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.
Dr Jerzy A Schmidt	ANON-BHRP-4H4P-C	Support with observations	<p>I'm worried about having Long Clawson as a primary rural settlement due to its road network. It is located on unclassified roads and traffic from 3 of the 4 directions reaching it has to pass through other smaller villages. Frisby on the Wreake, for example could be better suited as a primary rural settlement. It has been identified as a secondary but is located on a main A road and has good links to both Melton and Leicester. Further development along this access route could also prompt opening of a rail station to further support transport from these villages and reduce need for car travel</p>	Remove Long Clawson from the Primary list and replace with a similar community from the secondary list which has better road infrastructure	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.
Susan Love	ANON-BHRP-4H2P-J	Object	<p>Too many houses allocated to Bottesford. Bottesford floods. Bottesford flooded on 18 July, 2001.</p> <p>Residents received another Flood Warning from the EA on 29 April, 2012.</p> <p>Fortunately the heavy band of rain affecting the country in December, 2015 and Jan 2016 was further north than the East Midlands. Another incident of so-called 'excessive' rain could flood Bottesford again. Bottesford is vulnerable to flooding from the Devon, the Winterbeck, the reservoirs near Belvoir, and from the Grantham Canal which overflowed in 2001.</p>	<p>Bottesford floods. It has nearly reached its optimum size. The constraints on Bottesford re flood risk, size of the village centre, poor vehicular access to the schools causing congestion at peak times, and distance from Melton have not been fully acknowledged in the housing distribution.</p> <p>Flood free Waltham, near to Melton, with an excess of preferred SHLAAS should take more houses and benefit from some growth</p>	<p>The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.</p> <p>Flood issues have been addressed through Environment Chapter policies (Policy EN11).</p>	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.
Donald Colin	ANON-	Object	I disagree with the amount of housing	I suggest Frisby on the Wreake should be	The categorisation of villages is being	

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

macnab	BHRP-4HFS-1		<p>you are allocating to Frisby, which is a small community with a population of about 550. A new estate of 48 units (over 20% increase) will adversely affect the character of the village. The points scoring method you have used is inaccurate and results in some villages that are larger than Frisby having a significantly small allocation.</p> <p>In the previous Local Plan (1999) all 3 potential housing sites (including MBC/191/15) are located within "PARTICULARLY ATTRACTIVE COUNTRYSIDE" and it was accepted that housing would only be permitted in these areas where there is "NO ADVERSE IMPACT ON THE APPEARANCE OR CHARACTER OF THE LANDSCAPING". This cannot be achieved and the proposed allocations should not be adopted. It is illogical for a site that was confirmed to be worth protecting due to its landscape qualities a few years ago should now be developed for housing and it is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>It is also noted that two of the proposed sites are listed as Grade 3 Agricultural land. NPPF indicate this classification as the best and most versatile and it should be safeguarded.</p>	<p>allocated no more than 20 houses (10% increase) and they should be located on site(s) that have the least impact on the village and its surroundings. The stack yard to Wood's Farm on Rotherby Lane or the land opposite the farm appear to be the least contentious sites in the village. The development of Wood's farm could be linked to the repair/improvement of Zion House, a Grade 2 Listed Building.</p>	<p>looked at through the revised Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village. Housing allocation is based on population and sustainability of villages.</p> <p>Environment chapter deals with protection of the landscape character (Policy EN1).</p>	
Jeanne Petit	ANON-BHRP-4HF6-4	Object	See previous comments made about Somerby		Noted.	
Emily Aron	ANON-BHRP-4HMN-3	Object	<p>The housing allocation for Long Clawson is too large and would certainly damage the character and distinctiveness of the village - i.e. being contrary to the vision for the Borough as set out in the Local Plan. Villages should be allowed to develop gradually and naturally, encouraging large scale development creates estates and bolt-on communities and helps no one except the developers.</p>	<p>Long Clawson should be a secondary rural centre and not a primary rural centre</p>	<p>The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.</p>	<p>Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.</p>
Mr & Mrs J. Rogan	ANON-BHRP-4HMH-W	Object	<p>We object to the size of the Bottesford allocations and proposal to construct alongside the River Devon through the village which risk creating increased</p>	<p>Remove the Rectory Farm allocation in Bottesford.</p>	<p>This is being assessed as part of the Site assessment work for the Local Plan.</p>	

Chapter 5: Melton’s Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

			flooding risk for existing residents and will remove options for future management of water flow if global warming increases the incidence of flooding.			
Geoff Platts	ANON-BHRP-4HFU-3	Support with observations	<p>We note that new developments may need to be built outside of the existing urban area on greenfield sites, the development of brownfield sites is encouraged as it provides an opportunity to remove areas of contamination that would otherwise continue to present a risk to our environment, controlled waters and human health. It is important that adequate site investigation and remediation is carried out and groundwater issues are considered.</p>	<p>In the policy there is no mention of working with the water company to ensure development is in such a way that the growth occurs only where there is capacity or can be provided to ensure it would not result in a Water Framework Directive (WFD) deterioration.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth would not result in the need for an increased Dry Weather Flow application from STWL and a potential for a review of permit conditions. • It would be appreciated if there could be a standalone section mentioning the Water Framework Directive (WFD). We need to ensure that any activity will not jeopardise the improvement of the water bodies, or cause deterioration in status. The WFD requires that there is “no deterioration” in the water body status. In addition to “no deterioration” the WFD requires water bodies reach an overall designation of “Good Ecological Status” in inland and coastal waters by 2027. The WFD also requires all Artificial or Heavily Modified Water Bodies to achieve Good Ecological Potential. The status of a water body is measured across a number of elements. All elements must be at good ecological status or potential. <p>Could point 5 be amended to include "water efficiency"</p> <p>While Severn Trent Water is not classed as water stressed, Anglian Water is described as a seriously water stressed company (“Water stressed areas – final classification”, Environment Agency, July</p>	Noted. This is being addressed through Policy EN9 in the Environment Chapter.	Cross reference Policy EN9 with this criterion in Policy C1.

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

				<p>2013) and therefore the level of water efficiency would be better to be set at 110 litres/person/day (lpd).</p> <p>The Water Industry Act (1991) requires that all new buildings have a water meter installed. I would also be content to see in the Plan that any new flats will be individually metered. If one meter is installed for an entire block of flats it will reduce the incentive for occupiers in apartments to save water. This will help you achieve your CO2 emission targets.</p> <p>According to the Energy Saving Trust's Quantifying the energy and carbon effects of water saving summary report (2009), 89% of all emissions arising from the domestic water supply is attributable to use within the home. Having more efficient homes, particularly homes that are efficient with hot water use, will save carbon and benefit customers bills.</p>		
Nick Farrow	ANON-BHRP-4HUD-1	Support with observations	I do think that certain site have been allocated too much development.	Make the proportion of development according to local needs.	This is being looked at through the rigorous site assessment work and will be updated.	
Moira Hart	ANON-BHRP-4HU7-M	Object	<p>Long Clawson should NOT be classed as a Primary Rural Service Centre. It is unsustainable for large-scale development and only differs from many of the other villages by having the doctor's surgery.</p> <p>The village has already had a large amount of infill and the amenities (primary school, roads, parking and drainage) are at or beyond capacity.</p> <p>The section above notes 10 items that need to be fulfilled to support housing proposals; Long Clawson fails on 6 of the 10 items.</p> <p>Development in Long Clawson goes against item 3 and policy IN1 that the necessary infrastructure to support development will be available, the infrastructure is at capacity and has nowhere to expand.</p>	<p>Long Clawson should NOT be classified as a Primary Rural Service Centre. The whole classification scheme should be scrapped and apart from Bottesford and Asfordby all the other villages should be considered as a pool with only small-scale development allowed if it can be shown to be needed, sustainable and in support the existing infrastructure.</p>	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

			<p>Development in Long Clawson goes against item 6 as the transport impacts of development cannot be mitigated against without drastically improving public transport.</p> <p>It goes against item 7 as the public transport availability does not allow transport to any place of work except Melton Mowbray. Most people commute to work by car.</p> <p>For much of Long Clawson it goes against item 8 as the area has the greatest concentration of protected Great Crested Newt breeding ponds in the borough.</p> <p>It goes against item 9 of mitigating flooding. Long Clawson has a known and reported flood problem. Any development will exacerbate this problem (even with SUDS) on the south side of the village.</p> <p>It goes against item 10 for development in the historical and central parts of the village where both Heritage England and the Planning Appeals Inspector have objected to development.</p>			
Sarah mant	ANON-BHRP-4HUE-2	Support with observations	Development in the villages needs to be of a type and scale that suits each village	Consideration of public transport links and shop etc. when planning	This is being looked at through the updated Settlement Study work and the site assessment work. These look at the updated information on services and facilities in the villages.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.
CHRISTINE LARSON	ANON-BHRP-4HUU-J	Object	I dispute the suggestion that Long Clawson should be classed as a Primary Rural Centre. It is unsustainable for large-scale development and only differs from many of the other villages by having the doctor's surgery here. It DOES NOT have a bank, post office, convenience store or bus service to a higher order centre. Furthermore, the village has had a large amount of infill construction over the past 30 years to more than double its size. Consequently, the facilities (school, roads, parking and	The whole classification scheme should be scrapped and apart from Bottesford and Asfordby all the other Primary, Secondary and Supporter categories should be considered as a pool with development allowed if it can be shown to be needed, sustainable and in support the existing infrastructure, such as keeping school pupil numbers viable and supporting local shops and pubs.	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

		<p>drainage system) are at or beyond capacity (see the The Melton Local Plan Issues and Options: Infrastructure Delivery Plan which notes that Long Clawson School is at capacity). It is actually over capacity and new children to the village having to be schooled elsewhere.</p> <p>The section above notes 10 items that need to be fulfilled to support housing proposals; Long Clawson fails on 6 of the 10 items.</p> <p>Development in Long Clawson goes against item 3 and policy IN1 that the necessary infrastructure to support development will be available, the infrastructure is at capacity and has nowhere to expand.</p> <p>Development in Long Clawson goes against item 6 as the transport impacts of development cannot be mitigated against without drastically improving public transport.</p> <p>It goes against item 7 as the public transport availability does not allow transport to any place of work except Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>For much of Long Clawson it goes against item 8 as the area has the greatest concentration of protected Great Crested Newt breeding ponds in the Borough.</p> <p>It goes against item 9 of mitigating flooding as Long Clawson has a flood problem that will be aggravated by development (even with SUDS) on the south side of the village.</p> <p>It goes against item 10 for development in the historical and central parts of the village where both Heritage England and the Planning Appeals Inspector have objected to development.</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

Sarah Meadows	ANON-BHRP-4HE5-2	Object	<p>I do not agree with the housing allocation for Frisby on the Wreake. I moved to Frisby in August 2015 having spent 30 years living in busy cities and large towns working hard to save so I could move to a village with a better quality of life. I do not accept that anyone should be entitled to live 'affordably' in a small rural village - most of us have had to work long and hard to enjoy the peace and quiet of village life. This is what aspiration is all about. I also strongly reject the accusation that I am a 'Nimby'. I believe that villages such as this should be protected heritage villages. Conservation and green spaces are incredibly important to me, and more importantly to the British public. As a nation we flock to the countryside for our leisure pursuits, people want green spaces and pretty rural villages to visit on their time away from work. The RSPB and National Trust have more members than all the political parties which shows just how important the countryside and heritage is to us as a nation. Once it's gone, it's gone. Also, Frisby has circa 577 population, another 48 houses will mean between 50 - 200 additional residents, which is potentially over one third increase in a very short space of time. This will place an immense burden on the local infrastructure. I have particular concerns about proposed site 1 (Water Lane) as Water Lane, and Main Street, are at the heart of the 'old' village. Both 'roads' are already very busy in terms of traffic, and the type of traffic makes the road slow moving i.e. there are a lot of farm vehicles passing up and down as well as the bus. We experience bottle necks of traffic on a daily basis at the top of Water Lane, as the junction with Main Street. Water Lane is effectively one lane due to parking along one side for residents. There is also very limited parking for current residents (I often have to park on main street or even Rotherby Lane as there is no space on</p>	<p>I think that the secondary rural settlements should not have additional housing allocated, where it has been shown it is not required (Housing survey) and where amenities, services and infrastructure are limited. It is clear that people want houses where they work i.e. Melton / Leicester.</p>	<p>The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.</p> <p>Site assessment work which will look at each of the sites on individual basis and will select or reject a site based on its merits or demerits.</p>	<p>Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.</p>
---------------	------------------	--------	---	--	--	---

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

			<p>Water Lane available, especially when the village hall is in use which is frequent) - to build new houses which will rely on access via Water Lane would be a real burden to those already living there. At the very least there would have to be a residents parking scheme put into place. Additionally, there is the level crossing which means that traffic backs up along Water Lane early in the mornings and in the evenings due to trains crossing. There are also significant flood risks which could be exacerbated by further building. Furthermore, the post office parcel delivery service has been removed and the village pub has closed, just in the time we have lived here. The village school is full with no capacity (although other local schools i.e. Gaddesby have lots of space so perhaps they should have additional housing). The public transport system is poor, I have not needed to own a car until living here but it is now essential. The local GP services are under pressure. Most importantly, we know that a housing survey completed in 2014 made it clear that additional housing was not required in Frisby. In such a small village with very limited services, infrastructure and amenities it seems foolish to build what would amount to a housing estate in Frisby where it is not needed. Finally, having been to all the MBC and Parish council meetings on this subject there is a lot of resistance to the proposed housing development within the village and the majority of locals will do everything in their power to stop the development of 48 houses. However, many of us would have less objection to the development of 6-8 small properties.</p>			
Moira Hart	ANON-BHRP-4HBM-Q	Object	<p>We dispute the suggestion that Long Clawson should be classed as a Primary Rural Centre. It is unsustainable for large-scale development and only differs from many of the other villages by having the doctor's surgery here. Furthermore, the village has had a large amount of infill construction and the</p>	<p>Long Clawson should NOT be proposed as a Primary Rural Service Centre. The whole classification scheme should be scrapped and apart from Bottesford and Asfordby all the other Primary, Secondary and Supporter categories should be considered as a pool of villages with development allowed if it</p>	<p>The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.</p>	<p>Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.</p>

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

			<p>facilities (school, roads, parking and drainage system) are at or beyond capacity (see the The Melton Local Plan Issues and Options: Infrastructure Delivery Plan which notes that Long Clawson School is at capacity).</p> <p>The section above notes 10 items that need to be fulfilled to support housing proposals; Long Clawson fails on 6 of the 10 items.</p> <p>Development in Long Clawson goes against item 3 and policy IN1 that the necessary infrastructure to support development will be available, the infrastructure is at capacity and has nowhere to expand.</p> <p>Development in Long Clawson goes against item 6 as the transport impacts of development cannot be mitigated against without drastically improving public transport.</p> <p>It goes against item 7 as the public transport availability does not allow transport to any place of work except Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>For much of Long Clawson it goes against item 8 as the area has the greatest concentration of protected Great Crested Newt breeding ponds in the borough.</p> <p>It goes against item 9 of mitigating flooding as Long Clawson has a flood problem that will be aggravated by development (even with SUDS) on the south side of the village. A flood report for Long Clawson has recently been prepared that will form part of our Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>It goes against item 10 for development in the historical and central parts of the village where both Heritage England and the Planning Appeals Inspector have</p>	<p>can be shown to be needed, sustainable and in support the existing infrastructure, such as keeping school pupil numbers viable and supporting local shops and pubs.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

			objected to development.			
Kenneth Bray	ANON-BHRP-4HBX-2	Object	Is it 37 houses or 50 houses for Stathern? See earlier comments. Also a recent survey has established that there is no local support for a large site in the village, although the overall total over 20 years is supported. This is probably because we have history of large sites. In 1990-93 we had a new estate of 53 houses added to the village and this took a long time to assimilate and become part of the village. Although it helped the Primary school numbers (it had to have an extension built to accommodate numbers) the vast majority of the residents (including secondary age children) commute out of the village every day.	Large sites in village to be justified as exceptions not targeted. Melton is the only rural borough locally to actively promote developments in villages rather than allowing them where necessary.	The tables in the document are the indicative requirement based on past build trends/population numbers etc and the actual to be allocated shown in the Policy. However this work in being looked at through the site assessment work and will be reflected in the Submission Plan which will be consulted upon for 6 weeks.	A clearer explanation will be required in the supporting text in the document explaining the different figures in the tables.
Susan Herlihy	ANON-BHRP-4HE3-Z	Support with observations	The infra structure in the north of the town would be unable to take the number of houses suggested	No housing north or south without a proper ring road not just a link road!	Noted.	
Leon Gustard	ANON-BHRP-4HBA-B	Object	<p>I can see no reason whatsoever why an additional 300 houses are required in Bottesford.</p> <p>This will have a devastating impact on the quality of life within the village.</p> <p>The primary school is already oversubscribed.</p> <p>Public transport links to the village are barely adequate.</p> <p>Pinfold Lane and the high street are very busy and congested during daylight hours.</p> <p>The exit onto the A52 at the west of the village is extremely dangerous - the additional traffic created by 300+ homes will make it considerably worse.</p> <p>The quality of life of those adjacent to the proposed site will be severely impacted due to the increase in noise, traffic and loss of their natural aspect.</p> <p>There is already an ongoing development of 70+ houses in the village (the wickets) that was railroaded in</p>	Apply some common sense and develop on brown field sites with existing infrastructure, rather than take the easy option of concreting over green land.	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village. Being a rural district there are not as much brownfield sites.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

			against huge opposition. We don't need or want any more.			
Finola M Delamere	BHLF-BHRP-4HBJ-M	Object	(P.10 of the Summary Draft Document) I think it is unrealistic to plan to build 50 homes in Croxton Kerrial as it has few services. The bus service does not run at times to match working hours in the local towns - or for it to be possible to use public transport for entertainment in the evenings. It has no shop.	(P.10 of the Summary Draft Document) I think the House Needs Survey which determined a need for up to 14 affordable homes could more easily be accommodated without destroying the village character	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village. Noted.	
Deborah Caroline Adams	ANON-BHRP-4H38-K	Object	There is little hope in the Town of Melton of meeting points 3, 6 and 7 above which are about policy IN1 which is on page 150 of the Draft Local Plan unless a bypass is built.	Something more than just lip service to a Melton bypass. The CIL should have been sorted by now and road infrastructure and the Melton bypass should have been included in CIL payments.	This is being addressed through Policy IN1.	
Anthony Paphiti	ANON-BHRP-4HBV-Z	Object	I have commented variously before. The project is way too ambitious and I am not persuaded that such a huge amount of housing is needed.	I have commented variously before. The project is way too ambitious and I am not persuaded that such a huge amount of housing is needed.	The housing need is based on the evidence.	
Piers Geraint Hardiman	ANON-BHRP-4HU4-H	Object	Stathern should be designated a rural supporter not a secondary rural settlement	Stathern should be designated a rural supporter	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	
Shelagh Woollard	ANON-BHRP-4HB5-Y	Support with observations	Bottesford must surely reach its capacity as a village with the dwellings proposed.	A higher percentage of dwellings in Melton Mowbray.	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	
Neil Meadows	ANON-BHRP-4H6M-B	Object	Melton Borough Council opted for the highest option, with regard to the number of newly built houses in the borough. Once the land in Melton and surrounding villages has been built on it is gone forever. Melton won't be able to trade off its rural capital of England, it will just be another soulless suburban town. The allocation of houses to the small surrounding villages is excessive and will trash the beautiful rural landscapes forever.	Overall reduction in the number of houses proposed to be built. Specifically with regard to the housing allocation for my home village Frisby on the Wreake: an allocation of what will be essentially a whole new estate, likely to add a third to the population is not sustainable. The previous survey identifying the need for rural housing suggested an allocation of 6 houses for Frisby - not 48!!!	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.
Melanie Steadman	ANON-BHRP-4HFE-K	Object	I object to the housing allocation and the identification of Primary Rural Centres.	More evenly spread development across rural locations. More consideration to sustainability and not decisions based purely on amenities. Consultation with residents. Custom built communities	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

				with adequate infrastructure.	There is a policy on custom and self-build in this chapter – Policy C8	
Valerie Lever	ANON-BHRP-4HZY-U	Support with observations	Not able to make a judgement about some of these places	See above	Noted.	
Martin smith	ANON-BHRP-4H6A-Y	Object	Frisby criteria points do not add up to any more than a rural supporter status. is has a poor bus service, no pub and one small shop	Correct the Frisby village classification in line with your criteria	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.
Louise odonogue	ANON-BHRP-4H66-M	Object	I think that the Secondary rural locations are being asked to accommodate too much of the quota there are similar locations such as Eastwell which are currently similar but have no quota	More of the quota allocated to Melton, around 80%	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.
Christopher Fisher	ANON-BHRP-4HM2-7	Support with observations	As a Somerby resident, I believe no developments should be approved before the parish neighbourhood plan is completed and priorities/preferences agreed.		This is looked at by Development Management that determine individual applications.	
Robert Anthony Fionda	ANON-BHRP-4H13-C	Support with observations	<p>The mix of dwellings should be across the entire range from 5 bed down. Since 1991 only 28% of new builds have had 4 bedrooms or more, between 2001 and 2011 there has been a 50% reduction in homes with 4 bedrooms or more so family housing is being squeezed. This is particularly the case in villages where demand for smaller homes is poor and demand for larger homes is very high resulting in price escalation along the supply /demand curve.</p> <p>Affordable housing in villages works best on exception sites and all villages ought to be encouraged to provide these not just the few that have already been proactive.</p>	As above.	Housing Policies C2 (Housing mix) and Policy C4 (Affordable housing provision) address these issues. There is also an updated Housing Needs Study that has been done and will inform these policies.	
Richard Simon	ANON-BHRP-4HUB-Y	Object		Growth should be centred on Melton Mowbray and locations close to Melton Mowbray. Development centred on Melton Mowbray will give greater impetus to infrastructure reinforcement particularly the ring road which seems to be desired by all but only a part of which is envisaged in the plan. Building in villages close to Melton Mowbray will reduce the travel necessary for those who use Melton Mowbray as their main centre. It will allow the shopping experience to improve and may gain	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.

				<p>trade currently going to Leicester, Loughborough etc. At least 70% of new housing development should take place in Melton Mowbray and villages nearby as that would be the most sustainable option. It would also increase the chances of growing Melton's knowledge based economy and thereby produce higher waged employment opportunities.</p> <p>5.4.14(p59) Bottesford does indeed feature a regular bus service to higher order centres, but it is infrequent and generally slow.</p> <p>Timetables indicate – Bottesford to Melton 9 per day each way taking 50-65 minutes dependant on route taken for the 14 miles, which would be the distance if a more direct route was taken.</p> <p>Bottesford-Grantham 12 per day each way Monday to Friday and 8 on Saturday Bottesford to Bingham (connection to Nottingham) morning and evening commuter run only No day service Bottesford to Newark – Effectively none; it is possible to get to Newark but not to return.</p> <p>Muston has 1 bus per day and Normanton has no bus service</p> <p>SA objectives correction- The current bus timetable shows that the bus journey to Melton takes 50-65 minutes depending on the route, not the 45 minutes claimed in the assessment.</p> <p>5.4.18 (p60)</p> <p>Table 7 (P61) and Table 8 (P63) show a substantial mismatch between the potential site housing capacity and the indicative requirement: Location : Potential Capacity/Indicative Requirement Asfordby : 177/224</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

				<p>Bottesford : 283/300 Long Clawson : 267/122 Waltham : 294/67</p> <p>Asfordby Hill : 121/39 Croxton Kerrial : 119/45 Frisby : 40/48 Somerby : 59/34 Stathern : 0/40 Wymondham : 186/37</p> <p>This indicates that Waltham and Long Clawson have more land suitable for housing than is required, whereas Asfordby and Bottesford do not have enough. Furthermore, in these latter villages 'development options are restricted by areas.....at risk of flooding'. In contrast, Waltham on the Wolds has an excess of suitable SHLAA sites, no flood problem and is located near to Melton Mowbray where it might be expected that additional housing could have a positive impact on the economy of the town. Similarly Asfordby Hill, Croxton Kerrial and Wymondham also have more land than currently required for housing.</p> <p>The sustainability of Bottesford in general is questionable. Bottesford is very low lying - It's not called Bottes-ford for nothing. There are two fords in the village. It is surrounded by Flood Zones 2 and 3 and was seriously flooded in 2001. The village centre is small. The location of the school causes congestion at peak times when buses are entering and leaving via the narrow Barkestone Lane corner with the High St and schoolchildren are crossing. Further development of Bottesford will not improve the economy of Melton Mowbray. Villagers tend to use Grantham, Newark and Nottingham for employment, retail and leisure facilities. The Melton Local Plan does not identify the increase in people of school age which would result if additional housing were to be built, nor the capacity of both of the Schools at Bottesford to absorb</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

				<p>them. Whether or not there is a need for additional school buildings is unknown. In particular, expansion of the primary school on its current site seems to be severely restricted.</p> <p>Similarly the two Doctors Surgeries capacities to absorb extra workload is unknown but one of the surgeries has recently started to apply limits on attendances. It is noted that in Appendix 3 item 23 there would appear to be a plan to extend one of the surgeries to 180 Square metres.</p>		
Richard Simon	ANON-BHRP-4HZC-5	Object		<p>Growth should be centred on Melton Mowbray and locations close to Melton Mowbray. Development centred on Melton Mowbray will give greater impetus to infrastructure reinforcement particularly the ring road which seems to be desired by all but only a part of which is envisaged in the plan. Building in villages close to Melton Mowbray will reduce the travel necessary for those who use Melton Mowbray as their main centre. It will allow the shopping experience to improve and may gain trade currently going to Leicester, Loughborough etc.</p> <p>At least 70% of new housing development should take place in Melton Mowbray and villages nearby as that would be the most sustainable option. It would also increase the chances of growing Melton's knowledge based economy and thereby produce higher waged employment opportunities.</p> <p>5.4.14(p59) Bottesford does indeed feature a regular bus service to higher order centres, but it is infrequent and generally slow.</p> <p>Timetables indicate – Bottesford to Melton 9 per day each way taking 50-65 minutes dependant on route taken for the 14 miles, which would be the distance if a more direct route was taken. Bottesford-Grantham 12 per day each</p>	<p>The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.</p>	<p>Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.</p>

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

				<p>way Monday to Friday and 8 on Saturday Bottesford to Bingham (connection to Nottingham) morning and evening commuter run only No day service Bottesford to Newark – Effectively none; it is possible to get to Newark but not to return.</p> <p>Muston has 1 bus per day and Normanton has no bus service</p> <p>SA objectives correction- The current bus timetable shows that the bus journey to Melton takes 50-65 minutes depending on the route, not the 45 minutes claimed in the assessment.</p> <p>Table 7 (P61) and Table 8 (P63) show a substantial mismatch between the potential site housing capacity and the indicative requirement: Location : Potential Capacity/Indicative Requirement Asfordby : 177/224 Bottesford : 283/300 Long Clawson : 267/122 Waltham : 294/67</p> <p>Asfordby Hill : 121/39 Croxton Kerrial : 119/45 Frisby : 40/48 Somerby : 59/34 Stathern : 0/40 Wymondham : 186/37</p> <p>This indicates that Waltham and Long Clawson have more land suitable for housing than is required, whereas Asfordby and Bottesford do not have enough. Furthermore, in these latter villages 'development options are restricted by areas.....at risk of flooding'. In contrast, Waltham on the Wolds has an excess of suitable SHLAA sites, no flood problem and is located near to Melton Mowbray where it might be expected that additional housing could have a positive impact on the economy of the town. Similarly Asfordby Hill, Croxton Kerrial and Wymondham also</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

				<p>have more land than currently required for housing.</p> <p>The sustainability of Bottesford in general is questionable. Bottesford is very low lying - It's not called Bottes-ford for nothing. There are two fords in the village. It is surrounded by Flood Zones 2 and 3 and was seriously flooded in 2001. The village centre is small. The location of the school causes congestion at peak times when buses are entering and leaving via the narrow Barkestone Lane corner with the High St and schoolchildren are crossing. Further development of Bottesford will not improve the economy of Melton Mowbray. Villagers tend to use Grantham, Newark and Nottingham for employment, retail and leisure facilities. The Melton Local Plan does not identify the increase in people of school age which would result if additional housing were to be built, nor the capacity of both of the Schools at Bottesford to absorb them. Whether or not there is a need for additional school buildings is unknown. In particular, expansion of the primary school on its current site seems to be severely restricted.</p> <p>Similarly the two Doctors Surgeries capacities to absorb extra workload is unknown but one of the surgeries has recently started to apply limits on attendances. It is noted that in Appendix 3 item 23 there would appear to be a plan to extend one of the surgeries to 180 square metres.</p>		
Richard Simon	ANON-BHRP-4H1W-G	Object		<p>Growth should be centred on Melton Mowbray and locations close to Melton Mowbray. Development centred on Melton Mowbray will give greater impetus to infrastructure reinforcement particularly the ring road which seems to be desired by all but only a part of which is envisaged in the plan. Building in villages close to Melton Mowbray will reduce the travel necessary for those who use Melton Mowbray as their main</p>	<p>The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.</p>	<p>Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.</p>

				<p>centre. It will allow the shopping experience to improve and may gain trade currently going to Leicester, Loughborough etc.</p> <p>At least 70% of new housing development should take place in Melton Mowbray and villages nearby as that would be the most sustainable option. It would also increase the chances of growing Melton's knowledge based economy and thereby produce higher waged employment opportunities.</p> <p>5.4.14(p59) Bottesford does indeed feature a regular bus service to higher order centres, but it is infrequent and generally slow.</p> <p>Timetables indicate – Bottesford to Melton 9 per day each way taking 50-65 minutes dependant on route taken for the 14 miles, which would be the distance if a more direct route was taken. Bottesford-Grantham 12 per day each way Monday to Friday and 8 on Saturday Bottesford to Bingham (connection to Nottingham) morning and evening commuter run only No day service Bottesford to Newark – Effectively none; it is possible to get to Newark but not to return.</p> <p>Muston has 1 bus per day and Normanton has no bus service</p> <p>SA objectives correction- The current bus timetable shows that the bus journey to Melton takes 50-65 minutes depending on the route, not the 45 minutes claimed in the assessment. 5.4.18 (p60)</p> <p>Table 7 (P61) and Table 8 (P63) show a substantial mismatch between the potential site housing capacity and the indicative requirement: Location : Potential Capacity/Indicative Requirement Asfordby : 177/224</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

				<p>Bottesford : 283/300 Long Clawson : 267/122 Waltham : 294/67</p> <p>Asfordby Hill : 121/39 Croxton Kerrial : 119/45 Frisby : 40/48 Somerby : 59/34 Stathern : 0/40 Wymondham : 186/37</p> <p>This indicates that Waltham and Long Clawson have more land suitable for housing than is required, whereas Asfordby and Bottesford do not have enough. Furthermore, in these latter villages 'development options are restricted by areas.....at risk of flooding'. In contrast, Waltham on the Wolds has an excess of suitable SHLAA sites, no flood problem and is located near to Melton Mowbray where it might be expected that additional housing could have a positive impact on the economy of the town. Similarly Asfordby Hill, Croxton Kerrial and Wymondham also have more land than currently required for housing.</p> <p>The sustainability of Bottesford in general is questionable. Bottesford is very low lying - It's not called Bottes-ford for nothing. There are two fords in the village. It is surrounded by Flood Zones 2 and 3 and was seriously flooded in 2001. The village centre is small. The location of the school causes congestion at peak times when buses are entering and leaving via the narrow Barkestone Lane corner with the High St and schoolchildren are crossing. Further development of Bottesford will not improve the economy of Melton Mowbray. Villagers tend to use Grantham, Newark and Nottingham for employment, retail and leisure facilities. The Melton Local Plan does not identify the increase in people of school age which would result if additional housing were to be built, nor the capacity of both of the Schools at Bottesford to absorb</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

				<p>them. Whether or not there is a need for additional school buildings is unknown. In particular, expansion of the primary school on its current site seems to be severely restricted.</p> <p>Similarly the two Doctors Surgeries capacities to absorb extra workload is unknown but one of the surgeries has recently started to apply limits on attendances. It is noted that in Appendix 3 item 23 there would appear to be a plan to extend one of the surgeries to 180 square metres.</p>		
JOHN RUST	ANON-BHRP-4HUV-K	Object	<p>Extract:</p> <p>We dispute the suggestion that Long Clawson should be classed as a Primary Rural Centre. It is unsustainable for large-scale development and only differs from many of the other villages by having the doctor's surgery here. Furthermore, the village has had a large amount of infill construction and the facilities (school, roads, parking and drainage system) are at or beyond capacity (see the The Melton Local Plan Issues and Options: Infrastructure Delivery Plan which notes that Long Clawson School is at capacity).</p> <p>The section above notes 10 items that need to be fulfilled to support housing proposals; Long Clawson fails on 6 of the 10 items.</p> <p>Development in Long Clawson goes against item 3 and policy IN1 that the necessary infrastructure to support development will be available, the infrastructure is at capacity and has nowhere to expand.</p> <p>Development in Long Clawson goes against item 6 as the transport impacts of development cannot be mitigated against without drastically improving public transport.</p> <p>It goes against item 7 as the public</p>	<p>Extract:</p> <p>Long Clawson should be reclassified as a Secondary Rural Centre. Alternatively, the whole classification scheme should be scrapped and apart from Bottesford and Asfordby all the other Primary, Secondary and Supporter categories should be considered as a pool with development allowed if it can be shown to be needed, sustainable and in support the existing infrastructure, such as keeping school pupil numbers viable and supporting local shops and pubs.</p> <p>I dispute the suggestion that Long Clawson should be classed as a Primary Rural Centre. It is unsustainable for large-scale development and only differs from many of the other villages by having the doctor's surgery here. It DOES NOT have a bank, post office, convenience store or bus service to a higher order centre. Furthermore, the village has had a large amount of infill construction over the past 30 years to more than double its size. Consequently, the facilities (school, roads, parking and drainage system) are at or beyond capacity (see the The Melton Local Plan Issues and Options: Infrastructure Delivery Plan which notes that Long Clawson School is at capacity). It is actually over capacity and new children to the village having to be schooled</p>	<p>The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.</p> <p>The Site assessment study looks at detailed assessment of each site which looks at constraints and the facilities in the villages/ each individual site.</p>	<p>Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.</p>

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

			<p>transport availability does not allow transport to any place of work except Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>For much of Long Clawson it goes against item 8 as the area has the greatest concentration of protected Great Crested Newt breeding ponds in the borough.</p> <p>It goes against item 9 of mitigating flooding as Long Clawson has a flood problem that will be aggravated by development (even with SUDS) on the south side of he village.</p> <p>It goes against item 10 for development in the historical and central parts of the village where both Heritage England and the Planning Appeals Inspector have objected to development.</p>	<p>elsewhere.</p> <p>The section above notes 10 items that need to be fulfilled to support housing proposals; Long Clawson fails on 6 of the 10 items. Development in Long Clawson goes against item 3 and policy IN1 that the necessary infrastructure to support development will be available, the infrastructure is at capacity and has nowhere to expand.</p> <p>Development in Long Clawson goes against item 6 as the transport impacts of development cannot be mitigated against without drastically improving public transport.</p> <p>It goes against item 7 as the public transport availability does not allow transport to any place of work except Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>For much of Long Clawson it goes against item 8 as the area has the greatest concentration of protected Great Crested Newt breeding ponds in the Borough.</p> <p>It goes against item 9 of mitigating flooding as Long Clawson has a flood problem that will be aggravated by development (even with SUDS) on the south side of he village.</p> <p>It goes against item 10 for development in the historical and central parts of the village where both Heritage England and the Planning Appeals Inspector have objected to development.</p> <p>Change</p> <p>The whole classification scheme should be scrapped and apart from Bottesford and Asfordby all the other Primary, Secondary and Supporter categories should be considered as a pool with development allowed if it can be shown to be needed, sustainable and in support</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

				the existing infrastructure, such as keeping school pupil numbers viable and supporting local shops and pubs.		
Sharon Gustard	ANON-BHRP-4H6K-9	Object	<p>No evidence of the necessary infrastructure required to support development in accordance with policy IN1.</p> <p>The proposal will not only heavily impact the volume of traffic within the Bottesford village boundaries and therefore does not have measures to adequately mitigate any adverse transport impacts but will also increase noise pollution with the increased use of the concrete road surface of the A52 near Bottesford, which is audible from most parts of the village. The A52 is already a main artery connecting the A1 with the east coast and ports carrying many HGVs. It is recognised that Bottesford will attract people in from the Nottingham area and therefore it can be assumed they will continue to work in that region. The development has potential to further increase the volume of traffic between Grantham and Nottingham; making it more dangerous for road users and residents of the villages/towns which are passed en route. Access to the A52 at the west of Bottesford will be much more congested and create travel delays at peak times.</p> <p>The promotion of Bottesford as a commuter village for Nottingham will encourage residents to be travelling 45-60 minutes each way to their work destinations by car. This conflicts with government initiatives to reduce car usage and also as a result increase the pollution directly as a result. The level of public transport available does not support these sorts of journeys; particularly to take into account families who also have to fit in childcare arrangements before and after school hours.</p> <p>The designated site is located next to the</p>	<p>Confirmed increase in accessible public transport at times to assist working parents.</p> <p>Smaller developments of no more than 30 houses only approved to maintain the village community.</p> <p>Promote one or more of the Secondary Rural Service centres to a Primary RSC to make their services more widely available to residents in the Vale of Belvoir, to the north of Melton.</p>	<p>The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.</p> <p>The Site assessment study looks at detailed assessment of each site which looks at constraints and the facilities in the villages/ each individual site.</p>	<p>Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.</p>

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

			River Devon and therefore liable to flooding; with an increased risk once built on.			
John Matthew Williams	ANON-BHRP-4HBD-E	Support with observations	Please see other comments	Please see other comments: changes to this policy would be consequential to changes to others	Noted.	
Paul Girdham	ANON-BHRP-4H1T-D	Object	<p>I disagree the Long Clawson should be a Primary Rural settlement.</p> <p>Elsewhere, you mention employment in Melton Mowbray and encouraging employment in Melton by allocating suitable land. For Long Clawson, there is no such encouragement for employment and in fact I understand that one of the bigger employers (KS Composites) is about to move out (to Hose).</p> <p>Where does that leave your encouragement to use public transport, cycling and walking?</p> <p>The centre of Melton is run-down. It is full of charity shops and cheap £1 shops and the like. It needs more people to use the facilities, not less.</p>	<p>Move Long Clawson to a Secondary Rural settlement.</p> <p>Allow small and very small scale building in villages gradually so that the villages can adapt and absorb changes slowly.</p>	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.
Colin Love	ANON-BHRP-4HBR-V	Object	<p>As mentioned in responses to earlier sections, the allocation to Bottesford is disproportionately large... Just because it is already a substantial parish with a range of facilities does not mean that, without question, it can, or should, absorb more development. Indeed, with it being on the highest EA flood category, there is every reason to avoid any further development in the parish.</p> <p>That said, am I correct in noting that this section refers to 300 houses for Bottesford whereas in other sections that figure has been increased to 370? Any such increase must be resisted.</p> <p>Again as referred to in another section, the outline proposal for a 'Model Village' at Six Hills provides the opportunity for MBC to completely review the present allocation proposals.</p>	See above - with particular reference to Six Hills and the reduction of the allocation to Bottesford.	<p>The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.</p> <p>Six Hills is a part of Policy SS6 (Review Policy) in the Local Plan.</p>	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.
Alan and Heather	ANON-BHRP-	Object	Because Long Clawson is currently incorrectly classified as a Primary Rural	Reclassify Long Clawson as a Secondary Rural Service Centre. Make it's target 50	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

Woodhouse	4HMQ-6		Service Centre in contradiction of the set guidelines.	<p>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. i.e. Normanton Airfield, Dalby Airfield and Six Hills</p>	Settlement Roles. This study will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	
Anthony Edward Maher	ANON-BHRP-4HUS-G	Support with observations	With reference to the Northern Sustainable Neighbourhood: Any building in the close vicinity of the country park should be such as not to Dominate the landscape.		This is being addressed through policies in the Environment Chapter.	
N W Hoskins	ANON-BHRP-4H1F-Y	Object	<p>I object strongly to the number of additional houses being allocated arbitrarily to Frisby. The proposal to construct a further 40-50 houses in a village of less than 600 persons will mean a 20% increase in population, an increase far greater in percentage terms than in comparable areas contained in the Melton Local Plan. It is my understanding that three sites have been put forward by landowners for development. All three have previously been described as being "in particularly attractive country side" and that further housing would be allowed only if there were to be "no adverse effect on the character and appearance of the landscaping". It is a fact also that at least two of the three sites are Grade 3 agriculture land. The expansion of the village on the scale suggested would be to its irrevocable detriment, and two of the three sites being on high ground, clearly visible from the A 607, if accepted, would alter both the landscape and the character of the village in particular.</p>	<p>First and foremost one cannot help but question the need for the six secondary villages to have IMPOSED upon them some 300 additional houses. Whilst there is an obvious dictate on high about future housing requirements, such need, in the Melton Borough area, must be focused on Melton town itself, not in outlying areas where additional housing can lead only to additional commuting, be it to Melton, Leicester or Nottingham. Following the failure of the original Melton Local Plan, the percentage of prescribed development for Melton alone, has been reduced from 80% to 65%!!! One cannot help but question 'why' when a more than adequate BROWNFIELD site is available i.e. Dalby Airfield, which could assimilate comfortably not only the Secondary Villages, but also much of those of the Primary areas. Moreover, affordable housing could be easier to provide on, what effectively, would be a Melton satellite village..</p> <p>Returning to the proposed Frisby allocation, I am reminded that "secondary villages" were established on a facility principle - Pub, school and shop! Well the Frisby pub has now closed, having had numerous tenants in recent years, the local school, is full, and the shop/post office has recently lost its sorting office, which must question the long term viability of that outlet. As a final point, I consider a maximum of 12 additional houses would be acceptable in a village, described only</p>	<p>The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.</p> <p>The Site assessment study looks at detailed assessment of each site which looks at constraints and the facilities in the villages/ each individual site.</p> <p>Policy SS6 (Review Policy) addresses this.</p>	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

				this week by the Leicester Mercury as an "Historic Village of Older World Charm". 12 such additional houses could be quite easily contained in Woods Yard on Rotherby Rd behind Zion House, a grade 2 listed building currently in need of desperate repair and refurbishment.		
Mick Jones	ANON-BHRP-4H6N-C	Support with observations	I would support the developments above, only as long as it has the full support of the villages concerned.	None	Noted.	
Paul Laurance	ANON-BHRP-4HGH-Q	Object		Don't agree with Secondary Rural Supporters, think that the villages should be one category.		
Andrew Robert Bickle	ANON-BHRP-4HGA-G	Object	<p>I feel this is probably the most objectionable part of the proposed plan. My objections to it include:</p> <p>1) With respect, in my view it is fundamentally wrong for Long Clawson to be categorised a primary rural settlement. It is very different from the other proposed primary settlements. This large amount of new housing will change the character of the village more than the other proposed primary rural settlements. Long Clawson is more similar to settlements like Harby and Whissendine which are not proposed to be categorised this way.</p> <p>2) The roads accessing Long Clawson are not suitable for it to be a primary rural settlement. All the other proposed primary rural settlements are on major roads ('A' roads or 'B' roads). The extra traffic generated both in construction and when built would be inappropriate for the roads serving Long Clawson.</p> <p>3) The roads within Long Clawson and the village layout makes it unsuitable for this amount of extra housing. The main road through the village is very winding (indeed, the village is famed for the number of right-angle bends through it). Charming though this can be, at already it is very congested and, at times, dangerous to traverse by vehicles and pedestrians, particularly just to the east</p>	Long Clawson should not be categorised as a primary rural settlement. I would be reasonable for it to be categorised a secondary rural settlement with a housing allocation of about 40.	<p>The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.</p> <p>The Site assessment study looks at detailed assessment of each site which looks at constraints and the facilities in the villages/ each individual site.</p>	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

			<p>of the pub, around the junction between School Lane and Back Lane and close to access to the dairy.</p> <p>4) Parking at The Sands is already overflowing often and people do drive there from Long Clawson owing to infirmity and the layout of the village. With extra housing there would inevitably be demands to turn some of the green spaces around there into parking spaces. This would be of disbenefit to our children who play there and would also further urbanise our village.</p> <p>5) The school could not cope with the additional children that would live in this large amount of additional housing. The school is very overcrowded and cannot easily expand on its current site save to the detriment of the conditions there (building on the playground). I am very concerned about the education of my children who attend this school and other children from the village who will do so in the future. Last parents' evening we learnt to our disappointment, but not surprise, that my eldest son is being taught some lessons in the corridor. This in the year he should be preparing for entrance exams to secondary schools. This is not decent. The school cannot expand decently on the current site and we do not want a new school elsewhere in the village building on yet more countryside.</p>			
Angus Walker	ANON-BHRP-4HB4-X	Support with observations	There should be more Secondary Rural Settlements		Noted and is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.
Craig Eaton	ANON-BHRP-4HGU-4	Object	I object to the amount of new houses for Bottesford as they will overly stretch the services offered in the village and there simply isn't the space for them all without significant harm to the rural nature of the village. Also, I don't feel the schools can cope with these extra	Reduction in the amount of houses for Bottesford.	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

			houses being built as they are already struggling currently with mixed ages/levels of children in the same classes, as I have children at both the preschool and the primary school and can see the problems that exist currently.			
Colin Wilkinson	ANON-BHRP-4HGY-8	Other		<p>Asfordby Parish Council has made good progress with the preparation of the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan. It has successfully applied to Melton Borough Council to be designated a Neighbourhood Area, and a Parish Profile and other evidence has been prepared. Local residents and school children have already had a chance to influence the Plan. Consultation on a Pre-Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan has recently ended and the plan is due to be submitted very soon.</p> <p>National Planning Practice Guidance gives advice on the relationship between the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans (Paragraph: 013 Reference ID: 12-013-20140306). The Guidance states that 'where a neighbourhood plan has been made, the local planning authority should take it into account when preparing the Local Plan strategy and policies, and avoid duplicating the policies that are in the neighbourhood plan.' It is very likely that the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan will be 'made' in advance of the adoption of the Melton Local Plan. Accordingly, the Parish Council expects the new Melton Local Plan to do more to recognise the status of the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan and ensure that Local Plan Policies are consistent with it and do not duplicate its policies or proposals.</p> <p>In particular, we expect housing land allocations and their proposed capacity to reflect the approach being proposed by the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan as far as Asfordby village and Asfordby Hill is concerned.</p>	Noted.	A more robust explanation in the supporting text in the starting chapters is needed to establish clearly the relationship between the Neighbourhood Plans and the Local Plan.

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

David A Haston	ANON- BHRP- 4HG5-4	Object	<p>It is considered that a greater proportion of housing should be directed towards Long Clawson given that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it benefits from a good range of services and facilities; - it has a significant range of employers and proportionally more than within the other Primary Rural Service Centres, resulting in a relative imbalance between employment opportunities and local workforce, the consequence of which is the level of commuting into the village. Additional housing at Long Clawson would provide an opportunity to address this imbalance and help to create a more sustainable community; - The relatively small number of completions over the period 1994 to 2014 is as a direct consequence of restraints imposed by previous Development Plan policies as opposed to market demand or need for housing. Less weight should therefore be attributed to this criteria in the consideration of housing numbers within the emerging plan if the historic imbalance between employment and housing is to be addressed. Otherwise this historic problem will be perpetuated. - Unlike some other Centres, there are sufficient suitable and identified housing sites to meet a target of between 200 and 250 houses over the plan period. 	Increase the number of dwellings proposed at Long Clawson to between 200 and 250 dwellings (e.g. 225)	<p>The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.</p> <p>The Site assessment study looks at detailed assessment of each site which looks at constraints and the facilities in the villages/ each individual sites.</p>	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.
Colin Wilkinson	ANON- BHRP- 4HHN-X	Support with observations		The Glebe Road site should be identified as the preferred housing allocation for Wymondham. Wymondham is a sustainable village and there is good access from the Glebe Road site to its services and facilities. There is a shop with post office, public house, primary school, nursery and village hall all within reasonable walking distance. There is also a bus stop close to the site with a bus service to Melton Mowbray and Oakham and the higher order services	<p>Noted. And is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.</p> <p>The Site assessment study looks at detailed assessment of each site which looks at constraints and the facilities in the villages/ each individual site.</p>	

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

				<p>available in those towns. Residents of the site would have a realistic option of travelling to a good range of services and facilities by walking, cycling or using public transport.</p> <p>The Glebe Road site lies on the edge of the village and is currently the subject of outline planning application 15/00832/OUT for up to 15 dwellings. This would represent a modest extension of development into the countryside. The site is relatively unconstrained in landscape and visual terms while the scale of development proposed is consistent with the amount of housing suggested for Wymondham. Consideration can be given to extending the site should the need arise.</p> <p>Subject to appropriate conditions and the planning obligations there are no design or technical objections to the proposed development and nor would it have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Any harmful impact it would have on local infrastructure can be overcome by planning obligation.</p> <p>The proposed development would provide a number of economic, social and environmental benefits, not least a significant boost to the area's supply of houses, including a range of affordable dwellings. A living, working countryside depends, in part, on retaining local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of these local facilities.</p>		
<p>Cllr Martin Lusty</p>	<p>ANON-BHRP-4HBZ-4</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>See comments on numbers of dwellings and split between settlements in Chapter 4.</p>	<p>As above.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
<p>Nicholas John Walker</p>	<p>ANON-BHRP-4HGC-J</p>	<p>Support</p>		<p>Somerby Parish</p> <p>These numbers should only be achieved if proven and only through small infill numbers 6no maximum.</p>	<p>Noted. And is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in</p>	

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

				<p>This is to ensure the infrastructure and services although inadequate can cope with the increase and not detrimental to the "brand"</p>	<p>the village.</p> <p>The Site assessment study looks at detailed assessment of each site which looks at constraints and the facilities in the villages/ each individual site.</p>	
Colin Wilkinson	ANON-BHRP-4HHA-H	Support with observations		<p>The Earl of Rutland and Dr Fleming's Hospital Trust is promoting the development of the Rectory Farm site on behalf of a consortium of landowners. We can confirm that the site is suitable and developable.</p> <p>The site is well located in relation to Bottesford's services and facilities. The village centre, railway station, shops, schools, bus services, healthcare services and employment areas are all within reasonable walking distance of the site. The majority of the site is Flood Risk Zone 1.</p> <p>The site is well contained by the existing built-up area of Bottesford, disused railway line and the Grantham to Nottingham railway. As a consequence the impact of development on the wider landscape is limited. There are no significant heritage or biodiversity constraints.</p> <p>The site has multiple access points which allow good connectivity with the rest of the village.</p> <p>Following public consultation in December 2015, the site has emerged at the local community's preferred major housing growth option for the village. We understand that the site has been endorsed by the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Group as its preferred development option.</p> <p>We are now working with the Neighbourhood Plan Group and other local people on the Master planning of the site.</p> <p>Given the demonstrable local support</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

				for this housing development option, which is the only suitable site identified for Bottesford in the Draft Melton Local Plan, we consider that the site should be allocated for residential development.		
Richard Laurence John LING	ANON-BHRP-4HHH-R	Object	<p>Objections are raised to the Rectory Farm, Bottesford proposal ref MBC057/13 for the following reasons</p> <p>1. Access Issues and Problems - the allocation requires the construction of a new road down part of a disused railway line and building a bridge over the River Devon. The new road would require the closing off of Bowbridge Lane at its junction with Longhedge Lane to through traffic. In traffic terms this would cause problems to the NO6 bus service which uses Bowbridge Lane and Longhedge Lane to turn round to travel back to Grantham. The Longhedge lane/Nottingham Road junction has been described as unsatisfactory because of limited visibility for drivers looking left towards the village centre due to the humpback of the old railway bridge on Nottingham Road. If the proposed site is developed with 265 houses. There could be well over 500 additional traffic movements per day through this junction adding to the potential risk of accidents.</p> <p>It would take around 20 minutes or more to walk from the site to the schools on Barkestone Lane. On cold, dark or wet days, this distance would tempt parents to drive their children to and from school which would exacerbate existing traffic problems on Barkestone Lane and elsewhere in the village and reduce the (Council's) perceived attractiveness of this site as a sustainable development allocation.</p> <p>2. Flooding and Flood Risk - the Council is well aware of the flooding issues in the settlement. Whilst the proposed development site is not in a flood risk area, its development may increase the</p>	<p>Delete the site and make corresponding changes to the need for development in the settlement. Any major site proposals in the settlement need the issues affecting village services and traffic being correctly identified and dealt with first. The Council has not properly addressed these matters and has in effect put the cart before the horse.</p>	<p>This is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.</p> <p>The Site assessment study looks at detailed assessment of each site which looks at constraints and the facilities in the villages/ each individual site.</p>	

		<p>risk of flooding elsewhere in the village and surrounds. The proposed bridge may cause an obstruction to flood waters or change the directions of flow. When developed the site would cause more run off to the drains and the adjacent river. The proposed new road on the disused railway would also increase surface water drainage (there are existing localised problems within the site of poor drainage in wet weather close to the railway line). The local water table is high - the development of this site is likely to increase the height of the water table still further over a wider area.</p> <p>3. Loss of Amenity - there would be a loss of amenity to the residents of the many houses that overlook the green fields of Rectory Farm. This development affects the amenity of more residents than any of the other sites considered for the village.</p> <p>4. Archaeology - there is some evidence in this area of archaeological finds and these may be of wider than local significance. If this is the case, development of the site needs to be halted to assess and evaluate this issue. This could delay the development of the site or preclude parts of it being developed and may make the site uneconomic given the cost of the proposed road and bridge which are solely related to this site.</p> <p>5. Speed of Development - the development of this site required the considerable outlay of capital at the outset - not least the new road and bridge which are likely to be highly expensive to construct. This financial pressure is likely to mean that any prospective developer would wish to recoup the capital sums expended by building the houses in a very quick period of time. Issue 3 of the November 2015 questionnaire - overwhelmingly</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

			supported by local residents - stated that "new homes should be built in staged developments, spread uniformly over the next 25 years, rather than built in short-tern large-scale spurts of big development which would give no time for our community and services to react". Given the strength of local feeling on this issue, it is surprising that the Council has selected this site for housing development since the abnormal development costs would indicate that the site would have to be developed quickly. This would place great pressure on the local services and roads which require improvement to meet existing demands as has been emphasised in the objections to early sections of the Plan.			
Laurence Holmes	ANON-BHRP-4HGQ-Z	Object	Please see paragraph 3.66 of the 'Representation on the Melton Emerging Options Draft Plan' (Melton North Landowner Consortium Version).	Please refer to paragraph 3.67 of the 'Representation on the Melton Emerging Options Draft Plan' (Melton North Landowner Consortium Version).	Noted.	
Mary Anne Donovan	ANON-BHRP-4HUR-F	Object	<p>I recognize it is required to broadly allocate at this stage of the plan. I disagree with the policy because it contains no section which clearly spells out where proposals will not be supported. The term 'mitigation' is a subjective one and as applied in past decisions serves as a justification for erosion to important characteristics of settlements, landscapes and the historic environment. Burrough Hill is an example.</p> <p>The vision of the Plan does not place enough weight on the natural and historic environment of the Borough. The policies are pretty standard ones and are not written in the context of the major building growth in the Plan. This is a serious omission. Neighbouring authorities in Harborough District and Rutland have done a better job than Melton, for example, local landscape and built environment designations and the policy of 'restraint' villages.</p> <p>When asking the population to accept the high housing target, it would be</p>	<p>Expand this policy and tailor it to local issues to increase clarity and trust in future planning decisions.</p>	<p>Noted. The evidence base informs this policy. The 'small-scale site assessment' report includes the sites that were rejected. This work is being updated through local plan process.</p> <p>Noted. This has been picked up in the Vision Chapter of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Include clearly reference to natural and historic environment in the vision.</p>

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

			prudent, politic and socially just to draw red lines in the context of where housing proposals will not be accepted, and where subjective measures of mitigation are unreliable long term.			
Christopher Green	ANON-BHRP-4HHJ-T	Support with observations	While we support the allocation of housing in Wymondham, specifically regarding site MBC/070/13, we firmly believe that, in order to guarantee significant benefits to the community and local infrastructure, it would be advantageous to allocate larger housing growth for the village.		The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village. The Site assessment study looks at detailed assessment of each site which looks at constraints and the facilities in the villages/ each individual site.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.
Christopher John Noakes	ANON-BHRP-4HBK-N	Object	See comments in Chapter 4 on the overall % distribution of new growth between MM and rural areas. No comments on the criteria 1 - 10	As previously mentioned - increased % housing development at MM. IF it is considered unable to promote a greater (say 70 -75%) proportion of all new housing requirements to MM, then the residual (non-MM) % should be concentrated in Rural Centre and (at appropriate levels) supplemented at Secondary settlements. Additional options have been identified in these locations than fulfilled through the allocations for these settlements (e.g. Asfordby Hill; Long Clawson; Waltham). Such alternative would (in the absence of an increased MM solution) best meet sustainable objectives.	Noted.	
Lucy Aron	ANON-BHRP-4HHK-U	Object	The concept of primary and secondary rural settlements is flawed, the housing allocation should be more evenly distributed without putting undue pressure of inappropriate housing numbers on a few villages and undoubtedly altering the feel and profile of those villages forever.	Housing numbers should be more evenly spread in the Borough	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.
James Brown	ANON-BHRP-4HHC-K	Support with observations	As previously noted, considerations should be given to the creating a PRSC to the south of Melton Mowbray.	Some of the development proposed for Long Clawson & Waltham on the Wolds should be allocated to either Wymondham or Somerby and it should be upgraded to a PRSC.	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

					information on services and facilities in the village.	
Kerstin Hartmann	ANON-BHRP-4HGW-6	Object	Again as Somerby's house building over past 5 years has shown those allocations are not needed for next 20 years but will easily be met by organic growth.	Give us a target for next 20 years but do not allocate sites - infill and change of use into dwellings as well as division of huge houses into several dwelling will achieve the number easily.	Noted.	
Anthony Barber	ANON-BHRP-4H6R-G	Other	I would support the policy in terms of types of housing etc., but the housing allocations are still arbitrary and should be reviewed.	Fundamental review of housing allocations	Noted. And is being looked at through the updated work on Settlements and site assessment.	
Julian Parker	ANON-BHRP-4HHP-Z	Object	See my comments in other sections with regards to transport provision, if you build the good bypass in proper locations, development and business will come to Melton.	You have not properly addressed the necessary infrastructure to support this level of housing development.	Policy IN1 in the infrastructure chapter addresses this.	
Margaret Jean Bowen	ANON-BHRP-4HHV-6	Object	Please see comments in previous sections on the proposed number of houses for the different categories and the number of categories.	as above	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.
Hannah Marie Paterson	BHLF-BHRP-4HD6-2	Support	Village At Six Hills: A village at Six Hills would offer a primary route access to all large local cities and arterial road routes, and being a complete new build will offer a complete infrastructure of shops, schools, health facilities and road infrastructure suitable to the demands This would alleviate the pressures extending surrounding villages on local facilities i.e. schools, public transport and health facilities.	I would like to see the policy accepted. I can comment on this project legitimately as I originate from this area (Grimston).	This is a part of the review policy in the document (Policy SS6).	
Stewart Patience	BHLF-BHRP-4H83-K	Other	Policy C1 – Housing Allocations We note that it is not proposed to identify specific housing allocation sites at this stage. Therefore Anglian Water would wish to comment further on any housing allocation sites which are identified in the Local Plan within our area of responsibility. Our understanding is that the Council is intending to prepare a Water Cycle Study to inform the preparation of the Local Plan. This document could be used to assess the implications of additional housing for water and water recycling infrastructure within Anglian Water's area of responsibility.		Noted. Anglian Water will be consulted upon for all the stages of the Local Plan and also through Duty to Cooperate.	

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

Rachael A. Bust	BHLF-BHRP-4H8R-J	Other	The Coal Authority notes that although no specific sites are proposed for allocation in the plan the text does refer to sites being considered against identified constraints. The Coal Authority would expect this to include consideration of issues in respect of unstable land.	Noted.	
Susan Green	BHLF-BHRP-4H8N-E	Other	It is noted that in Policies SS4, SS5 and C1 the Council refers to policy requirements on energy efficiency and carbon emissions standards exceeding existing Building Regulation requirements. It is accepted that the Council can specify the proportion of energy generated from on-site renewables and / or low carbon energy sources but the Council cannot set a local standard for energy efficiency above the current 2013 Building Regulations standard. The Deregulation Act 2015 specifies that no additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings should be set in Local Plans other than the nationally described space standard, an optional requirement for water usage and optional requirements for adaptable / accessible dwellings. The Deregulations Act removed the power of authorities to require residential developments to exceed the energy performance requirements of Building Regulations therefore the Council should not be setting any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the performance of new dwellings. It is recommended that these policy requirements are deleted from the pre submission Plan. Moreover the Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) dated 25th March 2015 confirmed that “the optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the NPPG”.	Noted.	
Jim Malkin	BHLF-BHRP-4H82-J	Object	We strongly object to the quantum of development assigned to Waltham as part of this policy for the reasons set out in section 4.0 above. Development of the scale proposed in Waltham does not meet the growth agenda supported by the NPPF and would cause the village to stagnate and fall behind other Primary Rural Service Centres.	This is being looked at through the Revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	
Claire Hunt	BHLF-BHRP-4H8H-8	Other	<p>A review of the Settlement Roles and Relationship sets out the five roles the settlements fulfil within the Borough. This has been translated into Policy C1, which identifies Primary and Secondary Rural Services Centres as suitable settlements to accommodate a small proportion of the Boroughs housing growth. However, these allocations only equate to 956 dwellings, which realistically if the North and South Sustainable Neighbourhoods take over 5 years to come forward that equates to a housing delivery of 191 dpa. This represents a significant shortfall in housing delivery for the Borough. As such, it is considered the Council should include settlements from the Rural Supporter category as defined by the Settlement Roles and Relationship Report (2015), in order to identify further smaller site allocations. Rural Supporter settlements are defined as:</p> <p>‘Rural villages which provide some services to meet every day to day needs locally. Services may be shared with neighbouring service centres offering support in retaining those services. Generally have good access that can be gained through cycling, walking and public transport. Residents generally travel to attractions to meet their basic needs but enjoy a tranquil environment’ (emphasis added). Clearly, within this category there will be a range of settlements meeting this definition which may or may not be suitable to accommodate small development growth. Therefore, it should be for the Council to review the</p>	The categorisation of villages is being looked at through the Revised Settlement Roles and the Site assessment works. These studies will take into account the updated information on services and facilities in the village.	Update the grouping of villages based on the Revised Settlement Roles.

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

			settlements within this category and identify any settlements, such as Burton Lazars that would be suitable and appropriate for small development growth given the strong connection and relationship the village has with Melton Mowbray. The physical relationship of the two settlements plays a fundamental role to the sustainability of the village which by itself has limited services, however the services and facilities within Melton Mowbray are within walking and cycling distance of Burton Lazars. Burton Lazars is a settlement which offers the Council the opportunity to consider small scale housing sites which could support the vitality of the village without compromising the physical separation of Burton Lazars and Melton Mowbray.		
Emilie Carr	BHLF-BHRP-4H8Q-H	Support with observations	Criteria 10 would better read:- "The prevention of adverse impacts on heritage assets and their settings" In order to protect heritage assets.	Noted.	Set out clear wording to include "The prevention of adverse impacts on heritage assets and their settings" in order to protect heritage assets in criteria 10.
Phil Bamford	BHLF-BHRP-4H8J-A	Support with observations	Gladman support Policy C1 Housing Allocations in principle and particularly the allocation of the Melton South Sustainable Neighbourhood. It is considered that the Policy reference made in the table should be to Policy SS4 not G4. Gladman comment on Policy C2 Housing Mix that the data in the SHMA is a snapshot of housing need at a fixed point in time. Sufficient flexibility needs to be written into the Policy to allow for changes in need, demand and viability over time. As described above, the 2014 Leicester and Leicestershire SHMA upon which this policy is based requires updating, as such, the mix may need to be updated as a result of the new SHMA work.	Noted. This is being updated through the new work on HEDNA which will supersede the existing SHMA. Policy SS6 addresses the issue of flexibility and change in need in the future.	
Roger Smith	BHLF-BHRP-4H8U-N	Other		Policy C1 be amended to increase the capacity of the Melton North Sustainable Neighbourhood by 300 dwellings to 2,000 dwellings. This reflects the proposed amendments to Policy SS5 set out above.'	Noted.
Roger Smith	BHLF-BHRP-4H8C-3	Object	It is accepted that development in Melton Mowbray's main urban area provides greatest access to services, facilities, employment and transport choice. It is also accepted that, as the town is the focus for employment, shopping and community facilities, it presents the most sustainable location for new homes (Paragraph 5.4.9). The current housing position (Table 6) is given as follows:- Requirement (2011-2026) 3985 Total completions (2011-2015) 128	The level of housing should be significantly increased. The policy should acknowledge the role which both previously developed land and greenfield can make towards housing provision. The proposals map should also be amended to identify land suitable for housing development.	Noted.

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

			<p>Deliverable Supply 622</p> <p>Residual Requirement 3235</p> <p>The objection site at Snow Hill is seen as being capable of accommodating around 250 houses and associated works. This can make an important contribution to the Borough's housing requirements.</p>			
Laurence Holmes	BHLF-BHRP-4H8K-B	Other	<p>As set out in respect of Policies SS2 and SS5, there is scope to increase the total number of residential dwellings which have been identified for the NSN. The Illustrative Development Framework Plan (see Appendix II), demonstrates how at least 2,200 dwellings could be accommodated within the NSN without requiring an increase in its area.</p>	<p>The table set out in Policy C1 should be amended to reflect the higher number of dwellings which would be deliverable within the NSN. Accordingly, a figure of 2,200 should substitute 1,500 within the column entitled 'Number of homes'. A figure of 3,900 should substitute 3,200 within the column entitled 'Total per settlement'. The 'total per role' should be consistent with the figure of 3,900 dwellings.</p> <p>Reference to Policy 'G5' in respect of the NSN should be replaced with 'Policy SS5'.</p>	Noted.	
Brown & Co – Property & Business Consultants LLP	BHLF-BHRP-4HA9-2	Object	<p>Figures and allocations generally to be reviewed in line with earlier observations on the Plan.</p>		Noted. And is being updated through the Revised Settlement Roles and the Site Assessment work.	
Sean Mahoney	BHLF-BHRP-4HA7-Z	Support	<p>We welcome the commitment to support housing proposals which provide the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Energy efficiency levels to meet the minimum sustainability and energy efficiency requirements set out in policy; 2. Measures to adequately mitigate any adverse transport impacts; 3. Measures to maximise walking, cycling and access to public transport; 4. Measures to adequately mitigate any adverse impacts on important site features (including trees) protected habitats and species; 5. Measures to mitigate the impact of flooding and regulate surface water run-off through the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS); 6. Measures to mitigate any adverse impacts on heritage assets. 		Support welcomed and noted.	
Robert Galij	BHLF-BHRP-4H7A-Z	Object		<p>Housing Allocations : - Provision should be made for '600 dwellings' in 'Bottesford' during the plan period. Table 6 should be amended accordingly.</p>	Noted.	

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, healthy and vibrant – Policy C1-Housing Allocations

				<p>NB if the housing requirement in Melton Borough remains at (minimum) 6125 dwellings between 2011 and 2036, provision should be made for 'at least 1225 dwellings' in the Primary Rural Service Centres i.e. 20% share, of which (minimum) of 490 dwellings i.e. 40% (PRSC Apportionment) should be directed towards Bottesford. Policies SS2 and C1 and Tables 2,3,4 and 6 should all be amended accordingly.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--