



MEETING OF THE  
COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF MELTON

PARKSIDE, STATION APPROACH, BURTON STREET, MELTON MOWBRAY

16 JULY 2014

PRESENT

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

Chief Executive  
Strategic Director (KA), Strategic Director (CM)  
Monitoring Officer  
Central Services Manager  
Regulatory Services Manager, Local Plan Manager  
Senior Democracy Officer

The Reverend Kevin Ashby offered prayers

---

The Mayor announced that the meeting would be recorded and may be available for public listening.

CO15. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Barnes, Holmes, Horton, Moncrieff and Twitney and an apology for late attendance was received from Councillor O'Callaghan.

CO16. MINUTES

- (a) Minutes of 30 April 2014 – Minute CO86 - Questions from Members Rural, Economic and Environmental Affairs – 5 March 2014 - Minute 51  
Councillor Gordon referred to the Rural, Economic and Environmental Affairs minutes of 5 March 2014 and advised that the minute reference relating to her comment should read R51 and not R15. She also stated that she did not have an interest in the item but had left the meeting prior to the matter being considered and it was this that was omitted from the minutes.

- (b) Subject to the foregoing, the minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 30

April 2014 were confirmed and authorised to be signed by the Mayor.

- (c) The minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Council held on 14 May 2014 were confirmed and authorised to be signed by the Mayor.

#### CO17. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Orson, Posnett and Rhodes each declared a personal interest in any matters relating to the Leicestershire County Council due to their roles as County Councillors.

Minute CO25 – Melton Local Plan – Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report  
Minute CO26 – Melton Local Plan – Strategic Housing Market Assessment

Councillor Orson declared a personal and pecuniary interest in these two items due to possible land ownership and would leave the meeting when they were considered.

Councillor Graham declared a personal and pecuniary interest in these two items due to being a Trustee of the Sir John Sedley Foundation and would leave the meeting when they were considered.

Councillor Gordon requested to make a comment regarding the minutes of 14 May 2014. The Mayor advised that the minutes had been approved therefore no further comments could be made.

#### CO18. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor stated that

- there had been some sadness since the last meeting being the loss of one of the Council's Past Mayors, Margaret Moore. He stated that Margaret did so much for the community during her time as a Councillor and his thoughts were with her family;
- since taking up the office of Mayor in May he had attended 25 engagements. These had included activities with other Civic Heads such as Church Services, a Garden Party, a visit to a Farm which focused on food production whilst caring for the community, opening of Leicester Cathedral's gardens and an Army Regiment's Homecoming Parade in Leicester. Also he had been at many local events including the Defence Animal Centre's Open Day, the 70<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Memorial Service for the D Day landings at Saltby Airfield, the launch of a new running route, Lions Presentation Evening where cheques were handed out to good causes, local Sports Awards, the opening of the Country Fair, Quorn Hunt open day, Melton in Bloom competition, children's graduation event at a nursery school as well as the Armed Forces Day event held at Parkside;
- he and his wife were accompanied by Councillors Cumbers and Posnett on a Civic Visit to Sochaczew in June and they had found the trip most interesting and informative as well as culturally enlightening. Whilst there they also met colleagues from the Ukraine;

- his Deputy had been attending some engagements on his behalf and he was grateful for her support;
- invitations to his Civic Service were being sent to Councillors over the next few days and this was to take place on Sunday 31 August at 3 p.m. at St. Mary's Church and he hoped Councillors would be able to support this event.

The Young Mayor, Ashleigh Evans, had submitted apologies for the meeting and Councillor Posnett provided the following update to Members on her behalf :-

*'During the last few months I have been in discussions with the Skate Park group about helping with their fundraising effort by helping to organise a sponsored Zumbathon. Myself and Councillor Norman Slater came up with the idea of doing a zumbathon in the park. A date has not been set yet, but I have found an instructor who is willing to help us run the event and Norman has managed to speak to 103 the eye radio station and they will provide music. All the costs raised, charging people for entry etc. will go towards the skate park.'*

*The Skate park group have been busy fundraising and so far have raised more than £3,000. The skate park group raised over £1,500 through a sponsored bike ride to Skegness and £1,380 was raised from the 'Dance To Keep Dan's Dream Alive' jive event which was held last weekend in Dan Wakefield's memory. The new owners of the indoor skate park, Terminal 1, have also helped towards the fundraising effort by donating money from some of their events to the cause.*

*The skate park group also have a number of other fundraising events planned which include a live music event this Sunday the 20<sup>th</sup> at Melton's music café, beginner skateboard lessons, bag packing and a stall to raise funds at the Waltham Charter Fair in September.*

*One of the opportunities that the Young Mayor role has provided me with is that I have taken up the voluntary opportunity of working with Trading Standards to help them to check for compliance with regard to the sale of age-restricted products to underage people. I have so far visited 10 different stores (out of the Melton area) to purchase specific items requested by trading standards, and on a few occasions I was able to purchase the items.'*

Councillor Posnett reported on updates regarding previous Young Mayors as follows :-

- Sarah Boyce had forwarded a request for sponsorship from Members as she was fund raising for Alzheimer's Society and Alzheimer Scotland which were two charities which did crucial work for thousands of people suffering with dementia. She was going to bungee jump off the Titan Crane which was a 150 foot crane in Glasgow in three weeks' time. She also referred to how the Young Mayor role had been hugely responsible for her gaining a scholarship with the Lloyds banking group and was grateful for the time she had spent as the Young Mayor;
- David Downing had secured a second internship in Westminster;
- Adam Tate, although not a Young Mayor he had been active in the Youth Council, had recently achieved his degree and was then going to Oxford to start

a Masters qualification.

## CO19. LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader, Councillor Rhodes, stated that

- on 29 July 2014, the builders would start construction on site of the first of the Council's new Council houses and it was thought that these would be the first the Council had built in Melton for more than 25 years, probably longer. The first phase was for 10 new homes and there would be more in the years ahead;
- the Council was to consider two papers on the Local Plan at the meeting and these were on sustainability and housing numbers. This was the start of the detailed process which would lead the Council to the production of the 'Issues and Options' document which would be consulted on in the Autumn;
- last month the second Local Plan Conference was held to review progress and had been attended by nearly 100 people. Very favourable comments were made by attendees, many of whom had not previously been involved. He considered that the next round of reference group meetings would be very interesting;
- on the Cattle Market, the bid for funding through the Local Growth Fund had fallen at the last moment because the fund was four times over subscribed and the scheme was not 'shovel ready' yet. He had discussed this with the Minister concerned at the recent Local Government Conference and he had advised that the Council should keep up the work and re-apply at the next round when more money would be available;
- on leisure and sports, he was not able to report the good news he had forecasted in previous reports as legal matters had not been concluded. However he assured the Council that good progress was being made and he hoped to have better news at the next Council Meeting;
- on Friday 11 July 2014, the Council hosted a visit from the Government's Public Service Transformation Network Challenge Panel at Parkside and Phoenix House. This group consisted of high ranking civil servants and experts who were advising the Government and specifically Communities and Local Government on best practice in reforming and transforming public services. They had been to see other Councils but Melton was the only District Council they had been to. After they had toured Parkside to see how co-location of different organisations worked in a local government context, they went to Phoenix House. There they met some families and were shown how the Council's 'Supporting Families' and 'Me and my Learning' services worked. After the visit, some of the panel made the following tweets on Twitter :-

*'Such a strong focus on outcomes and the importance of supporting people' – Information Sharing Centre of Excellence*

and

*@LeicsCountyHall @DWP @communitiesUK why aren't more places integrating and co-locating with better outcomes for residents like MeltonBC' – Robert Pollock, PSTN Director and a senior civil servant from the Treasury.*

#### CO20. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no questions received.

#### CO21. PETITIONS

There were no petitions received.

#### CO22. RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

Councillor Graham moved and Councillor Manderson seconded the following four recommendations at (a), (b), (c) and (d) relating to the Governance Committee's recommendations. On being put to the vote, the motion was unanimously carried.

**(a) Governance Committee: 2 April 2014 – Minute G81: Review of Corporate Counter Fraud Strategy**

**RESOLVED** that the revised Corporate Counter-Fraud Strategy be approved for adoption in the Constitution.

**(b) Governance Committee: 23 June 2014 – Minute G10: Member Code of Conduct Governance Sub-Committee 2 (Hearing Procedure)**

**RESOLVED** that the Member Code of Conduct Governance Sub Committee 2 (Hearing Stage) Procedure be agreed for referral to the Full Council for approval and inclusion in the Council's Constitution subject to the following three amendments :-

- The introduction should include how the Chairperson is elected
- Item 5.5 be amended to include the procedure to adjourn
- Item 5.6 be amended to read 'The meeting may be adjourned prior to the decision being made'

**(c) Governance Committee: 23 June 2014 – Minute G12: Payment for Parish Representatives when dealing with Parish Councillor Complaints**

**RESOLVED** that the Welland Independent Remuneration Panel be requested to consider an allowance for the Parish Representatives when they are involved in a Governance Sub Committee Meeting.

**(d) Governance Committee: 23 June 2014 – Minute G13 Constitution Update 2014-15**

**(i) QUORACY**

**RESOLVED** that the Procedure Rule relating to quoracy be amended as shown in italics below so that the rule reflects the position with the

Governance Sub Committees and refer the same to the Council for adoption and inclusion in the Council's Constitution :-

## 7. QUORUM

7.1 The quorum of a Council meeting will be at least half of the whole number of members. During any meeting if the Mayor counts the number of members present and declares there is not a quorum present, then the meeting will adjourn immediately. Remaining business will be considered at a time and date fixed by the Mayor. If he/she does not fix a date, the remaining business will be considered at the next ordinary meeting.

7.2 *In respect of committees and sub-committees quoracy be a minimum of 4 members or 25% of the whole number of members, whichever is the greater except in the case of the Governance Sub Committees 1 and 2 which are quorate with 3 Members.*

### **(ii) SCHEME OF DELEGATION**

**RESOLVED** that the Scheme of Delegation to the Head of Regulatory Services be amended at items 48 and 49 as set out in Appendix A and refer the same to the Council for adoption and inclusion in the Council's Constitution.

Councillor Rhodes explained that with regard to the following item from the Policy, Finance and Administration Committee on pensions, the Council had never exercised its discretion but should there be a need, this recommendation would facilitate an application if required. He then moved the recommendation and Councillor Posnett seconded. On being put to the vote, the motion was unanimously carried.

### **(e) Policy, Finance, & Administration Committee: 1 July 2014 – Minute P8: Discretionary Pension Policies**

**RESOLVED** that the Head of Communications in consultation with the Head of Central Services be given delegated authority to agree application of the Discretionary powers as detailed in 5.2 below.

*(5.2 The financial implications in each instance will be considered individually and the discretion will only be allowed where it is in the best financial interests of the Council and agreed by the Head of Communications in consultation with the Head of Central Services.)*

### **CO23. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**

- (a) In accordance with Procedure Rule 10.1, the Chairmen of Committees were to respond to any questions upon items of reports of Committees when those items were received or were under consideration by the Council as follows :-

Policy, Finance & Administration Committee	16 April 2014
Planning Committee	29 May 2014
Rural, Economic & Environmental Affairs Committee	4 June 2014

Planning Committee	12 June 2014	Withdrawn
Community & Social Affairs Committee	18 June 2014	
Governance Committee	23 June 2014	
Ad Hoc Planning Committee	26 June 2014	
Policy, Finance & Administration Committee	1 July 2014	

Policy, Finance & Administration Committee – 16 April 2014

Minute P86 – Minutes

Minute P80 - Green Waste Club Subscriptions

Councillor Gordon requested that it be made clear that she did not have a personal or pecuniary interest in the Garden Waste Service.

Ad Hoc Planning Committee – 26 June 2014

Councillor Botterill stated that Councillor Chandler, had left the meeting due to a complaint made against her relating to the previous decision on the application under consideration. He asked why the complaint had not been dealt with before the June meeting which would have meant she could take part in that meeting.

The Monitoring Officer responded that the complaint was at the confidential stage and she would provide a response to Councillor Botterill following the meeting and provide a copy to all Councillors.

- (b) In accordance with Procedure Rule 10.5, the Mayor, the Leader and the Chairmen of Committees were to answer any questions on any matters in relation to which the Council has powers or duties or which affect the Borough of which due notice had been given.

Councillor Freer-Jones read out the following question to the Council which was received on 10 July 2014 from Councillor Freer-Jones on behalf of the Independent Group which met Procedure Rule 10.5(b) :-

*‘The independent Group reads with interest the recent statement from the Leader regarding a Bypass for Melton.*

*Whilst we are encouraged to hear that the Council sees a bypass as a priority, and that our MP is fully supportive of the need for it, we, like many other people, continue to be disappointed that for many years now so many words have been spoken on this subject, so many hopes raised, and yet a bypass is no nearer to being a reality than it ever was.*

*The Leader states that we can only expect between 20% and 25% contribution out of a total cost of £40million, to come from housing developers.*

*Is it realistic to expect that somehow the Government can be convinced to allocate the remaining £30 million?*

*As an illustration, if 5000 dwellings were built... to create £10 million would mean a contribution of a mere £2,000 per dwelling.*

*Given an average house price of £180,000, this amounts to only 1.1%*

*Notwithstanding the fact that other developer contributions are currently imposed ... if a levy specifically for a bypass could be incorporated either in place of some or all*

*of the other contributions, or if necessary, as well as the other contributions; then if 5000 homes were to be built, with a levy on each home of say £6,000... this would generate £30 million... three quarters of the estimated cost of a bypass. Surely this would be an extremely positive and proactive move, and would significantly improve our chances of securing the remaining share from Central Government/County Highways?*

*The Independent Group asks the following question :-*

*“Given the new powers and decision making mandate given to Local Authorities in the Localism Act; would the Leader undertake, to have Melton Borough Council, with immediate effect, put in place a Bypass levy on every new dwelling built in the Borough in order to create a fund to make a significant contribution to the cost of a bypass.*

*The exact level of which to be determined, along with the rates at which Rural developments would contribute... but in any case, 50% of such levy to be charged on the granting of Planning Consent, with the balance charged on completion of each dwelling”.*

*The Leader responded as follows :-*

*‘I am grateful for the question as it enables me to address some misconceptions.*

*I think it’s safe to say we can all support the sentiment of the question – nobody has been more public in support of a bypass than myself.*

*I have indeed expressed my strong support for a by-pass, and my view that new development should make its contribution. However, we are still going to have to get Government support because new development alone cannot be expected to provide all the necessary funding. And besides, this is a problem with us right now and affects us all, future residents will add to the problem but should they be expected to pay for more than their fair share of the solution?*

*I also note the figures used (5000) are over optimistic – as up to half of this number, although in the Borough, won’t be in Melton and a limited number are already committed without the burden of the suggested levy. Furthermore, it still only provides part of the answer – the balance of at least £10-20 million would still need to be found from elsewhere.*

*I support the concept of a levy on new development to secure their contribution. Legislation allows for this in the form of the Community Infrastructure Levy. But the law requires that a plan is adopted before we introduce a levy and we are not able to do so in advance of that. We are trying to develop a Local Plan that has as much consensus as possible. The way in which proceeds from development will be used is part of this and I believe it would be wrong to specify sums for a by-pass at this stage, without the necessary discussion about what development can afford and what other contributions we need. If we did, we may be in real danger of taking away potential funding for other priorities, such as schools, affordable housing and police services. The correct forum for this debate is the local plan and as fellow Members know, the big debate on this and all of the issues will start in September with the ‘Issues and Options’ publication.*



*The Local Plan is the means by which a by-pass as a project will be formalised and any route defined. At present, whilst my view that a by pass is needed is widely shared, it isn't an adopted policy. Therefore developers have no obligation to make a contribution to such a project.*

*But that doesn't mean we should take no action at present. We have already commissioned highways studies in order to provide us with evidence of the extent of the problem and how current proposals will be adding to it. This evidence will allow us to deal with the proposals that are arriving now, by showing that they may need to provide a solution, or a contribution to a solution. Whilst CIL isn't possible at present, s106 is still relevant and in all cases we will be making sure development pay for their 'fair share' towards the problems they create.'*

Councillor Freer-Jones thanked the Leader for his response and asked a supplementary question. She stated that it was important that the Council showed more commitment and could the Council ask senior officers to make a contribution scheme towards a bypass.

Councillor Rhodes responded that this was not possible until a Local Plan and an evidence base in place and until then the Council was not in a position to make a scheme enforceable. He added that the Council had to go through all the stages of the process and it did not have the power.

(Councillor O'Callaghan entered the meeting during the preceding item.)

#### CO24. MOTIONS ON NOTICE

There were no motions on notice received.

#### CO25. ANNUAL REPORT ON THE TREASURY MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES AND ACTUAL PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS 2013-14

The report (copies of which had previously been circulated to Members) was presented by the Leader and he explained the purpose of the report to the Council in that it provided a summary of the Treasury activities in 2013-14 and covered the actual position on the Prudential Indicators in accordance with the Prudential Code. He advised that the Council was in a comfortable financial position and its only debts were in the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and on a leasing arrangement. With regard to the HRA, this debt position was put on the Council by the Government so that they could control the Council's housing stock. He further advised that the Council had enough funds to service the debts. He added that it had been raised at the Budget and Strategic Planning Working Group as to whether the Council should employ external management. The Working Group had considered this may be a possibility in the future but not now. He moved the recommendations in the report and this was seconded by Councillor Posnett.

Councillor O'Callaghan apologised for his late attendance and stated that there was a lot less information in the report than was usual in terms of financial overview. He would have liked to see specific interest rates and how they affected the Council. He added that the expectation was interest rates would become lower than in the past and the Council's exposure to this as well as the affect of any interest increase

would have been helpful. He considered it was not the time to change the Council's arrangements and there was a good balance. He agreed with the current position but felt more information on interest rates would have improved the report.

The Leader responded that he was grateful for the comments but could not foresee the future and referred to the Bank of England's position affecting the Council in terms of whether interest rates went up or down.

Following a vote, it was unanimously

**RESOLVED** that

- (1) the Treasury Management Annual Report for 2013-14 be approved;
- (2) the actual position on Prudential Indicators for 2013-14 be noted.

(Due to their interests declared at Minute CO17, Councillors Graham and Orson here left the meeting for the following 2 items of business.)

#### CO26. MELTON LOCAL PLAN : SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SCOPING REPORT

The Chair of the Melton Local Plan Task Group, Councillor Wright, presented the report (copies of which had previously been circulated to Members) and stated

- the report set out how the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process would be integrated into the preparation of the new Melton Local Plan and sought approval of the SA Scoping Report subject to a 5 week consultation with Statutory Agencies and other interested parties;
- the SA process was an opportunity to consider ways by which the plan could contribute to improvements in the environment, social and economic conditions. As well as a means of identifying and mitigating any potential adverse effects that the plan might have;
- the SA would incorporate the Equalities Impact Assessment in the interest of efficiency and the desire to ensure that the equalities impact assessment was threaded through the preparation of the Local Plan. This approach was supported by the Council's Equalities and Diversity consultant and paragraph 5.6 of the report referred;
- the initial stage of the SA scoping report compiled relevant plans policies and programmes from an international, national, regional, county and local level. This information had been collated with baseline information on the existing environmental, economic and social characteristics of the Borough to develop SA objectives and this was outlined at page 4 of Appendix 1;
- the SA objectives were slightly different to the Local Plan objectives in order to monitor any significant effects of the implementation of the plan on the borough's current environment;
- the SA objectives had been developed into a framework to assess all of the

policy options and sought to predict significant effects of the plan. Where potential negative effects were identified, possible mitigation measures would be identified if appropriate, such findings would be considered by the Melton Local Plan Working Group and Full Council at the relevant stages;

- the Council had gained free professional advice in preparing the SA Scoping report from the Planning Advisory Service, acting as critical friend; their conclusions from reviewing the draft SA report stated that it met the basic requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive;
- the SA would provide clarity on the sustainability impacts of policy options as they developed into draft policies. At each stage of the Local Plan preparation an SA report would be produced and could be referred to in any consultation response;
- as Chair of the Melton Local Plan Working Group, he moved the recommendation in the report for approval.

Councillor Illingworth seconded the motion.

Following a vote, it was unanimously

**RESOLVED** that the Draft Melton Local Plan Sustainability Scoping Report be approved (Appendix 3) for a five week consultation with statutory consultees and any other interested party, with authority delegated to the Head of Regulatory Services to approve any minor amendments following the responses received.

## CO27. MELTON LOCAL PLAN : STRATEGIC HOUSING MARKET ASSESSMENT

The Chair of the Melton Local Plan Task Group, Councillor Wright, presented the report (copies of which had previously been circulated to Members) and stated

- the report set out the findings of Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and moved its approval as part of the technical evidence needed to inform the Melton Local Plan;
- as SHMA was not adopted policy it would need to be tested through the development of the Melton Local Plan and further discussions across the Housing Market Area (HMA) on the distribution of housing would be required before any figures could be considered for adoption as policy;
- the SHMA was based on Government projections these were regularly updated so may be subject to amendments if a meaningful change in the housing situation was identified;
- the methodology used followed the advice contained in the NPPF and the recent National Planning Practice Guidance, along with the CLGs SHMA guidance;
- the first stage of the SHMA was to determine the most appropriate HMA and it identified a strong basis to continue with the Leicester & Leicestershire HMA, although the Council would be entering into Duty to Cooperate discussions with Rushcliffe, South Kesteven and Rutland as there were HMA overlaps with these

authorities;

- CLG's household projections form the starting point, these were then adjusted, subject to the influence of three factors:-
  1. Market Signals
  2. Affordable Housing Evidence
  3. Economy/Employment Growth
- the SHMA identified a range of objectively assessed housing need per annum from a lower end demographic-led projection to a higher end supporting economic growth with an adjustment for market affordability pressures as outlined at paragraph 3.7 of the report;
- as a result the SHMA recommended the housing requirement for Melton Borough should fall within the range of 195 to 245 dwellings per annum to 2036. However the SHMA did not provide housing targets for the Local Plan, a variety of other factors would need to be considered including sustainability issues, availability of land supply, the provision of infrastructure to support development, and flooding etc.

Councillor Illingworth seconded the motion.

The Leader stated that this was a substantial and technical piece of work by GL Hearn. Appendix 1 showed that it was being suggested the Council provided 195 to 245 houses per annum. When looking at other Councils such as Leicester and Charnwood their allocation per annum was much higher apart from Oadby and Wigston which was only 75-95 houses. The Council received lots of complaints from residents when applications came in questioning the need for more houses and why should the Council allow them because people did want more housing near them. When the Council heard about other areas, it was appreciated that the need for housing was much deeper than people realised and Melton was not immune and would have to provide its share. He added that Melton was better off than some other districts in Leicestershire and this must be taken into account during discussions with the public. There were people that needed these homes and they were already taking advantage of new housing under construction. For some people this was really important and the Council needed to ensure there was a framework in place to satisfy the housing need therefore he supported the motion.

Councillor O'Callaghan referred to paragraph 3.2 of the report and that the figures were subject to amendment if the situation changed and this had happened only a couple of months ago. He considered the process was going to take time and how likely was it that new population estimates would have a knock on affect to the housing allocation. He referred to the make up of the Borough and how the urban/rural split would be identified and it was important to take a close look at the drivers for where the houses were needed. He stated the Council did not need top down planning from the Government and although SHMA provided the housing targets, the Council could decide where the houses would go and if land was not provided for housing, the plan may be rejected therefore the Council had to co-operate in this way. He referred to the high need of affordable housing in the rural areas and asked why there was such a large degree of uncertainty in our allocation of 195-245 and had the needs of people commuting to work in Leicester for instance been taken into account in the document.

Councillor Chandler referred to the rural affordable housing and that 40 percent was too high. She mentioned a recent planning application where the design was too urban and not in keeping with the rural feel of the area and the Council needed to be wary of this and provide decent housing in the rural areas.

Councillor Botterill added that some rural areas were sustainable but it was limited as to which villages could be built in therefore it would be difficult to meet targets and housing allocation should be realistic to take account of this. He considered that the Council should charge to help with a bypass and this would start to get things moving.

Councillor Wright responded that the points raised would be dealt with through the Reference Group meetings including the future of the allocation numbers, the rural/urban split, neighbouring authorities would be consulted and the differences between authorities would be looked into. He asked the Local Plan Manager to respond also.

The Local Plan Manager referred to the technical information in the report and the government projections and how different issues including positive and negative factors had contributed. He add that affordable housing pressures, pressures in the Borough, the high need and numbers of people living in rented accommodation that needed affordable housing. There were also economic issues to consider such as the ability to maintain a labour force, the aging population and all of these issues were layered throughout the report.

Following a vote, it was unanimously

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted and the suggested housing requirements for Melton Borough be approved as technical evidence to inform the Melton Local Plan.

The meeting, which commenced at 6.30 p.m., closed at 7.35 p.m.

Mayor