


**Policy SS2 – Development Strategy (Part 1)**



Answer	Response ID	Do you support the strategy set out in this policy? - yes or no	Please explain why you are supporting or objecting - space for comments about the vision	What changes would you like to see made to this policy? - Comments	Officer Response	Officer Recommendations
Adrian Thorpe (on behalf of Oadby and Wigston Borough Council)	BHLF-BHRP-4H84-M	Yes	<p>The Melton Local Plan Development Strategy makes provision for the development of at least 6,125 homes between 2011 and 2036. This is consistent with the Objectively Assessed Need for the Borough of Melton of 245 dwellings per annum as identified in the 2014 Strategic Housing Market Assessment. It is also consistent with the Memorandum of Understanding that has been signed by all the Councils in the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area on this matter.</p> <p>The Development Strategy also makes provision for 51 hectares of employment land between 2011 and 2036. It distributes housing and employment growth across the borough with the Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area identified as the priority location for growth. This is supplemented by more limited amounts of growth in the</p>		Support noted	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			<p>more rural parts of the Borough.</p> <p>Policy SS2 Development Strategy is consistent with the evidence base relating to the wider Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area and as such, is supported by Oadby and Wigston Borough Council.</p>			
Aidan Thatcher (on behalf of Mr Herbert Daybell)	ANON-BHRP-4HEA-E	No	<p>The Primary Rural Service Centres should be given a higher proportion of the Borough's housing need as they sustainably meet the needs of the residents without having to travel large distances.</p> <p>The smaller centres should have a lower level to acknowledge that they are less sustainable locations.</p>	That Primary Rural Service Centres have a proportion of 20% of the Borough's housing need.	The settlement Roles and Relationships reviewed, this will be used together with the conclusions of the assessment of sites for allocation to determine the appropriate amount of housing to be allocated to each settlement	
Alan and Heather Woodhouse	ANON-BHRP-4HMQ-6	No	Because Long Clawson is currently incorrectly classified as a Primary Rural Service Centre in contradiction of the set guidelines.	<p>Reclassify Long Clawson as a Secondary Rural Service Centre.</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.</p>	65%/35% split between Melton Mowbray and the villages is considered appropriate and reflects evidence of need arising from population change. Settlement Roles review considers the appropriate role of each village.	Add additional text to the plan evidencing the urban /rural split
Alan Luntley	ANON-BHRP-4HEQ-X	No	much too complex		noted	
Angela Cornell – Fisher German LLP (on behalf of Burrough Court Estate Ltd)	BHLF-BHRP-4HAX-1	No	<p>Policy SS2 identifies that 'Rural Settlements' will accommodate 5% of the Borough's housing need, whilst 'Rural Supporter' settlements will accommodate 10% and 'Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area' will accommodate 65% of housing need. The 'Melton Local Plan Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities' (April 2015) document highlights that there are 47 'Rural Settlements' in the Borough*. The Emerging Options Plan identifies a requirement of 305 homes to be delivered by 2036, which equates to an average of 6.48 dwellings permitted per 'Rural Settlement'. The policy indicates that developments of 3 dwellings or less will be permitted in 'Rural Settlements' which is not considered to be the most appropriate or flexible means of achieving housing and will therefore mean needs will not be able to be met on a single site where development of 6 dwellings, for example, on a single site may be the most appropriate solution for the settlement. In light of the restrictive nature of the policy, sites presented for development cannot be built out to capacity, and development may become fragmented as opposed to a more comprehensive approach adopted when planning marginally larger schemes. The potential for developer contributions dedicated to the local community may also be threatened as a result of limitations placed on development. In light of the lack of a 5 year housing land</p>	<p>It is considered that there should not be a limit to the number of dwellings permitted in a single application in the 'Rural Settlements' (category for reasons outlined in section 3a). The onus should be on identifying appropriate sites to accommodate development, within and adjoining settlement boundaries that place more emphasis on design and use of vernacular styling and local materials as opposed to setting a limit to development which would undermine the Local Plan and housing delivery.</p>	<p>These restrictions apply to the very small villages, which have few or no local facilities. These locations are not considered to be sustainable places to promote growth. The restrictions included in the policy are an effective method of limiting development to a scale appropriate to each village.</p> <p>A review of the Settlement Roles and a detailed site assessment has been undertaken to identify the appropriate sites for allocation this will determine the housing distribution across the settlements</p> <p>Comments about the incorrect number of villages are noted and should be corrected.</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			<p>supply, it is considered that this policy will further exasperate the situation in that it will effectively limit potential housing coming forward to meet local housing needs. However, the policy does indicate that development 'within and adjoining' settlement boundaries will be permitted, this is an area which we support since identifying sites within settlements which are developable, deliverable and suitable for residential development presents a significant challenge as many settlements just do not have such opportunities.</p> <p>*It is worth noting that Paragraph 5.4.31 of the Emerging Options Plan identifies that there are 24 'Rural Supporters' and 39 'Rural Settlements' in the Borough (total 63 settlements), whilst Appendix 2 of the Emerging Options Plan, which is further corroborated by the 'Melton Local Plan Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities' document, identifies that there are 18 'Rural Supporters' and 47 'Rural Settlements' (total 65 settlements). It is this number which has been adopted here.</p>			
Angus Smith	ANON-BHRP-4HZK-D	Yes	Please do define who lies within each band clearly, otherwise communities will be left guessing which only leads to confusion frustration and unnecessary anger.	Clarify where villages land, where boundaries are - sketches of boundaries with colour shading - simple though they are - are very effective in communicating.	Noted	
Angus Walker	ANON-BHRP-4HB4-X	Yes	Broadly agree although they should be proportionally adjusted if any locality has new approvals prior to the adoption of the plan	Agree that numbers are required; unclear as to when they must be achieved over 25 year period	Noted, phasing policy may need to be included in the plan where it can be justified	Consider the need for a phasing policy
Anthea Brown	ANON-BHRP-4HE4-1	Yes	I am supporting the strategy because it has been well thought through with reference to the expanding population requirement for more housing in both rural and urban areas.	Medium sized developments in the primary rural service centres would make sense because these would be more likely to include affordable starter homes and small family homes and homes for older people wishing to downsize.	Support for the approach noted	
Anthony Barber	ANON-BHRP-4H6R-G	No	The concept of secondary rural service centres is flawed as previously stated.	A complete review of the spatial strategy for the whole of the rural community in the borough.	See Settlement Roles review	
Anthony Edward Maher	ANON-BHRP-4HUS-G	Yes	I am supporting this on the grounds that infrastructure delivery is delivered in advance or alongside the developments and we are not waiting for long periods while the Town and larger villages become increasingly gridlocked.	Some further wording around the delivery plan for infrastructure.	Noted. Additional detail and a detailed infrastructure delivery plan will be included in the plan	Add detail regarding the delivery of essential infrastructure resulting from the IDP
Anthony John Connolly	ANON-BHRP-4HFT-2	No	A large development in Croxton Kerrial is not sustainable, most new inhabitants would commute by car. Melton main urban area should take a larger proportion of the housing allocation.	Allocations in secondary rural centres should be limited to small developments of 10 dwellings or less.	See Settlement Roles review	
Anthony Paphiti	ANON-BHRP-4HBV-Z	Yes	I do not entirely support the proposal, but I am more supportive of it than not. The allocation of 51 hectares of employment land is a large area and links to my comment about the ultimate vision for the town and borough. Will we	Set a lower target for housing development than the proposal for "at least" 6,125 homes	Housing requirement is based on evidence of need set out in the SHM. This housing requirement needs to be appropriately distributed to the more sustainable locations	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			<p>lose our identity as a market town and become just another manufacturing centre? It will depend on the type of businesses attracted. It will also depend upon good road/rail/broadband communications.</p> <p>I live in Great Dalby, which is designated a Rural Supporter and is one of 18 villages in this category. Great Dalby has a population of about 400 people. Absorbing 615 homes equates to about 34 houses per village, which in turn means (on just 2 persons per household) 68 additional inhabitants. In other words, a minimum of 17% increase in the size of the community. At an average of 3 persons/household, this increases to 102 persons/25.5% respectively. This will probably change the character of each village.</p> <p>Bearing in mind that the village is poorly served by public transport, there will be an increased usage of private cars with concomitant pollution and congestion problems.</p>		and to appropriate sites which can deliver development	
Anthony Thomas	ANON-BHRP-4HFX-6	No	Housing estates do not have a place in rural locations. Why not grant permission for a new settlement at Six Hills which would answer all planning requirements for the borough for the next 20 years at least.	Housing estates do not have a place in rural village locations. Why not grant permission for a new settlement at Six Hills which would answer all planning requirements for the borough for the next 20 years at least.	Rural settlements have always changed and developed and evidence suggests a need for this to continue to support the vitality and viability of our rural communities. Consideration has been given to the identification of a new village – however this is not considered to be the most appropriate means of delivering our housing need during the early part of the plan period – it has however been included as a long term option arising from the need to review the plan in policy SS6	
Beth Johnson (chair) – Burton & Dalby Parish Council	ANON-BHRP-4HU6-K	No	<p>1) The Leicester &amp; Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies an objectively assessed need range between 195 (Demographic led) and 245 (Economic growth led) new homes a year in Melton borough.</p> <p>2) Overall support the settlement definitions, but consider that the phrase, "new development will be restricted to that which is necessary and appropriate in the open countryside." is too vague. Without village envelopes there is now no definition of where open countryside begins and no clarity about how 'necessary' or 'appropriate' are to be judged.</p>	<p>1) The policy should read 'up to 6125' rather than 'at least 6125'. As currently worded the implication is that more than the upper requirement figure would be appropriate.</p> <p>2) The section on Open Countryside should read: "New development will be restricted outside the settlements identified as Primary and Secondary Rural Centres, and those villages identified as Rural Supporter and Rural Settlements."</p>	<p>1) National policy means that the housing requirement cannot be worded as a maximum – therefore the phrase "at least" is appropriate.</p> <p>2) Agree with revised wording</p>	Revise Open Countryside section of policy to say: "New development will be restricted outside the settlements identified as Primary and Secondary Rural Centres, and those villages identified as Rural Supporter and Rural Settlements."
Brian Kirkup	ANON-BHRP-4HE9-6	No	Objecting to the proportion of houses allocated to the rural groups below primary rural centre.	The overall build to be reduced by 1000 houses by adopting the lower figure of 195 houses per year. The reduced need used to reduce building in all villages below 1ary Rural Service centres.	See Settlement Roles review	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

				If you find this unacceptable, then having more housing in Melton or on adjacent Dalby airfield as this makes sense re CO2 figures and maintains the beauty of the rural environment for the whole Boroughs use.		
Brown & Co – Property & Business Consultants LLP (on behalf of landowners M Hill, P Hill, M Hyde & P Pickup)	BHLF-BHRP-4HA9-2	No	<p>The figure for Melton Mowbray should be increased to circa 70 – 75%.</p> <p>The figure for the Primary Rural Service Centres is probably not unreasonable in general terms.</p> <p>There should be a very limited amount of allocation to sites in the Secondary Rural Service Centre villages where other Plan policies can show that there will be sustainable growth. At the very most there should be 5%, but a lesser figure would be appropriate.</p> <p>There should be no allocation to the Rural Supporter Villages. Only minor infill within existing curtilage lines should be allowed and it is wholly inappropriate to accommodate 10% of the Borough’s housing need in these non-sustainable locations.</p> <p>Rural settlements should not have a specific percentage allocated – our comments with regard to the Rural Supporter Villages above apply to Rural Settlements.</p>	<p>The percentage distribution should be:</p> <p>Melton Mowbray Urban Area 75%  Primary Rural Service Centres 20%  Secondary Rural Service Centres 5%  Rural Supporter 0%  Rural Settlements 0%</p>	See Settlement Roles review	
CHRISTINE LARSON	ANON-BHRP-4HUU-J	No	<p>As mentioned already I believe that MBC has taken a worst case scenario in determining the housing need. The overall number of 6125 houses proposed is too great and puts undue pressure for development that is going to be unsustainable. Putting 35% of development into the villages is also going to change their characters considerably and a lower figure would be more sustainable. This goes against Melton Mowbray Vision to protect and retain the character of its midland villages.</p> <p>Bottesford and Asfordby, are supported by good transport infrastructure. Similarly, some villages on main roads also have good transport infrastructure, but are given minimal amounts of development. For example Asfordby Hill and Frisby-on-the-Wreake all share the same good bus links from Melton through Asfordby to Leicester. Nether Broughton and Ab Kettleby share a good bus route from Melton to Nottingham. Sustainability is based around having good public transport links, but these do not appear to have been considered in the assessment for the distribution of housing.</p> <p>The way the housing is proposed to be distributed takes no</p>	<p>The apportionment for all the villages, except Asfordby and Bottesford should be scrapped and spread throughout all the villages. Villages should be allowed developments up to 10 houses in a year if the local infrastructure can cope and if the development can be shown to be environmentally sustainable (i.e. not cause flooding or undue stress on infrastructure). Large developments of more than 10 houses should not take place in the villages since suburban type estates change the character and sense of place of the villages and undermine the historical character and culture of the villages - the very reason why people come to live or stay living in Melton Borough.</p>	See Settlement Roles review	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			account of the sustainability of the villages and the scope those villages have for expansion. Building large numbers of houses in Long Clawson is unsustainable because it has only limited public transport; is 2.8 miles from the nearest main road; the school is full (see The Melton Local Plan Issues and Options: Infrastructure Delivery Plan). However, other villages have schools that are on the brink of closure due to lack of pupils, the assessment of sustainability should consider the viability of schools, shops and pubs, not just be a checklist of facilities.			
Christopher Fisher	ANON-BHRP-4HM2-7	Yes	It is not clear whether there is an upper limit for the secondary service centres. It is potentially possible for Somerby to have planning applications for double the designated number. Would this be excessive? How do you ensure a fair and a strategic approach?		National policy means that the housing requirement cannot be worded as a maximum or upper limit. Consider revising the policy wording to clarify this.	Clarify policy wording
Christopher Green – Andrew Granger & Co (on behalf of a local landowner)	ANON-BHRP-4HHJ-T	No	Whilst we support the overall strategy set out in the policy and the housing targets, as alluded to earlier in this submission, we consider that the strategy for delivery of new housing with Secondary Rural Service Centres needs to be amended.	<p>We do not believe that this level of growth for Secondary Rural Service Centres can be delivered in the form of small sites of 10 dwellings or less and would be surprised if the opportunities for this type of development within village limits exists to such an extent as to deliver circa at least 50 new homes per settlement.</p> <p>We propose that the policy be changed to allow for this level of growth (at least 300 homes) to be delivered on larger sites, which are well related to the existing settlements and in keeping with the built character.</p>	<p>Sites would also be allocated which would accommodate more than 10 homes. This should be clarified</p> <p>See also Settlement Roles Review</p>	Clarify policy wording
Christopher John Noakes	ANON-BHRP-4HBK-N	No	<p>The overall distribution of new housing development between MM town and the rural areas has FUNDAMENTAL implications for the achievement of sustainable objectives of the Plan and the realisation of the specific objectives for MM itself, including the realistic completion of an outer relief road. At 65% - 35% split, this reduces the opportunities to secure a greater overall sustainable pattern of growth, linked to the provision of services, employment, affordable housing and infrastructure, as well as the enhancement of MM town centre (e.g. through consolidation of growth and developer contributions).</p> <p>The chosen distribution would appear to arise from a (albeit reduced) dependence on past trends in housing provision, whereas the MLP should be taken as the opportunity to redirect this previous (less sustainable) trend, with</p>	<p>See 2 above - increased emphasis of overall % housing growth at Melton Mowbray (say up to 75%) and consequential reduction in expectations from rural settlements, particularly the lower category villages.</p> <p>As indicated elsewhere, a simplification of the rural categorisation, including provision for 'local needs' development in the (combined lower two categories of village).</p>	<p>Comments about the split are noted however evidence suggested that the 65%/35% split is appropriate reflection of the changes in population for the plan period.</p> <p>See also Settlement Roles Review</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			<p>consequential benefits for sustainable objectives set out in the Plan. These benefits are recognised in the SSRS report (para 13/Table 12).</p> <p>The 65-35 distribution places an undesirable reliance on the provision of housing amongst rural areas. Indeed, it is clear from the SSRS report that the rejection of a 70-30 distribution pattern would result in the 5% differential falling wholly onto the (currently nominated) Rural Supporter villages (namely +600 houses - rather than +300 - amongst 18 settlements of varying and questionable sustainable capacity).</p> <p>The SSRS concluded that the scale of new development in Supporter and smaller villages would be unlikely to generate any significant benefits other than new homes AND rely on good connections to larger settlements to achieve any benefits.</p> <p>An even greater emphasis on MM itself could easily be justified, when examining the (non-rejected) SHLAA options around the town itself (e.g. 75 - 25 split ?).</p> <p>Additionally, by definition the 65-35 split appears to place an unreasonable reliance on the achievement of 'windfall' sites in the lower category settlements (i.e. 15% of overall provision in the Plan period).</p>			
Christopher Palmer	ANON-BHRP-4HEF-K	Yes	Good basis as the majority of the need is met by Melton and the Primary Rural Centres. Other villages are still contributing to help to meet the demand		Noted	
Clair Ingham	ANON-BHRP-4HMZ-F	Yes	Whilst developing for future needs we need to be careful not to overdevelop our villages but the town could be developed with better infrastructure included in this development	None	Noted	
Cllr Martin Lusty – Waltham on the Wolds & Thorpe Arnold Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Group	ANON-BHRP-4HBZ-4	No	<p>We believe that Melton town, with its train station, numerous supermarkets, library, good entertainment amenities, etc. can sustainably support a higher percentage of the Borough's housing needs, say 70% or 75%.</p> <p>A lower percentage of housing growth in all the villages will preserve the rural quality of life for which the Borough is famous.</p>	As above.	Comments about the split are noted however evidence suggested that the 65%/35% split is appropriate reflection of the changes in population for the plan period.	
Colin Love	ANON-BHRP-4HBR-V	No	<p>Text - It should be 10 dwellings or fewer (not less) in the different sections.</p> <p>It is not acceptable that Bottesford should be allocated such a large portion of the 15% allocated to the four Primary Centres. There is a strong case that Bottesford has already reached its</p>	See response in Box 2.	See Settlement Roles Review	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			<p>limit as a sustainable centre - exacerbated by the EA confirmed very high flood risk situation. Because it is already 'large' does not thus imply it can simply become disproportionately 'larger'.</p> <p>Then, as indicated in earlier sections above, more consideration should be given to the potential sustainable development of the Secondary centres.</p>			
Colin Wilkinson – Planit-X Town & Country Planning Services Ltd (on behalf of Mr G Bryan)	ANON-BHRP-4H19-J	Yes	The identification of Hoby as a 'Rural Supporter' is welcomed.	<p>While supporting the settlement roles and the settlement hierarchy the approach to non-allocated, 'windfall' sites needs to be reconsidered:</p> <p>1 The limitation of development on windfall sites is unclear and could give rise to large scale development, by the accumulation of many small sites, in relatively unsustainable location;</p> <p>2 The limitations may prevent good, large sites coming forward for development, including brownfield sites;</p> <p>3 The limitations may discourage the type of housing that is needed in rural areas. For example, the limitation to sites of three dwellings or less in Rural Settlements will encourage more large, detached properties and discourages mixed housing developments including smaller semi-detached homes.</p> <p>4 The limitations on size, especially in 'Rural Settlements' are unlikely to generate opportunities to enhance local services and facilities through planning obligations.</p>	Comments are noted and consideration should be given to revising the policy wording to provide greater clarity	Revise Policy SS3 to provide clarity
Colin Wilkinson – Planit-X Town & Country Planning Services Ltd (on behalf of Mrs G Moore)	ANON-BHRP-4H15-E	Yes		<p>While supporting the settlement roles and the settlement hierarchy the approach to non-allocated, 'windfall' sites needs to be reconsidered:</p> <p>1 The limitation of development on windfall sites is unclear and could give rise to large scale development, by the accumulation of many small sites, in relatively</p>	Comments are noted and consideration should be given to revising the policy wording to provide greater clarity	Revise policy SS3 to provide clarity



Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

				<p>unsustainable location;</p> <p>2 The limitations may prevent good, large sites coming forward for development, including brownfield sites;</p> <p>3 The limitations may discourage the type of housing that is needed in rural areas. For example, the limitation to sites of three dwellings or less in Rural Settlements will encourage more large, detached properties and discourages mixed housing developments including smaller semi-detached homes.</p> <p>4 The limitations on size, especially in 'Rural Settlements' are unlikely to generate opportunities to enhance local services and facilities through planning obligations.</p>		
Colin Wilkinson – Planit-X Town & Country Planning Services Ltd (on behalf of Asfordby Parish Council)	ANON-BHRP-4HGY-8	Yes		<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</p>	<p>MBC has sought to work closely with Neighbourhood Plan groups in designated areas. Asfordby has made considerable progress in the preparation of their plan. MBC will reflect the proposals included in any neighbourhood Plan which has been made or reached Submission stage.</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

				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.		
Colin Wilkinson – Planit-X Town & Country Planning Services Ltd (on behalf of Belvoir Estate)	ANON-BHRP-4HHZ-A	Yes		<p>While supporting the settlement roles and the settlement hierarchy the approach to non-allocated, 'windfall' sites needs to be reconsidered:</p> <p>1 The limitation of development on windfall sites is unclear and could give rise to large scale development, by the accumulation of many small sites, in relatively unsustainable location;</p> <p>2 The limitations may prevent good, large sites coming forward for development, including brownfield sites;</p> <p>3 The limitations may discourage the type of housing that is needed in rural areas. For example, the limitation to sites of three dwellings or less in Rural Settlements will encourage more large, detached properties and discourages mixed housing developments including smaller semi-detached homes.</p> <p>4 The limitations on size, especially in 'Rural Settlements' are unlikely to generate opportunities to enhance local services and facilities through planning obligations.</p>	Comments are noted and consideration should be given to revising the policy wording to provide greater clarity	Revise policySS3 to provide clarity
Craig Heaney	ANON-BHRP-4HUY-P	No	This is too woolly and does not go far enough to stress the vital importance of establishing the link road prior to large scale development.	as above	Noted. Additional text should be included connecting the development of the two SUEs with the provision of the relief road	Add text regarding the provision of the ORR for Melton Mowbray
David A Haston (on behalf of Mr Richard Chandler, Highfield)	ANON-BHRP-4HG5-4	Yes	<p>The Settlement hierarchy and the Development Strategy are in principle supported.</p> <p>The identification of Asfordby, Bottesford, Long Clawson and Waltham on the Wolds as Primary Service Centres is considered justified and is supported. It also reflects the</p>	None	Noted	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

Farm, LE14 4NQ			<p>observations of the Inspector who Examined the previous plan.</p> <p>The target of at least 920 dwellings on allocated sites within the Primary Service Centres is supported.</p>			
David Jinks	BHLF-BHRP-4HC8-3	No	Croxtan needs better 7-11, 7 day public transport to allow it to be a thriving commuter village.		Noted	
Deborah Caroline Adams	ANON-BHRP-4H38-K	No	<p>It is too clinical as there is little scope for flexibility. For example Bottesford should take on a bigger share of new development than the likes of Long Clawson whose road infrastructure is way below the standard of Bottesford.</p> <p>In order for the smaller villages to survive there has to be an acceptance that developments of more than 5 dwellings should be built otherwise developers will not have the money to help a village by contributing towards the village's amenities and facilities particularly if they are still expected to provide affordable housing! Perhaps up to 10 dwellings is more realistic, and the recognition that village envelopes (just like the Town envelope) has to disappear.</p> <p>The same applies to Secondary Rural Service Centres, in that to only approve sites of up to 10 dwellings is detrimental to the village concerned as no meaningful contribution to the amenities and facilities of these larger villages will be possible particularly if again affordable housing has to be included.</p>	<p>More flexibility as to numbers of dwellings allowable for each village. Doing away with the village envelopes which had become a strangle hold on the villages is a good thing. It enables careful consideration of suitable sites for development in each village without ruining the overall appearance of the village.</p> <p>I cannot believe that there were no suitable development sites for the following villages and would ask that these are revisited:</p> <p>Ab Kettleby - a village with its own school, pub and village hall, on the main A606 Nottingham Road with bus links to Nottingham and Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>Ashby Folville - not a lot of facilities but scope for a few more dwellings.</p> <p>Easthorpe - so close to the A52 and Bottesford it could easily take up to 10 more dwellings.</p> <p>Branston - a sprawling village but one which is close enough to the A607 Grantham Road and to Grantham itself to take another dozen or so dwellings.</p> <p>Buckminster - on the B676 so not a main road but could take another 6 homes.</p> <p>Burton Lazars - so close to Melton and on the A606 Oakham Road which divides the village into two. It could certainly take more housing particularly on the western side. It is somewhat</p>	See settlement role review and the re-assessment of sites allocations.	

				<p>restricted on its southern flank by the dip into lower fields which are prone to flooding.</p> <p>Cold Overton - has its own industrial estate and is close to Oakham for amenities so could easily accommodate another development of up to 10 dwellings.</p> <p>Eastwell - not on a very good road but is close enough to Waltham, Scalford (school) and Melton so should be good for a few more homes.</p> <p>Eaton - reasonably close to the A607 Grantham Road and could support up to 5 new homes but only market homes.</p> <p>Gaddesby - nearer to Syston than Melton and with an improved link to the A607 could take another dozen or so new dwellings.</p> <p>Grimston - is deceptively large and whilst it does not have many facilities it could nevertheless take another half dozen dwellings (market homes).</p> <p>Harby - for a village that could easily be a Secondary Rural Service Centre, to suggest there are no suitable development sites is ridiculous.</p> <p>Hose - out in the sticks but it could probably accommodate another 6 dwellings.</p> <p>John O'Gaunt - shares facilities with Twyford. It could take 5 or 6 more homes.</p> <p>Kirby Bellars - it straggles the A607 Leicester Road and its proximity to Melton plus its own facilities surely enables another dozen homes to be built there.</p> <p>Knossington - fairly close to Oakham albeit on a country road. It could take a</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>few more houses bearing in mind the number there already.</p> <p>Muston - with its close proximity to the A52 and to Bottesford, and taking into account its reasonable size, another 10 dwellings could be accommodated.</p> <p>Nether Broughton - has expanded over the last few years and could take a few more particularly bearing in mind its close proximity to the A46.</p> <p>Normanton - the Normanton airfield which practically comes alongside the A1 on its northern tip could be developed into a new health village. It could easily have an area of separation from Normanton village and indeed developers could ensure that the airfield village did not have direct access to the existing Normanton village but only had access on the site's eastern and northern flanks. The site is so ideal I can only presume that the only reason that it has not been developed up to now is because some of the area is shared with another council as it is not wholly within the Borough of Melton. Well, with a bit of effort at inter-council co-operation surely some agreement could be struck.</p> <p>Old Dalby - with its facilities and location between the A606 Nottingham Road and the A46, it has scope for at least another dozen homes.</p> <p>Redmile</p> <p>Scalford - scope for a number of dwellings on the outer edges of the village</p> <p>Six Hills - what better place could there be for a new village; being next to the A46 and so in easy reach of Nottingham and Leicester, and to a lesser extent the Borough of Melton.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

				Stathern		
Dermot Daly	BHLF-BHRP-4HDK-Q	No	<p>Furthermore, I am unable to understand the reasons for Bottesford needing to take any substantially sized developments. When other Category 1 village in the Borough, some of which have many more suitable SHLAA sites, can take a significant greater percentage of the development requirements.</p> <p>Reasoning for this view includes existing sustainability of those villages, their closer proximity to Melton for access to core services, better transport links with Melton, and being integral villages within the County (compared with the location of Bottesford relevant to the Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire County borders). This would mean that further development of Bottesford would not benefit Leicestershire in respect of employment, retail spend, etc., in fact the services contained within Bottesford are likely to be consumed by smaller villages outside of Leicestershire. This would indicate that development for the rural allocation should be taken in the main by Asfordby, Waltham and Long Clawson.</p>	<p>Furthermore, I am unable to understand the reasons for Bottesford needing to take any substantially sized developments when other Category 1 village in the Borough, some of which have many more suitable SHLAA sites, can take a significant greater percentage of the development requirements.</p> <p>Reasoning for this view includes existing sustainability of those villages, their closer proximity to Melton for access to core services, better transport links with Melton, and being integral villages within the County (compared with the location of Bottesford relevant to the Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire County borders). This would mean that further development of Bottesford would not benefit Leicestershire in respect of employment, retail spend, etc., in fact the services contained within Bottesford are likely to be consumed by smaller villages outside of Leicestershire. This would indicate that development for the rural allocation should be taken in the main by Asfordby, Waltham and Long Clawson.</p>	See Settlement Roles Review	
Dr Leonard Richard Newton	ANON-BHRP-4HET-1	No	Secondly rural service centres e.g. Frisby, Croxton, Waltham have wholly inadequate transport links to justify expansion.		See Settlement Roles Review	
Elizabeth Ann Johnson	ANON-BHRP-4HGR-1	No	<p>I support the proposed distribution of housing but object to the way policy SS2 has been worded:</p> <p>The Leicester &amp; Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies an objectively assessed need as a range between 195 (Demographic led) and 245 (Economic growth led) new dwellings a year in Melton borough.</p> <p>Policy SS2 proposes at least 6125 dwellings. This is too open-ended and implies a total number of dwellings in excess of 6125.</p> <p>The Open Countryside paragraph is vague and open to interpretation.</p>	<p>Amend the first line to:</p> <p>"Provision will be made for the development of 6,125 homes and 51 hectares of employment land between 2011 and 2036 in Melton Borough."</p> <p>Open Countryside paragraph should read: "New development will be restricted outside the settlements identified as Primary and Secondary Rural Centres, and those villages identified as Rural Supporter and Rural Settlements."</p>	<p>1) National policy means that the housing requirement cannot be worded as a maximum – therefore the phrase "at least" is appropriate.</p> <p>2) Agree with revised wording</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

<p>Gary Stephens – Marrons Planning (on behalf of Mr Hawley and Mr &amp; Mrs Stokes, landowners at Six Hills)</p>	<p>BHLF-BHRP-4H8Y-S</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>However, the scale of development proposed at the Primary Rural Service Centres, which is set out in Policy SS2 – Development Strategy, needs to be justified and demonstrated to be the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives, such as land at Six Hills.</p> <p>The overall level of housing and employment growth to be planned for within Melton Borough to 2036 is under review and will be replaced by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment for Leicester and Leicestershire.</p> <p>Until the results of this exercise are published, and the Councils (particularly Leicester City) have demonstrated they can accommodate their needs within their administrative area, it is not possible to comment on whether the target for the number of new homes and employment land required in the Borough is robust.</p> <p>Given the current uncertainty, the Council should not proceed to its Submission Version of the Local Plan until this has been properly addressed with the authorities within the Housing Market Area.</p> <p>However, in setting the overall targets and deciding on the appropriate Development Strategy to meet the targets, the following general comments are made.</p> <p>Housing delivery rates in the Borough since 2011 have been significantly lower than the Council's initial target of 245 dwellings per annum, and a shortfall of 874 dwellings has arisen in the first four years of the plan period.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Council acknowledge at 2.2.2 that providing homes for those that cannot afford to buy is a key challenge for the Borough, particularly given the very low rates of delivery in recent years. Just 7 affordable homes were built in 2012/13, and only 6 affordable homes in 2013/14.</p> <p>A housing backlog has therefore arisen and there is therefore an urgent need to boost housing supply in the Borough in order to address unmet needs.</p> <p>Providing choice for the house building industry will clearly be an important part of the response of the Plan to this problem. Whilst small sites in the villages can make a contribution to the overall need, they clearly cannot deliver the same scale or speed of housing delivery that can be achieved on larger sites where multiple house builders can operate. Recent evidence produced by the Home Builders Federation confirms that such large sites on average can typically</p>	<p>Policy SS2 should be amended to include the allocation of land at Six Hills in order to provide greater flexibility and demonstrate delivery of the development needs of the Borough.</p>	<p>The site at Six Hills has been assessed as part of the large site assessment. This concluded that the proposal for a new village in this location did not represent the best or most sustainable option for addressing the Borough's housing requirement within the plan period. However policy SS6 identifies a new village at Six Hills as one of a number of possible options for addressing future housing needs through a review of the Local Plan. This approach would encompass the need to review the plan in the event of failing to meet the 5 year housing land supply requirement or changes arising from the OAN.</p> <p>In light of the conclusions of the Large site assessment it would be inappropriate to identify a new village at Six Hills in the Local Plan as any such development could "compete" with the delivery of homes at Melton South and Melton north and will therefore affect the ability to deliver the ORR.</p> <p>Despite the evidence quoted which indicates a delivery rate of between 70 – 90 homes per annum on large sites, such evidence reports also consider the long lead in times before large sites, especially new villages, begin to deliver new homes. Whilst this site is not affected by the need to provide significant highway infrastructure it will still have a significant lead in time – in the same way that the two Melton SUEs will have a long lead in time – this allows for the planning process, site preparation and putting in initial utility and services. The development would also be expected to deliver the community infrastructure required to support a new community (such as a school and shops) in the very early stages adding further delay to the early completion of homes on the site.</p> <p>It is recognised that the borough has significantly under-delivered on its housing requirement over recent years and there is currently no five year supply of housing land, however work on the assessment of sites for allocation includes consideration of site delivery in order that a robust housing trajectory can be included in the Local Plan which will demonstrate a deliverable five year housing</p>	
---	-------------------------	-----------	---	--	--	--

		<p>deliver between 70 to 95 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>Boosting supply quickly will therefore be reliant on large sites whose delivery is not constrained by infrastructure capacity or infrastructure improvements that will take time to plan and implement, and the Council's choice of large sites will therefore be critical to the success and soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>The draft Development Strategy relies on nearly 4,000 homes being delivered on two sites around Melton Mowbray, which equates to nearly two thirds of the initial housing target coming from just two sites. This itself is of concern given the over reliance on two sites.</p> <p>Furthermore, reference is made within the Consultation document to the need for an outer relief road for the town, and that the developments proposed around Melton Mowbray are dependent upon this road for access. Development will provide or contribute towards its delivery in part, although there is no certainty as to the funding arrangements for connecting sections. Reference is also made to additional modelling and engineering solutions being explored with the County Council in order to define the route, and there is clearly still some uncertainty in relation to its design.</p> <p>It is also evident from Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan that the delivery of the outer relief road and associated junction improvements are critical to the Plan, and yet the timing of delivery of large parts is still undetermined. The A606 Nottingham Road to Melton Spinney section of the road, critical for the delivery of the Northern</p> <p>Sustainable Neighbourhood (SN), is phased for 2016-21. No further information on the phasing of the remaining sections is provided. This places doubt on whether the two SNs can be delivered concurrently, as suggested by the trajectory at Table 5.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Council will have to go through a lengthy process before</p> <p>construction of the road can even begin, with the process likely to involve</p> <p>safeguarding the route, compulsory purchase, obtaining Network Rail consent and overcoming flood risk constraints in certain areas. This adds further uncertainty as to whether the first phase of the road is likely to be delivered within the 2016-21 period as indicated by the IDP.</p>		<p>land supply.</p> <p>Delivery of the two SUEs in Melton Mowbray is not dependent upon two sites as there are a number of development parcels contained within each SUE which will be delivered concurrently – the indicative trajectory for delivery of the two SUEs take a realistic and pragmatic view that two developers may be delivering concurrently on each SUE</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--



		<p>In the absence of any clear evidence on the design, timing and delivery of a relief road, it is not possible to comment on whether the growth identified for Melton Mowbray in the draft Development Strategy can be regarded as sustainable development. Furthermore, there is no certainty the proposed trajectory for these sites are deliverable. Indeed, it is questionable whether the two SNs, which would be in direct competition with each other, are capable of coming forward at the rates suggested in any event.</p> <p>In this context, it has to be concluded the draft Development Strategy as currently proposed is not sound. It is a high risk strategy for the Council to place such reliance on two large sites that are dependent upon highway infrastructure that has yet to be defined in terms of what it is, how it will be funded, or when it will be delivered.</p> <p>The Council will be aware that any delay in the delivery of these two sites against the trajectory proposed will result in unmet housing needs, as there is no flexibility as Melton Local Plan – Emerging Options (January 2016) printed form drafted within the Development Strategy to rely on alternative sites. Unmet housing needs results in a lack of a five year housing land supply, and makes the Council more vulnerable to losing appeals on sites not supported by its Plan.</p> <p>Paragraph 14 of the Framework requires that local plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change (our underlining).</p> <p>In this context, the Council should reconsider Policy SS2 and identify additional allocations in order to demonstrate a robust strategy is in place to deliver the development needs of the area.</p> <p>Policy SS6 is noted, and the intention of the Council to monitor implementation, and review the Plan if housing and employment is not delivered as envisaged.</p> <p>However, the Framework already places a requirement on the Council to regularly</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			<p>monitor and review its Plan. Policy SS6 does not therefore negate the need for a</p> <p>robust strategy and flexibility to be built into the Plan through a revision to Policy SS2 and the Development Strategy as described above.</p> <p>In reviewing Policy SS2 and the need for greater flexibility, the Council should re-consider the allocation of land at Six Hills.</p> <p>As already set out above, and in direct contrast to the Melton North/South SNs and</p> <p>other options around the town, the delivery of development at Six Hills Garden Village is not constrained by highway infrastructure. Moreover, its location means that it would not directly compete with allocations around the town.</p> <p>As the land is under the control of only two landowners who are working</p> <p>collaboratively in promoting the site, delivery will not be delayed due to landownership issues. Discussions are also on-going with prospective delivery partners.</p> <p>In light of the relatively limited upfront infrastructure required, it is conceivable for the site to make a meaningful contribution towards the Council's five year supply at the point of adoption of the Plan, and to deliver a minimum of 100 dwellings per annum once a number of house builders are active on the site during the plan period.</p> <p>In fact, its delivery and the potential to contribute towards highway infrastructure through CIL payments could aid delivery of development at Melton Mowbray (see separate response to Chapter 8).</p> <p>In this regard, the landowners are prepared to give a clear commitment to the Council that such contributions would be made where fair and reasonable.</p>			
Gordon Raper	ANON-BHRP-4H3N-9	Yes	The figures for Bottesford represent approx 16 per year. This is reasonable. The village needs to attract new residents to support the local businesses etc. Otherwise it becomes a sleepy retirement settlement.	None	Noted	
Graeme Gladstone	ANON-BHRP-4HZH-A	No	<p>I would like to see a much more proactive approach to where new houses should be located.</p> <p>MBC should consult with local communities on the most</p>		Comments noted. Community consultation about the location of development sites forms part of this consultation process.	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			<p>desirable locations whether these are brought forward by land owners or not.</p> <p>I would like to see a more creative and imaginative approach being adopted to solve some of these issues. As it stands the plan is too passive.</p> <p>What about a new purpose built and designed village somewhere in the borough for example?</p> <p>What about big thinking and ambition for the borough? Restoring a direct rail link to Nottingham for example?</p>			
<p>Helen Hartley – Nexus Planning (on behalf of Richborough Estates)</p>	<p>BHLF-BHRP-4H8A-1</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>It is with reference to the above and to the excellent sustainability credentials of Land off Great Lane (MBC/191/15) that we consider a greater level of housing should be directed towards Frisby on the Wreake than the 50 dwelling requirement proposed in the Emerging Options Draft Plan.</p> <p>In addition to the role and function of Frisby, it is apparent from our review of our Council’s Sustainability Appraisal that the ‘Potential Site Option’ in Frisby of land off Great Lane (MBC/191/15) has excellent sustainability credentials and is more sustainable than the majority of the other ‘Potential Options’ identified in the SRSC level. The assessment from Turley Sustainability contained in Appendix 1 demonstrates that Land off Great Lane is one of only four proposed allocations within the Borough with no major negative sustainability impacts.</p> <p>Given these impressive sustainability credentials, Land off Great Lane (MBC/191/15) presents an opportunity to deliver more dwellings than the currently proposed allocation for 48 and has an important role to play in contributing to the overall housing need of the SCRS’. The merits of the site, its deliverability for housing and the scope to include additional land in the allocation, is considered in detail in Section 3 of these representations.</p> <p>An increased level of housing provision in Frisby on the Wreake will also help to reduce the disparity that currently exists between the need and provision of affordable housing. The latest SHMA has indicated that in order to meet identified needs at authority level, new developments are expected to deliver 40% affordable housing. With reference to ward level census data, just 3.5% of residents in Frisby-on-the-Wreake live in social rented accommodation and so this provides a clear indication of the underlying affordable housing need that exists.</p>	<p>Richborough Estates strongly support the identification in Policy SS2 of Frisby on the Wreake as a SRSC and believe this to be fully justified with regard to its services and role and function in the wider rural area.</p> <p>Following a review of the evidence base, it is considered the Local Plan should be seeking to allocate a greater proportion of development to the Secondary Rural Service Centres and consequently to Frisby on the Wreake than the currently proposed 50 dwellings for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· In seeking to direct 5% of the overall housing requirement for the Borough towards the Secondary Rural Service Centres, the Emerging Options Draft Plan purely seeks to continue the past trend of development in these settlements. This is considered to be a significantly flawed approach given the past rates of development are reflective of out-dated policies constraining development and not reflective of need or deliverability. Given the Council has failed to meet the 5 year housing land supply requirement by a significant and substantial amount, it is imperative the Emerging Options Draft Plan takes a different approach to the distribution of development than has been previously realised. It is within this context that it is considered the Melton Local Plan should be directing more than 300</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. See site assessment for further information about this site.</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			<p>An increased housing allocation in excess of 50 dwellings is therefore warranted and can be justified, in accordance with paragraph 47 of the Framework.</p>	<p>dwellings towards the Secondary Rural Service Centres in order to ‘boost significantly the supply of housing’ as required by national planning policy;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Our review of services and facilities reveals Frisby on the Wreake is the most sustainable of the Secondary Rural Service Centres, alongside Asfordby Hill;</li> <li>· Frisby has a very limited supply of affordable dwellings and the need for affordable and low-cost housing for young people was frequently raised by local residents during a recent consultation on the emerging Frisby on the Wreake Neighbourhood Plan. More development will therefore help meet these needs;</li> <li>· Whilst the Emerging Local Plan identifies a requirement of 40 dwellings for Stathern, there are no potential sites identified for the village, leaving a question as to where these 40 dwellings are going to be delivered;</li> <li>· The evidence in the Sustainability Assessment demonstrates that Land off Great Lane is one of the most sustainable sites from all those assessed in the Borough. It has capacity to accommodate more than 50 dwellings, as confirmed in more detail</li> </ul>		
Jane Wilson – Friends of Melton Country Park	BHLF-BHRP-4H8X-R	Yes	<p>We agree with the distribution strategy based on the settlement hierarchy and we agree with the percentage split between the town (65%) and rural area (35%). We do not support increasing the town allocation beyond the 65% should certain rural areas be unable to provide the allocated housing. It is our belief that the rural area has sufficient capacity to absorb 35% of the housing development need for the borough, it will ensure the rural area will improve with regards to sustainability and in some cases remove the risk of certain villages becoming isolated and unsustainable.</p>		Support noted	
Jeanne Petit	ANON-BHRP-4HF6-4	No	<p>See comments already left for Somerby in previous section. Plus: - Not sure Somerby needs more housing - Proposed site(s) will only increase flooding problems</p>		See Settlement Role Review	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			<p>Somerby already suffers from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Negative impact on rural aspect of the village and nature/wildlife</li> <li>- Negative impact on Drainage situation</li> </ul>			
<p>Jim Malkin – BHB Architects (on behalf of Barwood Homes)</p>	<p>BHLF-BHRP-4H82-J</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Melton Local Plan Emerging Options (Draft Plan) Policy SS2 (Development Strategy) advises that provision should be made for 6,125 new homes and 51ha of new employment land between 2011 and 2036.</p> <p>This strategy provides details of the distribution of growth across the Borough over the plan period and seeks to focus 65% of all growth within the Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area. In order to achieve this two major sustainable neighbourhoods (north and south) are proposed. To the south it is proposed to allocate some 120ha of land to provide 2,000 homes (1,700 in the plan period) and 20ha of employment, and to the north 100ha of land for 1,700 homes (1,500 in the plan period).</p> <p>Whilst admirable in its ambition to provide the necessary new housing in two sustainable urban extensions concerns are raised over the over-reliance on large strategic allocations. These types of allocations in other areas have historically been known to fail, or be slow to deliver due to market conditions or through infrastructure constraints, whilst issues inevitably arise where multiple landowners are involved, as is the case with these two sites, which will be slower to deliver if they come forward at all.</p> <p>We are therefore of the view that the Melton Local Plan places too much reliance on the delivery of these two sites to meet the development needs of the Borough over the next plan period.</p>		<p>Comments noted – it is considered that the 65%/35% split is a sustainable approach which will address the needs arising from population change during the plan period. Development of the two SUEs has been planned with an appropriate lead in time to allow for the necessary planning process and the site preparation work to begin. In the meantime it is expected that the smaller sites will make a significant contribution to housing delivery during the early years of the plan period. This will be clarified by the inclusion of a detailed housing trajectory in the pre-submission plan. See also site assessment of alternative sites</p>	<p>Include detailed housing trajectory</p>
<p>Joanne Belcher</p>	<p>ANON-BHRP-4HHM-W</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>It appears to be very restrictive.</p>	<p>Greater flexibility - particularly with the village development.</p>	<p>noted</p>	
<p>Joe Pell</p>	<p>ANON-BHRP-4H68-P</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>I believe that while the majority of development should be in Melton there should be scope for appropriate small scale developments in both the Rural Supporter and Rural Settlement Villages. The increase in home working and improvements such as broadband mean that living / working from home in villages is perfectly sustainable and ensure that they are allowed to grow and prosper. There is a need for a greater number of suitable retirement properties for example to allow people to continue to live in villages.</p>		<p>Policies SS2 and SS3 allow for this</p>	
<p>John A Herlihy</p>	<p>ANON-BHRP-4HU3-G</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>All developments MUST consider the impact upon Traffic flows and micro environments. ( 'Micro' because they are small villages. What they do will collectively affect the Boro'.)</p>	<p>More recognition of Traffic conditions / flows etc.</p> <p>If local villages are allowed to grow their housing they will ultimately affect the</p>	<p>Traffic and highway safety is one of the criteria used to assess the suitability of sites for development.</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

				<p>numbers of children attending John Fernely / Belvoir / Longfield schools.</p> <p>AND WE ALL KNOW HOW THE TOWNs ROAD SYSTEMS ARE CLOGGED UP NOW.- HEAVEN HELP US IF THERE ARE MORE CHILDREN ON THESE ROADS.</p> <p>Increased likelihood of serious accidents on major roads - and we do not have full blue light cover! Brilliant!!</p>		
John David Smith	ANON-BHRP-4H4X-M	Yes	I base my response on the proposal for Stathern, my home village.	None.		
John Mace	ANON-BHRP-4HEM-T	Yes	The allocation of housing seems reasonable subject to sustainability, especially in Melton with its severe traffic problems. Additional schooling, medical and policing needs will have to be met	Emphasis of tackling the traffic problems before additional traffic weight is added to the urban environment	Noted	
John Matthew Williams – Wymondham and Edmondthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Committee )	ANON-BHRP-4HBD-E	No	In secondary rural service centres sites of less than ten units should form part of the Local Plan if adopted through a Neighbourhood Plan. This is consistent with the methodology proposed for the 2016 SHLAA	<p>- with regard to sites of less than ten units the methodology proposed for the 2016 SHLAA be adopted for secondary rural service centres, rural settlements and rural supporters</p> <p>- the acceptance of windfall sites as contributing towards meeting target housing allocations following the methodology proposed for the 2016 SHLAA should be adopted</p>	Comments noted	
John Moore	ANON-BHRP-4HZS-N	No	<p>I support the proposed distribution of housing but object to the way policy SS2 has been worded.</p> <p>The Draft Plan states (para 4.2.1) that the Leicestershire SHMA has identified an Objectively Assessed Need for 245 dwellings a year (not at least 245 dwellings).</p> <p>So given that housing need has been objectively assessed why does Policy SS2 propose at least 6125 dwellings? This is too open-ended. SS2 should state a total number of dwellings over the 25 years of the plan which will be subject to objective review.</p>	<p>Amend the first line to:</p> <p>"Provision will be made for the development of 6,125 homes and 51 hectares of employment land between 2011 and 2036 in Melton Borough."</p>	National policy means that the housing requirement cannot be worded as a maximum – therefore the phrase “at least” is appropriate.	
JOHN RUST	ANON-BHRP-4HUV-K	No	<p>Extract</p> <p>We question the calculation that Melton needs at least 245 houses every year for 25 years. This figure, as noted in our comment about the overview (Chapter 4), is based on the largest most optimistic forecast of possible growth. Spreading 35% of this figure throughout the rural community is not sustainable development and as such it goes against the NPPF.</p>	<p>Extract</p> <p>The overall housing allocation for Melton Borough is based on the largest and most optimistic of all the forecast figures presented in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 and should be reduced.</p> <p><a href="http://www.melton.gov.uk/downloads/">http://www.melton.gov.uk/downloads/</a></p>	<p>The housing requirement and the split of this by urban and rural is justified by the evidence provided by the SHMA and the emerging Melton Borough housing need study.</p> <p>New housing development is largely delivered by the market and the Council has not means of controlling how and when individual house builders build the homes they get planning</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			<p>We challenge the interpretation that Long Clawson should be a Primary Rural Centre, it is not sustainable as such as noted in the question about settlements roles and relationships.</p> <p>As mentioned already I believe that MBC has taken a worst case scenario in determining the housing need. The overall number of 6125 houses proposed is too great and puts undue pressure for development that is going to be unsustainable. Putting 35% of development into the villages is also going to change their characters considerably and a lower figure would be more sustainable. This goes against Melton Mowbray Vision to protect and retain the character of its midland villages.</p> <p>Bottesford and Asfordby, are supported by good transport infrastructure. Similarly, some villages on main roads also have good transport infrastructure, but are given minimal amounts of development. For example Asfordby Hill and Frisby-on-the-Wreake all share the same good bus links from Melton through Asfordby to Leicester. Nether Broughton and Ab Kettleby share a good bus route from Melton to Nottingham. Sustainability is based around having good public transport links, but these do not appear to have been considered in the assessment for the distribution of housing.</p> <p>The way the housing is proposed to be distributed takes no account of the sustainability of the villages and the scope those villages have for expansion. Building large numbers of houses in Long Clawson is unsustainable because it has only limited public transport; is 2.8 miles from the nearest main road; the school is full (see The Melton Local Plan Issues and Options: Infrastructure Delivery Plan). However, other villages have schools that are on the brink of closure due to lack of pupils, the assessment of sustainability should consider the viability of schools, shops and pubs, not just be a checklist of facilities.</p> <p>Long Clawson is developing a Neighbourhood Plan and finds that the assertions for it to be classed as a Primary Rural Centre are ill-founded and unsustainable. It does not have the transport or road infrastructure, it does not have good transport links and it cannot cope (especially the school) with the number of extra people that the primary designation is likely to bring with it.</p>	<p>file/1676/leicester_and_leicestershire_strategic_housing_market_assessment_2014</p> <p>Long Clawson should not be classed as a Primary Rural Centre, it is closer to a Secondary Rural Centre. However, the classification of the villages (apart perhaps the small hamlets) into Primary, Secondary and Rural Supporter is a poorly designated set of divisions that do not take any account of sustainability and transport infrastructure. The only two villages that merit Primary Rural Centre designation are Asfordby and Bottesford, which both have substantial transport, school and facilities infrastructure.</p> <p>Melton Mowbray is destined to take 65% of the housing development with 35% in the rural areas. The policy should state that development in the rural areas will not proceed faster than development in Melton Mowbray. This is to avoid there being a rush by developers to the villages and a lack of development in Melton Mowbray. For every 35 houses built in the rural areas there should be 65 constructed in Melton and the two figures should run hand-in-hand.</p> <p>The apportionment for all the villages, except Asfordby and Bottesford should be scrapped and spread throughout all the villages. Villages should be allowed developments up to 10 houses in a year if the local infrastructure can cope and if the development can be shown to be environmentally sustainable (i.e. not cause flooding or undue stress on infrastructure). Large developments of more than 10 houses should not take place in the villages since suburban type estates change the character and sense of place of the villages and undermine the historical character and culture of the villages - the very reason why</p>	<p>permission for.</p> <p>It must be recognised that whilst the most sustainable way to deliver large numbers of new homes is through urban extensions these also take a long time to begin delivering homes, whilst small and medium sized sites are generally quicker to deliver. National planning policy states that a council should have 5 years supply of deliverable housing land, where it cannot demonstrate this the policies of the plan relating to housing will be considered out of date. In this context it is imperative that the council supports development of sites which will deliver within the first five years to ensure that the policies in the plan remain relevant and up-to-date.</p> <p>Issues relating to access to public transport and the capacity of existing facilities will be factored into the distribution of housing through the review of the Settlement Roles</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

				people come to live or stay living in Melton Borough		
John William Coleman	ANON-BHRP-4H6C-1	No	<p>I question the need and achievability of the target of 6125 additional houses by 2036, as explained in my response to Chapter 4 Overview. Even if this figure is accepted, I consider the allocation of housing targets to the smaller villages to be arbitrary and disproportionate. 615 houses are assigned to 18 Rural Supporter villages, giving an average of 34 houses per village.</p> <p>Taking my own village, Hoby, as an example, this would increase the present housing by almost a third. The secondary RSCs are each assigned 50 houses (increases of approx. 17 to 25%). The Rural settlements are each assigned an average of 6 houses (increases of 10 to 15% for Rotherby and Ragdale).</p> <p>So the Rural Supporter allocation should be reduced substantially.</p>	Reduce the total house build target, and make a fairer allocation among the smaller villages, as indicated above.	See Settlement Role review	
John William Fairbrother - MNAG	ANON-BHRP-4H45-H	Yes	<p>Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area</p> <p>If key infrastructure means link roads through new housing developments, this does not constitute traffic relief in the town as would a proper bypass. We cannot expect heavy haulage to use unconnected link roads through housing estates.</p>	Melton Council and all connected authorities, including the local MP should be making stronger and continuous representation to the government for a bypass for Melton as anything less cannot be considered as a traffic relief alternative. This should be included in the local plan before any housing projects begin.	Noted, however development is required to fund and provide parts of the ORR and must therefore begin before a relief road is in place. LCC and MBC have accepted that there will be some “pain before the gain”	
Joyce Noon – CPRE Leicestershire	BHLF-BHRP-4H2J-4	No	<p>HOUSING NEED</p> <p>Melton Borough Council forms part of the wider housing market of Leicester and Leicestershire. All planning Authorities co-operated to produce the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014. The Summary of projections 2011 – 2036 – average - Melton identified between 173 (PROJ 1) to 239 (PROJ 4) (annual requirements. (25yrs x 206 average = 5150)</p> <p>There does appear to be some confusion on the number of dwellings required in the period 2011 – 2036. The overall total in the Local Plan of 6125 seems to be based on 245 per annum, whereas the 2014 SMHA figure (mid estimate) is 194 per annum.</p> <p>It would therefore be reasonable to assume that an average mean figure based on the advice given in Leicester &amp; Leicestershire Strategic Market Assessment would be used. Some explanation is required as the overall target for housing appears to be in excess of requirements by approximately 1000 dwellings, a huge over-provision.</p>	<p>CPRE has grave concerns about the vague and meaningless wording relating to open countryside. The resulting policies are weakened.</p> <p>CPRE considers that they would not be robust enough to give clarity when considering planning applications in open countryside.</p>	<p>Comments relating to housing need and the OAN are noted. Additional clarity can be provided to explain why the council has opted for the higher economic growth option OAN from the SHMA.</p> <p>Greater clarity would be provided by amending the text relating to “open Countryside” as suggested</p>	<p>Provide greater clarity about OAN and housing requirements in text.</p> <p>Amend policy wording as suggested in relation to Open Countryside</p>



Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			<p>The NPPF (Para 48) advises “Local planning authorities may make an allowance for windfall sites in the five-year supply if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens”</p> <p>CPRE respectfully suggest that this figure should be included in the total required as assessment based on past completions in the Local Plan as well, given that there will be evidence that supply through windfall sites can be obtained and satisfied. The Annual Monitoring Report should give this record.</p> <p>Requirement</p> <p>POLICY SS 2 – DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <p>“Open Countryside Outside the settlements identified as Primary and Secondary Rural Centres, and those villages identified as Rural Supporter and Rural Settlements, new development will be restricted to that which is necessary and appropriate in the open countryside” (page 35).</p> <p>Where the guiding policy to determine what is ‘is necessary and appropriate in the open countryside? This statement is ambiguous and meaningless.</p>			
Julie Moss	ANON-BHRP-4HM5-A	Yes	No comment	Bottesford is not a Primary Rural Service Centre for the reasons previously noted	Noted	
June Grant	ANON-BHRP-4H6Y-Q	No	All guidelines for planning have been thrown out, now it is a free for all.		The purpose of the Local Plan is to provide the policy framework and guidelines to control and guide development	
Kenneth Bray	ANON-BHRP-4HBX-2	No	I don't have the data to calculate this properly but based on what I can see for Stathern and other villages I know the complexity of this approach seems irrelevant. The increase in the village would be roughly the same whether we were a Secondary or a rural Supporter. The 'constraint' of up to five or up to ten houses is artificial and probably unsupportable and is belied by the attempt to find major sites in smaller villages.	See Q2 in Settlements and Roles above	See Settlement Role review	
Kerstin Hartmann	ANON-BHRP-4HGW-6	No	I object to any figures attached to house building before road links and employment have been decided. Unemployment is still fairly high in the East Midlands in comparison to the national average, also wages have not increased at the same rate.	A strategy for Melton Town including roads, bus links, train links, attracting industry and building accordingly following the demand relevant to increased employment opportunities, not the other way round which is a	The plan promotes employment development alongside housing development and new road infrastructure. In addition a transport strategy is being prepared to sit alongside the local plan which considers bus, cycling, walking and other traffic	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

				good recipe for disaster meaning high unemployment and low wages.	measures alongside the provision of an Outer Relief Road.	
Laura Smith	ANON-BHRP-4HB7-1	No	Why the rural supporters are allocated 10% of housing, and Secondary Rural Service Centres allocated 5%? As the latter have more and/or better services and facilities than the rural supporters, I would have thought that they should have the higher percentage allocated to them. Please explain the rationale behind the proposed split.		This is a % split by settlement role and results in smaller numbers for the villages within each role as there are more Rural Supporters than Secondary Rural Service Centres. However this split will change as a result of the settlement role review.	
Laurence Holmes – Melton North Landowner Consortium	ANON-BHRP-4HGQ-Z	No	Please refer to paragraphs 3.2 to 3.22 of the 'Representation on the Melton Emerging Options Draft Plan' (Melton North Landowner Consortium Version).	Please refer to paragraphs 3.23 to 3.28, and Table 3.2 of the 'Representation on the Melton Emerging Options Draft Plan' (Melton North Landowner Consortium Version).		
Laurence Holmes – Leicestershire County Council and Richborough Estates	BHLF-BHRP-4H8K-B	No	<p>The Draft Plan identifies a requirement of 6,125 residential dwellings to be provided within the Borough between 2011 and 2036, as informed by the findings of the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2014. The spatial distribution of this requirement, as currently proposed, is set out in Policy SS2 of the Draft Plan. Policy SS2 as currently worded proposes to accommodate at least 3,980 dwellings (65% of the overall housing requirement) within Melton Mowbray Urban Area. This area includes the NSN, which is proposed for allocation under Policy SS5 and which includes the developers' site. In the first instance, it is important to recognise that Melton Mowbray, including the proposed NSN, presents the most sustainable location for accommodating growth in the Borough.</p> <p>The identified housing requirement of 6,125 dwellings for the Borough between 2011 and 2036 equates to 245 dwellings per annum. This aligns with 'Option 3' of Question 6 of the SA, which places emphasis on supporting economic growth.</p> <p>Question 7 of the SA considers the options available in terms of how the Borough should grow. Option 1 in relation to Q7 focuses development on Melton Mowbray with small-scale development in rural settlements. Option 2 would see a reduced focus on Melton Mowbray, with increased development within the rural villages. Option 3 would see a more dispersed pattern of development within the Borough, with a further reduction in growth at Melton Mowbray substituted by increased development at other, smaller settlements.</p> <p>The findings set out in Table 4.1 of the SA, which are supported by the developers, demonstrate that Option 1 would achieve the highest sustainability score of all the options. Whilst consistent with the majority of scores applied in respect of Option 2, Option 1 was afforded a</p>	<p>The strategy to direct the greatest proportion of the Borough's identified housing growth should be more clearly aligned with 'Option 1' of Q7 within the supporting SA. To achieve this, the proportion of the Borough's housing requirement to be met within the Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area should be increased within Policy SS2.</p> <p>The above would serve to rebalance the distribution of housing growth away from unallocated sites, principally within the Rural Settlements and Rural Supporter villages, which are in less sustainable locations, to highly sustainable locations within Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>The Melton NSN area presents the most sustainable location for accommodating additional housing growth. This is corroborated by the findings presented in the SA which supports the Draft Plan. The NSN, as defined on the supporting Policies Map, is sufficient to accommodate at least 2,200 dwellings. From this total, the Developers' site would accommodate approximately 680 dwellings, at an average density of 30 dwellings per hectare. The uplifted figure would be deliverable during the plan period, thus representing an</p>	<p>Comments noted – but not supported. It is important that the plan demonstrates the ability to deliver the housing requirement set out by the SHMA in the first five and 10 years. Given the considerable lead in times for SUE development it must be recognised that these sites will not begin contributing towards meeting the housing land supply for 3-5 years. In this context there is a need to identify sufficient deliverable supply of small to medium sized sites across the Borough which are deliverable, and attractive to the market. It is also important that the market is provided with a choice of size and location of sites to support a vibrant housing market.</p> <p>If the Northern SUE can accommodate more homes this should be accommodated as part of the proposal over a longer timeframe recognising a realistic delivery rate for each development parcel. This can be accommodated within changes to policy SS5 without affecting the overall split of 65%/ 35%</p>	Consider overall capacity of the Northern SUE as part of changes to policy SS5

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

		<p>higher score in terms of facilitating access to education provision ('significant positive').</p> <p>The contrast in scoring between Options 1 and 3 on a number of sustainability criteria is significant and this should be afforded renewed consideration by the Council in determining the spatial distribution of development set out under Policy SS2. In particular, the dispersal of development to small rural settlements, in terms of meeting the housing needs of present and future residents of the Borough, was afforded a neutral score (e.g. mix of 'minor positive and negative effects'), compared with a 'significant positive' effect created by Option 1 against this sustainability criteria.</p> <p>As the Council will be aware, one of the key elements of the above criteria is whether there would be a contribution to the stock of affordable housing in places where a need has been established. In this context, it must be borne in mind that the ability to deliver affordable housing in order to meet identified needs within the Borough will be most effectively achieved at large-scale allocation sites such as Melton North.</p> <p>A significant difference in the scoring applied to Options 1 and 3 under Q7 of the SA is also apparent in terms of facilitating access to education for residents. As such, development focused at Melton Mowbray has been identified as having a 'significant positive' effect against this criteria, as opposed to a 'negative' effect which is identified for development dispersed around smaller rural settlements.</p> <p>As highlighted above, the small size of many sites which may become available for development within the smaller settlements means that there will not be scope to deliver education facilities in the way that will be possible with the strategic allocation sites such as the NSN at Melton. Consequently, the Council will be reliant upon securing developer contributions towards existing and new education provision off-site in order to meet the needs of additional residents in the small rural settlements.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the likelihood of viability constraints which could impact upon the ability of S106 contributions to be levied on small developments, it is considered likely that there will be little, if any, opportunity to provide additional education provision, particularly at secondary school level, within smaller rural settlements to serve new residents. Consequently, the provision of housing identified for smaller settlements within the Borough under Policy SS3 will perpetuate unsustainable travel patterns, through journeys</p>	<p>increase of 700 dwellings from the 1,500 dwellings currently identified for this area under Policy SS5 of the Draft Plan.</p> <p>With the increase in capacity at the NSN taken into account, the total number of dwellings identified for the Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area should be increased from 3,985 to 4,685 for the plan period. To accommodate this increase, it is proposed that reductions are made to the level of housing provision currently identified for the Secondary Rural Service Centres, Rural Supporter and Rural Settlements. The recommended adjustments are summarised in Table 3.2:</p> <p>Settlement SS2 Requirement Recommend Requirement</p> <p>Melton Mowbray 3,985 4,685</p> <p>Bottesford 370 370</p> <p>Asfordby 300 300</p> <p>Long Clawson 150 150</p> <p>Waltham 100 100</p> <p>Total for Primary Rural Service 920 920</p> <p>Asfordby Hill 50 50</p> <p>Somerby 50 50</p> <p>Frisby on the Wreake 50 50</p> <p>Stathern 50 50</p> <p>Wymondham 50 50</p> <p>Croxtan Kerrial 50 50</p> <p>Total for Secondary Rural 300 300</p> <p>Total for Rural Supporter 615 130</p>		
--	--	---	---	--	--

		<p>being made to schools and other education facilities in Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>With the majority of facilities, including those relating to employment, shopping, leisure and other services, being located within Melton Mowbray, it is appropriate to accommodate the majority of the Borough’s housing growth within and around this settlement. In this regard, it is considered that criteria (4), relating to economy and employment, should take into account the extent to which development under the various growth options is able to contribute to the vitality and viability of Melton Mowbray town centre, as the principal focus for economic, shopping and leisure activity within the Borough.</p> <p>In view of the above, focusing development at Melton Mowbray, in particular the NSN would serve to maximise the retention of future residents’ expenditure within the town centre. It would also ensure that facilities are readily accessible for future residents, including those at the NSN.</p> <p>In contrast, development in the smaller rural settlements would be limited in terms of accessible facilities, thus likely to result in more car-based travel to other destinations in order to meet residents’ needs. This will increase the risk of expenditure on shopping, leisure and other services being leaked to destinations outside of the Borough, to the detriment of Melton Mowbray town centre.</p> <p>It is clear that the housing requirement identified for the Borough under Policy SS2 is required in order to facilitate increased economic growth in the Borough. However, with the majority of both existing and planned employment facilities, together with shopping, leisure and other services, also being located within Melton Mowbray, residents of new development in the smaller rural settlements will be more dependent on car-borne travel, in order to access jobs and services. This is recognised in the scoring applied to Options 1 and 3 within the SA in respect of the sustainable transport sustainability criteria.</p> <p>The NPPF is clear in paragraph 17 that planning should:</p> <p>“...actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable”.</p> <p>With the above in mind, it should be acknowledged that many rural settlements within the Borough, for which</p>	<p>Total for Rural Settlements 305 90</p> <p>Borough Total 6,125 6,125</p> <p>Adopting the adjusted figures in Table 3.2 would see the proportion of housing currently identified by Policy SS2 for the Primary and Secondary Rural Service Centres remain unchanged, whilst the proportion of housing identified for the Rural Supporter Villages and Rural Settlements reduced by approximately 75% over the plan period. This reflects a more sustainable approach to housing distribution, which would help to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provide the majority of new homes within the most sustainable locations within Melton Mowbray, ensuring that employment, education, shopping and other local facilities are readily accessible by a range of travel modes;</li> <li>· Maximise the delivery of affordable housing within the Borough, facilitated through strategic development sites in Melton Mowbray;</li> <li>· Optimise expenditure retention within Melton Mowbray town centre in order to bolster its vitality and viability and increasing the propensity for investment in shopping and leisure facilities;</li> <li>· Minimise unsustainable travel patterns across the Borough, thus ensuring consistency with Policy IN1;</li> <li>· Reduce the reliance on windfall sites to meet the Borough’s housing needs over the plan period; and</li> <li>· Increase protection of the historic character and setting of the Borough’s rural villages.</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			<p>growth has been identified within Policy SS3, are not served by adequate public transport services. This is in contrast to the NSN which already benefits from access to public transport services. In particular, this area is served by a number of existing bus services, including Nos. 15, 19 and 24 which run along Nottingham Road and provide links to Melton Mowbray town centre, Oakham and Nottingham, and the No.25 service which runs along Scalford Road and provides links to Scalford, Eastwell and Stathern.</p> <p>There is the potential to extend and increase the frequency of existing bus services within the strategic development area to ensure future residents are afforded greater choice and flexibility in travel options when seeking to access jobs, services and facilities within Melton Mowbray and the wider area. This is unlikely to be achieved in respect of new development within the smaller rural settlements, thus increasing residents' dependency on car-based travel.</p>	The capacity of the NSN with regard to accommodating an increased proportion of the total dwellings identified for the Borough is addressed in further detail in paragraphs 3.30 to 3.43 below.		
Lesley Judith Twigg	ANON-BHRP-4HEH-N	No	As I set out above 6100 is the maximum of housing support economic growth over 20 y. This will inevitably be inaccurate when one considers all the assumptions about work habits, population changes over such a long time I think a reduction at least to your middle option or the "demographic" growth option would be possible --reducing the housing pressure by 1000 without definitely compromising the economy. These things can be reviewed so why "go for broke" at the beginning?	see above	Noted. Housing figures are based on evidence contained with the SHMA	
Linda Irena Adams	ANON-BHRP-4HHY-9	No	I do not have sufficient knowledge of communities other than Long Clawson which I believe has been erroneously classified as a Primary Rural Centre	Remove Long Clawson from the Primary Rural Centre category	See Settlement Role Review	
Louise Odonogue	ANON-BHRP-4H66-M	No	I think more like 80% of the housing should be centred around Melton as the town is much better equipped to provide jobs infrastructure and wider transport links. It is not fair to change the character of villages to fill quotas and the roads and road safety are not adequate there are few footpaths and the roads are hardly gritted in winter. Rural roads are already known to be more dangerous than motorways, adding more people rushing to work in the dark in winter across unlit and ungritted bendy roads that make no provision for pedestrians or cyclists is not a good idea	More housing allocated to Melton and more emphasis on the use of brownfield sites rather than the sustainability of the housing type provided	Comments noted. Consideration could be given to amending this split to 70%/30%	
Malcolm Anthony Grant	ANON-BHRP-4H6T-J	No	It is far too prescriptive		Noted	
Malcolm Brown	ANON-BHRP-4HEV-3	Yes	I support the need for development within the villages to meet needs of first time buyers and pensioners wanting to down size particularly the Primary Rural Centres>	None but ensure development is of required type.	Support Noted	
Margaret Jean Bowen	ANON-BHRP-4HHV-6	No	To demand that the villages account for 35% of the development is unreasonable if 'sustainability' means, at least in part, not having to travel to work.	Melton to have at least 80% of development.	Comments noted. Consideration could be given to amending this split to 70%/30%	
Mark Brend	ANON-	Yes	The overall strategy is appropriate, with most development	Limits on the total development across	Noted	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

	BHRP-4HGD-K		focussed around existing resources and protection of open countryside.	the term of the plan should additionally be applied to growth for Rural Settlements, Rural Supporters and Secondary Service Centres to prevent fundamental changes to the character of these communities. Without this protection, the settlements that provide the rural charm and character of the borough could well be through over development.		
Mark Colin Marlow	ANON-BHRP-4HEJ-Q	No	The criteria for development does not take into consideration the needs or opinions of the rural communities.	The notion of development need is arguable. The idea of allocating certain numbers of development units to certain areas is unrealistic. Large scale developments in rural areas will be the death of rural areas. MBC is always trying to tell the world how glorious the hunting scenes are and how wonderful our home made cheeses and pork pies are. Stop building houses on the fields that supply these things. Rural communities will apply for developments when they need them, not when MBC says they need them. Villages are built by and for villagers as required.	Comments noted	
Mark Jopling	ANON-BHRP-4HUZ-Q	Yes	As a Stathern family we support the carefully managed expansion of the village to ensure its vital services and character are retained		Support for development in Stathern noted	
Martin Alderson	ANON-BHRP-4HHU-5	No	I fear Melton will lose its identity and become just somewhere to live rather than a functioning community.		Noted	
Martin Smith	ANON-BHRP-4H6A-Y	No	The village I know and have lived in for 40 years should be classified as a rural supporter and as such would provide small unallocated developments of 5 dwellings or less	Re examination of classification of villages so that large developments 25 plus dwellings are only proposed for Asfordby sized villages and many more for Melton Mowbray. With smaller developments of max 5 dwellings for smaller villages.	See settlement role review, however it must be accepted that villages such as Asfordby with a good range of local services and good bus access to Melton Mowbray are sustainable locations suitable for additional housing development. It is not practical or reasonable to put all development into Melton Mowbray	
Mary Anne Donovan	ANON-BHRP-4HUR-F	No	I understand the 6,125 target is a top down allocation and largely not based on local need. It had been increased by approximately 2,000 houses from initial thinking but I am not aware of the justification.  The 37% target for affordable homes lacks clarity in terms of types of affordable homes considered (e.g., social housing v. first time buyers, etc.) which is an important omission of a draft plan.  With such large growth planned I would have thought the	The statement that Neighbourhood Plans must be consistent with the strategic objectives should be re-written and properly qualified as these Plans do not have to be completely consistent.  What is 'necessary and appropriate' for building in open countryside is too subjective and criteria should be set with regard to the safeguarding of important landscapes, areas of	These issues are largely addressed by detail policies on Affordable housing, housing mix, employment allocations and development and infrastructure delivery.  The housing requirement is based upon evidence of population and household change as well as applying an economic dimension relating to new jobs created.  Agree to clarifying the statement about	Clarify statement about NDPs being consistent with the Local Plan.  Add clarification about "necessary and appropriate" uses in the countryside

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			<p>Council would be looking at housing mix also for its effects on future revenue from the tax base and in an average wage and below area, calculate the financial sustainability of services given the major change in housing mix the Plan proposes.</p> <p>There is no guarantee of a bypass yet without which the Plan is unworkable. There is no Alternative scenario I can see identified in the Plan if the bypass is not forthcoming, or a decade away. There is no assessment of impact on traffic, landscape, heritage, etc. for the effects of major development in the South of Melton, which is an important omission.</p> <p>I take issue with the thinking that building homes attracts new businesses to locate here. I have found no studies/evidence to support this opinion except for small mixed industrial/housing developments. Realistically, without plausible new business development, the 12,000 or more new workers will have to travel, likely towards the urban areas of Leicester, Nottingham and Lutterworth.</p> <p>That brings into question the spatial strategy which allocates 35% of growth to villages, many of which are not located with easy access to urban areas. An alternative strategy which proposed new settlements with better access to employment opportunities seems not to have been considered. In my view this would have been an enlightened and more economical approach, and one which would have more environmental sustainability.</p>	<p>separation, historic landscapes and heritage settings and valuable agricultural land.</p>	<p>neighbourhood plans which should be in “general conformity “ with the local plan and add clarification about “necessary and appropriate “ uses in the countryside</p>	
Melanie Steadman	ANON-BHRP-4HFE-K	No	<p>If Melton is to provide 3980 homes, it will need a by-pass before these are built. A 20 year period for development, on-going, with no bypass is years of misery for commuters. Bottesford, lies on the border of Nottinghamshire, houses built here are highly unlikely to provide a workforce into the Borough. The same for Waltham and Clawson. As previously mentioned, there are very few inhabitants that work within the Borough these days. Clawson and Waltham are villages, Bottesford and Asfordby are already small towns, large villages. Clawson does not have the infrastructure to cope with this level of development. Bottesford has similar problems with their main road, as does Waltham. All three have problems with flooding, none of which have been addressed and Asfordby is the only place with a flood alleviation scheme, by-pass and good transport links. All of these villages, with the exception of Asfordby, are to the north of the Borough, the main employment bases are to the south. If people were to work in Melton, they would have to pass through the town every day, and not by bus, as there aren't any. It would be better advised to build a new settlement, with adequate sub-structure, with extra capacity built in than to load already unsustainable villages with development which it cannot absorb or sustain.</p>	<p>I would like to see either a new site developed, with adequate sub-structure and facilities and amenities. Custom built, near to Melton (as this is where the employment is). It could have a short, regular bus services, meeting the sustainability angle in your policies and meet the employment needs of the town, without the necessity to commute through Melton for employment.</p> <p>This would be my preferred option. Otherwise, I'd look more closely at spreading development more evenly across the borough instead of swamping two or three locations. South of Melton in particular does not seem to have much allocation, yet this is where the employment centres are. Some villages have no allocation and are likely to lose what remaining facilities they have. As the world</p>	<p>Comments noted. See Settlement Role review</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

				changes to more "online" shopping; facilities within villages become less important which is something worth considering if this plan is to span 20 years.		
Mick Jones	ANON-BHRP-4H6N-C	Yes	In principle, the policy sounds fine but I have reservations over the borough council actually being able to drive the plan forward without legal challenges from developers.  There also needs to be an employment and skills analysis prior to approval so that this will go hand in hand with the plan.	A new look at how the classifications came about.	Noted.	
Mike Plumb	ANON-BHRP-4HH2-2	No	The strategy is based to some extent on historic growth patterns in rural locations. The historic growth was not based upon a sustainable planning policy and has in fact led to unsustainable communities while depriving Melton of much needed development. The new Local Plan provides an opportunity to direct growth in a positive and sustainable manner with benefits to all.  The original studies indicated a 70:30% split as appropriate but the draft plan suggests 65:35%. The allocation of the 5% difference to the Rural Supporter group (below the level of settlement currently seen as sustainable) does not appear to have any rationale and runs contrary to sustainability principles.  The 15% proposed development in Rural Supporters and Rural Settlements is excessive and probably not achievable given the recognition in the evidence base that most current available sites in these villages could not be used for sustainable development.	I would like to see the Plan direct development to sustainable communities i.e. Secondary Rural Service Centres and above. Development in smaller communities could be limited to that which would protect the well-being of those communities in terms of existing facilities and enhancing buildings under threat e.g. redundant farm buildings.	Comments noted. See Settlement Role review	
Moira Hart	ANON-BHRP-4HU7-M	No	I do not agree that Melton Borough needs at least 245 houses every year for 25 years. This figure, as noted in our comment about the overview (Chapter 4), is based on the largest most optimistic forecast of possible growth.  Spreading 35% of this figure throughout the rural community is not sustainable development and goes against the NPPF.  Long Clawson should be a Primary Rural Service Centre, it is not sustainable see comments in the question about settlements roles and relationships. It does not have the road infrastructure, it does not have good transport links to larger cities where the majority of people work i.e. Leicester / Nottingham. The school could not cope with more people that	The overall housing allocation for Melton is based on the most optimistic of all the forecast figures presented in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 and should be reduced.  Long Clawson should not be classed as a Primary Rural Service Centre. It is closer to a Secondary Rural Service Centre. However, I disagree with the classification of the villages into Primary, Secondary and Rural Supporter. The categorisation is a poorly designated and does not take any account sustainability and transport infrastructure. The only two villages that merit being classed Primary Rural	The housing requirement and the split of this by urban and rural is justified by the evidence provided by the SHMA and the emerging Melton Borough housing need study.  New housing development is largely delivered by the market and the Council has not means of controlling how and when individual house builders build the homes they get planning permission for.  It must be recognised that whilst the most sustainable way to deliver large numbers of new homes is through urban extensions these also take a long time to begin delivering homes, whilst small and medium sized sites are generally quicker to deliver. National planning policy states that a council should have 5 years supply	



Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			<p>large scale development would bring.</p>	<p>Service Centres are Asfordby and Bottesford, which have substantial transport, school and facilities infrastructure.</p> <p>Melton Mowbray is destined to take 65% of the housing development with 35% in the rural areas. The policy should state that development in the rural areas will not proceed faster than development in Melton Mowbray. This is to avoid there being a rush by developers to the villages and a lack of development in Melton Mowbray. For every 35 houses built in the rural areas there should be 65 constructed in Melton and the two figures should run hand-in-hand.</p>	<p>of deliverable housing land, where it cannot demonstrate this the policies of the plan relating to housing will be considered out of date. In this context it is imperative that the council supports development of sites which will deliver within the first five years to ensure that the policies in the plan remain relevant and up-to-date.</p> <p>Issues relating to access to public transport and the capacity of existing facilities will be factored into the distribution of housing through the review of the Settlement Roles</p>	
<p>Moira Hart – Clawson in Action</p>	<p>ANON-BHRP-4HBM-Q</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>We question the calculation that Melton needs at least 245 houses every year for 25 years. This figure, as noted in our comment about the overview (Chapter 4), is based on the largest most optimistic forecast of possible growth. Spreading 35% of this figure throughout the rural community is not sustainable development and as such it goes against the NPPF.</p> <p>We challenge the interpretation that Long Clawson should be a Primary Rural Centre, it is not sustainable as such as noted in the question about settlements roles and relationships.</p> <p>Long Clawson is developing a Neighbourhood Plan and finds that the assertions for it to be classed as a Primary Rural Centre are ill-founded and unsustainable. It does not have the transport or road infrastructure, it does not have good transport links and it cannot cope (especially the school) with the number of extra people that the primary designation is likely to bring with it.</p>	<p>The overall housing allocation for Melton Borough is based on the largest and most optimistic of all the forecast figures presented in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 and should be reduced. <a href="http://www.melton.gov.uk/downloads/file/1676/leicester_and_leicestershire_strategic_housing_market_assessment_2014">http://www.melton.gov.uk/downloads/file/1676/leicester_and_leicestershire_strategic_housing_market_assessment_2014</a></p> <p>Long Clawson should not be classed as a Primary Rural Centre, it is closer to a Secondary Rural Centre. However, the classification of the villages (apart perhaps the small hamlets) into Primary, Secondary and Rural Supporter is a poorly designated set of divisions that do not take any account of sustainability and transport infrastructure. The only two villages that merit Primary Rural Centre designation are Asfordby and Bottesford, which both have substantial transport, school and facilities infrastructure.</p> <p>Melton Mowbray is destined to take 65% of the housing development with 35% in the rural areas. The policy should state that development in the rural areas will not proceed faster than</p>	<p>The housing requirement and the split of this by urban and rural is justified by the evidence provided by the SHMA and the emerging Melton Borough housing need study.</p> <p>New housing development is largely delivered by the market and the Council has not means of controlling how and when individual house builders build the homes they get planning permission for.</p> <p>It must be recognised that whilst the most sustainable way to deliver large numbers of new homes is through urban extensions these also take a long time to begin delivering homes, whilst small and medium sized site are generally quicker to deliver. National planning policy states that a council should have 5 years supply of deliverable housing land, where it cannot demonstrate this the policies of the plan relating to housing will be considered out of date. In this context it is imperative that the council supports development of sites which will deliver within the first five years to ensure that the policies in the plan remain relevant and up-to-date.</p> <p>Issues relating to access to public transport and the capacity of existing facilities will be factored into the distribution of housing through the review of the Settlement Roles</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

				development in Melton Mowbray. This is to avoid there being a rush by developers to the villages and a lack of development in Melton Mowbray. For every 35 houses built in the rural areas there should be 65 constructed in Melton and the two figures should run hand-in-hand.		
Mr & Mrs J. Rogan	ANON-BHRP-4HMH-W	No	We are unhappy that housing allocations in Bottesford risk creating flooding for existing housing.	We would like housing allocations to be determined in ways that are not merely the convenient colouring-in of gaps in perceived village envelopes - some green spaces are needed within villages as they inevitably expand, and with housing already built on the south side of the River Devon through the village, a new allocation on the north side of the river seriously risks creating significant new flooding risk.	Comments noted. Consideration of flood risk includes considering the potential effect of new development on flood risk to other areas. Flood risk is a significant consideration in determining the suitability of a site for development. The Environment Agency will object to development which is in an area of high risk of flooding or which may significantly increase the risk of flooding to an area down stream.	
Mr John Brown	ANON-BHRP-4H4Z-P	No	Melton Mowbray should have a higher % figure as it has better employment, education facilities, transport links, etc. Another surgery at the other end of town, encouraging employers to area (with incentives) and another school, along with a bypass, would allow more housing development.	Melton Mowbray should have a higher % figure as it has better employment, education facilities, transport links, etc. Another surgery at the other end of town, encouraging employers to area (with incentives) and another school, along with a bypass, would allow more housing development.  Borough villages should be assessed on a case by case basis in a VERY sensitive manner. Setting your targets, as you have, is not the answer. A blanket number for a certain category village is not the answer. Some villages are better developed than others. Some have better facilities than others. Some have facilities that are at a maximum now without any further development. Some villages are better equipped than others. This is not an easy solution and GREAT CARE is needed otherwise the character of villages will be ruined forever - just like Melton Mowbray's has been over the years.	See settlement role review	
Mr Julian Evans	ANON-BHRP-4H43-F	No	No more houses, we have enough in the Borough.	A Ring Road.	Evidence in the SHMA demonstrates an objectively assessed need for 245 homes per annum. The plan must make provision to meet this requirement otherwise it will be found unsound.	
Mr N M R	ANON-	No	It pays too little attention to settlement size. The arbitrary	A rethink is required. The proposal for	See settlement role review	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

Walker	BHRP-4HFM-U		allocation of 50 houses to Croxton Kerrial represents a 30% increase in the size of the village, which is disproportionately far greater than that for the other SRC's. I am not against some limited development, but 50 houses is too many. The allocation should be based on the relative size of the villages.	2,500 houses at Six Hills would deal with all the village issues in one go. Such a settlement would create good, and viable, opportunities for public transport links to Melton, Nottingham, Bingham, Grantham and Leicester. It would greatly reduce the building requirements elsewhere. Adding houses to settlements around Melton merely adds to the already bad traffic congestion in Melton, increasing the need for a bypass.		
Mr Peter Rogers	ANON-BHRP-4H62-G	No	Your Settlement criteria is floored and you now have to work on identifying another fairer system to all borough urban areas.	Take into account size of village, transport, amenities, infrastructure to cope. Frisby will grow by 25% is that realistic, I think not.	See settlement role review	
Mrs Clarissa Sally Garden	ANON-BHRP-4HUG-4	Yes	Please note that there is a typo in the Neighbourhood Plans paragraph.		Noted	Correct mis-spelling of Neighbourhood
Mrs K E Walker	ANON-BHRP-4HFZ-8	No	The Development Strategy pays too little attention to the size of settlements. An arbitrary 50 houses for Croxton Kerrial represent a 301% increase in village size which, in relative terms, is far greater than all of the other Secondary Rural Centres. I am not against some limited development but 50 houses is far too many. The allocation should be based on the relative size of the village. Any building also should be in keeping with the village which is a conservation area.	The whole policy should be scrapped. The proposal to create a new settlement at Six Hills would deal with nearly all the village issues. Adding houses to settlements around Melton Mowbray just increases the already bad congestion in Melton. MM would need a by pass if this proposal were to proceed..	See settlement role review	
Nicholas John Walker	ANON-BHRP-4HGC-J	No	Melton town should support more housing and leave the rural "brand" improve Melton with a ring road housing and work opportunities.		Noted	
Nick Farrow	ANON-BHRP-4HUD-1	No	The council has gone the highest growth % and I think they should review their view and go for a lower %.	Reduce the number of properties the area needs to develop.	Noted, however evidence demonstrates need for additional homes and the plan must make provision for this.	
Nicola Desmond	ANON-BHRP-4H6E-3	No	The divide raises concerns still. For communities to grow and be successful all segments of society need to be able to make the choice to live in villages also. Young families are being forced away from villages by price and this means villages are not reflecting a mix of ages and socio economic groups.	At the moment developments in the villages like my old village Frisby seem limited to squeezing them into gardens and gaps. We need to be creating new developments to enhance the village and its appearance rather than cramming houses in.	Noted. The approach set out in SS2 would allow for planned development in villages such as Frisby, rather than squeezing development into gardens.	
Patricia Laurance	ANON-BHRP-4HG2-1	No	Don't agree with the Secondary Rural Service Centres or Rural Supporter category. The villages are mixed up between the two.  Villages on the Lincolnshire side of Melton are much smaller in character than villages on the edges of Rushcliffe and Charnwood. Villages on good transport connections to Leicester and Nottingham are nearer to the main employment	It would be better to develop all the two sets of villages below Primary Services Centres with an overall allocation of housing. I think it would then be 915 houses across 17 villages? I think it should also be possible to have development above the 5 houses cap if it is brownfield development as long as	See settlement Roles review	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			areas and therefore more attractive to commuters. They are more expensive as there is a lack of supply of good housing in the cities. Building more houses further away will just result in longer commutes and more pollution which isn't sustainable	it is appropriate in scale to the village.		
Peter zawada	ANON-BHRP-4H1K-4	No	I would like to place my comments in the context that I am not in principle against the need for a development strategy. I am sensitive to the need for increasing housing opportunities regionally such as the Melton Borough and of course the greater national need. However, I have been asked to comment on this strategy where there appears to be serious inconsistencies and errors in the data on which the classification of the settlements has been done. For example, the error that Barkestone does not have a church and that Plungar has a Post Office, which it does not. Although, you may view such errors as minor they fundamentally undermine the veracity, precision and accuracy of the classification of settlements - a fundamental principle in the allocation of housing. If I can be convinced that the settlement classification is a valid one, that data has been fully verified then I would be happy to consider the strategy in this light but not where there appears to be errors. If indeed there are errors in the base data on which the settlement classification has been done, this testifies to an approach that is at best unprofessional and at worst disingenuous when requesting opinions and views of residents who rightfully assume that the data is correct in the first place. May I strongly urge you to address this matter as the Borough will have based its decision making on potentially faulty information, which of course represents an enormous legal liability for the future. Get the data right from the outset and the Borough will be able to move ahead with its strategy with confidence and clarity.	You should surmise from the above that because I am of the view that your settlement data maybe in error, I have no confidence in its application and tool for prioritising housing. Please give me the confidence that the data is correct and I would therefore be happy to make comments on the strategy.	Comments about the “incorrect” data used to assess the villages is accepted. This information has been requested from parish council in a bid to ensure it is correct in any future iteration. The newly updated information has been used for the settlement role review, however it must be recognised that this is a rapidly changing environment where changes in services can happen overnight.	
Piers Geraint Hardiman	ANON-BHRP-4HU4-H	No	Objecting to Stathern being designated as a Secondary Rural Service Centre, should be designated as a Rural Supporter	Stathern to be designated as a Rural Supporter	See Settlement Role review	
Richard Cooper – HSSP Architects	ANON-BHRP-4HMY-B	Yes	majority of new homes in and around Melton & primary & secondary service centres.  Rural supporters and rural centres definitely need some growth to ensure they do not become dormant with aging populations and no 'new blood' into the community.	Think sites of 3 in rural settlements are maybe too many - reduce this to individual sites, and allow provision of larger family homes where sites are appropriate.	Noted – consideration should be given to amending the limits in policy SS3	
Richard Simon – Bottesford Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	ANON-BHRP-4HUB-Y	No	Melton Mowbray is the only truly sustainable location in the Borough; in every other village the majority of the residents either work or shop or both outside of the village.	4.2.11 (p33) More building at Melton Mowbray to fund infrastructure including ring road also 5.4.9, 6.13.1, 7.16.5 Melton Mowbray is the only really sustainable place in the Borough. It is close to employment retail and leisure	See Settlement Role review	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

				<p>facilities, and has the population density to support good public transport thus minimising car travel and helping with carbon reduction. The population, about 25K, is small for such a town, and a larger population will permit a more viable town centre in competition with nearby towns. An expanded Melton Mowbray would also provide a source of employment and a level of real sustainability to its nearby satellite villages. There should be a consideration of including the west end development firmly within the Plan timescales rather than as a contingency should additional development be needed.</p> <p>The objectives for the Borough (p21) include revitalising Melton Mowbray town centre and reducing traffic congestion in Melton Mowbray including completion of the ring road. Both would be greatly aided by concentration of building in the town and the related funding that would bring to cover these infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>The strategy proposed in the Melton Local Plan Emerging Options (Draft) will result in Bottesford, currently the second biggest centre in the Borough and the most remote from Melton Mowbray,, outstripping all other settlements outside Melton Mowbray itself by 2036. This will inevitably preclude improvement in the size and facilities in other villages in the Borough, and contradicts the statement in 4.2.11 that 'Vision for the Borough should not be at the expense of allowing some of our villages to grow to become more sustainable'. Is this what is intended?</p>		
Richard Simon	ANON-BHRP-4H2C-5	No	<p>Melton Mowbray is the only truly sustainable location in the borough in every other village the majority of the residents either work or shop or both outside of the village.</p> <p>Growth should be centred on MM and locations close to MM. Development centred on MM will give greater impetus to</p>	<p>More building at Melton Mowbray to fund infrastructure including ring road also 5.4.9, 6.13.1, 7.16.5</p> <p>Melton Mowbray is the only really sustainable place in the Borough. It is close to employment, retail and leisure</p>	See Settlement Role review	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			<p>infrastructure reinforcement particularly the ring road which seems to be desired by all but only a part is envisaged in the plan. Looking at building in villages close to MM will reduce the travel necessary for those who use MM as their main centre. It will allow the shopping experience to improve and may gain trade currently going to Leicester, Loughborough etc. MM is a relatively small town of about 25k inhabitants and growth should be good for it and make it compete effectively with its much larger neighbours</p>	<p>facilities, and has the population density to support good public transport thus minimising car travel and helping with carbon reduction. The population, about 25K, is small for such a town, and a larger population will permit a more viable town centre in competition with nearby towns. An expanded Melton Mowbray would also provide a source of employment and a level of real sustainability to its nearby satellite villages. There should be a consideration of including the west end development firmly within the Plan timescales rather than as a contingency should additional development be needed.</p> <p>The objectives for the Borough (p21) include revitalising Melton Mowbray town centre and reducing traffic congestion in Melton Mowbray including completion of the ring road. Both would be greatly aided by concentration of building in the town and the related funding that would bring to cover these infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>The strategy proposed in the Melton Local Plan Emerging Options (Draft) will result in Bottesford, currently the second biggest centre in the Borough and the most remote from Melton Mowbray,, outstripping all other settlements outside Melton Mowbray itself by 2036. This will inevitably preclude improvement in the size and facilities in other villages in the Borough, and contradicts the statement in 4.2.11 that 'Vision for the Borough should not be at the expense of allowing some of our villages to grow to become more sustainable'. Surely this isn't what's intended?</p>		
Richard Simon – Bottesford Parish Council	ANON-BHRP-4H1W-G	No	<p>Melton Mowbray is the only truly sustainable location in the Borough; in every other village the majority of the residents either work or shop or both outside of the village.</p>	<p>4.2.11 (p33) More building at Melton Mowbray to fund infrastructure including ring road also 5.4.9, 6.13.1, 7.16.5</p> <p>Melton Mowbray is the only really sustainable place in the Borough. It is</p>	See Settlement Role review	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

				<p>close to employment retail and leisure facilities, and has the population density to support good public transport thus minimising car travel and helping with carbon reduction. The population, about 25K, is small for such a town, and a larger population will permit a more viable town centre in competition with nearby towns. An expanded Melton Mowbray would also provide a source of employment and a level of real sustainability to its nearby satellite villages. There should be a consideration of including the west end development firmly within the Plan timescales rather than as a contingency should additional development be needed.</p> <p>The objectives for the Borough (p21) include revitalising Melton Mowbray town centre and reducing traffic congestion in Melton Mowbray including completion of the ring road. Both would be greatly aided by concentration of building in the town and the related funding that would bring to cover these infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>The strategy proposed in the Melton Local Plan Emerging Options (Draft) will result in Bottesford, currently the second biggest centre in the Borough and the most remote from Melton Mowbray,, outstripping all other settlements outside Melton Mowbray itself by 2036. This will inevitably preclude improvement in the size and facilities in other villages in the Borough, and contradicts the statement in 4.2.11 that 'Vision for the Borough should not be at the expense of allowing some of our villages to grow to become more sustainable'. Is this what is intended?</p>		
Robert Anthony Fionda	ANON-BHRP-4H13-C	Yes	It is particularly encouraging to see that all villages are being allowed some development. One improvement would be the publication of average target development figures for each village. This would help with monitoring of the plan over time and also encourage villages to produce neighbourhood plans	As above.	Support noted	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			to consider the most appropriate sites for their development quota.			
Robert Galij – Barratt Homes North Midlands	BHLF-BHRP-4H7A-Z	No	<p>Concern is expressed over the scaled of residential development proposed in Melton Borough and its intended distribution between 2011 and 2016. In particular, the overall (minimum) level is too low and should be increased to a (minimum) 7500 dwellings thereby reflecting 300 dwellings per annum - in order to make up the shortfall in (annual) delivery since 2011 - rather than 245 dwellings per annum, as currently envisaged.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed distribution of housing across the Borough, too little is being directed at PRSCs during the plan period. A minimum of 920 dwellings (15%) does not reflect their pre-eminent status in the settlement hierarchy, nor does it acknowledge the historical distribution trend towards PRSC's between 1993 and 2014 which has been 20% of the overall scale of housing across the Borough rather than 15% as currently envisaged.</p> <p>A minimum of 1225 dwellings should be directed towards PRSC's of which (minimum) 490 dwellings should be earmarked for Bottesford given its 1st position ranking (69 points - Village Performance Index, Settlement Roles and Relationships Report, April 2015) and acknowledges 'sustainability credentials'. This equates to 40% share of the (Revised) PRSC Apportionment which could even be increased to a minimum of 612 dwellings i.e. a 50% share of the revised PRSC Apportionment, in recognition of its recognized status in the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>Concern is also expressed over the 'residual' housing requirement in Bottesford i.e. 300 dwellings between 2011 and 2036 from a base of 370 dwellings. Both are considered too low and fail to reflect its (top) position in the (rural) village hierarchy, as determined by a number of indicators including size, facilities, services and accessibility to public transport and employment opportunities.</p>	<p>Policy SS2 - Development Strategy and Policy C1 - Housing Allocations are separate Policies yet inextricably linked. Hence comments and proposed changes to each of them below.</p> <p>Policy SS2 - Development Strategy:- Provision should be made for 'at least 7500 homes' between 2011 and 2036 in Melton Borough. Regarding PRSC's, they should accommodate 20% of the Boroughs housing need equating to 'at least 1500 dwellings', of which (minimum) '600 dwellings' i.e. 40% (PRSC Apportionment) should be directed towards Bottesford. Tables 2,3 and 4 should be amended accordingly.</p>	See Settlement Role review	
Robert Ian Lockey	ANON-BHRP-4H3G-2	Yes	I don't particularly object to the numbers, though I don't think that forecasts are sufficiently firm to justify such a precise allocation.	The numbers should be regarded as a forecast and indicative rather than a rigid policy. The number and distribution of new dwellings should be an input to the plan rather than an integral part of it. The plan should primarily address what enhancements to services, facilities etc. are needed to support the anticipated population growth.	Noted – this is why the policy refers to “at least”	
Roger Smith –	BHLF-BHRP-	Yes	The provisions of the policy specifically identifies the main urban area of Melton Mowbray as being the “priority	The level of housing provided in Melton Mowbray should be significantly	Consideration could be given to amending the split to 70%/30%	



Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

Worthearly Ltd	4H8C-3		location for growth". This is supported.  It is considered that, given the status of the town, it should accommodate a much higher level of the Borough's housing provision well above the 65% (or 3980 homes) specified in the policy.	increased by reducing that which is proposed for less sustainable locations such as the surrounding villages.		
Ros Freeman	ANON-BHRP-4HF2-Z	No	I do not agree with categorising villages in this way, giving blanket approval for development, Each planning application in the villages should be done on their own merits.	All villages should be required to have a Neighbourhood plan and that should form the basis of considering new development based on actual local need.  Blanket categorising by MBC is just wrong and pushes problems out to the villages when they should be tackled in the Town. I accept the Town is planning large development but just spreading it around and spoiling the villages is doing everything opposite to what you say you want to protect- rural character, tourism, countryside, wildlife	See Settlement Role review	
Russell Collins	ANON-BHRP-4HZW-S	Yes	I support the development proposed to the north and south of Melton. I do have concerns about some of this development being outside the envelope created by the proposed ring road. This will cause traffic conflicts.	Limit development to that within the envelope of the proposed ring road.	Noted. Development should be limited to within the line of the proposed link road, however engineering solutions for junctions and road alignments may mean that this is not always possible.	
Sarah mant	ANON-BHRP-4HUE-2	Yes	It is obvious the borough needs more housing, but this needs to be planned in the right places	Review of housing allocation for villages - for example Croxton Kerrial which has little viable public transport infrastructure so anyone planning to live in the village and work elsewhere needs to have a car	See Settlement Role review	
Sharon franklin	ANON-BHRP-4HMA-P	No	I am objecting as Somerby has sustainable building going on in the village already. Traffic will be a huge problem as the high street is already very congested, Parking for residents is also a problem as many have no option but to park on the high street.  Flooding the proposed site on the Oakham Rd has always had an issue with flooding, so how will it cope with more houses.  Amenities. The school will not be able to cope.  Surgery. The surgery is very busy now so will be unable to cope.  The proposed site on the Burroughs road will be very dangerous due to the	Future developments need to be built in areas that have the amenities to cope. Villages can only cope with a small amount of new developments and Somerby already has this going on.	See Settlement Role review	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			<p>Very bad bends either side of proposed site, also the traffic coming down the</p> <p>Burrough road often travels too fast.</p>			
Sharon Gustard	ANON-BHRP-4H6K-9	No	<p>The increase in provision of housing commenced in 2011 - there is no indication of whether homes built since this time will be included in the required housing numbers. Why should small scale development of 10 dwellings or less be classed as outside of the allocations? There is no evidence of protecting our rural communities, regardless of their size.</p> <p>The infrastructure supporting the villages (large and small) has built up around historically old village centres which were not designed for almost 100% increases in size. The Borough Council should be supporting the villages to maintain their individuality and not become rebuilds of the post war housing boom, which are looked at as mass produced inferior quality and designed housing estates.</p> <p>The Wickets at Bottesford only further demonstrates this by developing homes which can barely achieve the government's National Technical Housing Standards (nationally described space standard). Further large scale developments will only financially be achievable to such national companies who have no regard for the villages they are impacting on and are purely profit making enterprises.</p>	All development sites to be limited to a size of no more than 30 houses per development and incentives to be provided to local builders to enable them to utilise local knowledge and take into account resident's points of view.	<p>Clarify the way housing figures are calculated and that homes built since 2011 will be taken off the overall requirement.</p> <p>Comments about the houses on the wickets are noted – however it should be recognised that these houses have been sold. The Council has little control over the size and design of new homes – national policies require this to be market driven</p>	
Shelagh Woollard	ANON-BHRP-4HB5-Y	No	<p>Villages need to remain as villages - make them too large and they become towns and will lose their rural character.</p> <p>The town of Melton should take a larger proportion of new dwellings.</p>	Allowing some small scale development in the "non-sustainable" villages to help them become sustainable.	See Settlement Role review	
Sheryl Smart	ANON-BHRP-4H1G-Z	No	<p>I agree that most of the housing should be within Melton. I don't agree with villages being defined into the categories above and would also like to know what</p> <p>" the Council will seek to maintain and enhance their roles in the Borough through planning positively " means. Does this include new doctors surgeries in more villages, increasing funding for schools to accommodate additional pupils or building of new schools, providing better transport links etc.</p>		See Settlement Role review	
Siobhan Noble	ANON-BHRP-4HED-H	No	<p>Again I have concerns about the split, I think all modern communities need to grow to thrive. Younger people need the chance to live away from the town, indeed some want to be close to their parents. With fewer village properties exchanging ownership the prices have risen dramatically. Demand outstrips supply to the point that a 2 bedroom property with no garden will sell for £200,000</p>	An open minded approach to developments of 15-20 properties which would provide single story buildings and mixed family housing at different price brackets. A move away from infill planning permission that has seen 1 dwelling become 3 or a garden halved and a house built. This compression is ruining the character of the village. New developments should	<p>Comments noted. The removal of village envelopes and approach set out in policy SS3 to allow for small scale incremental growth of villages should address this concern. Policies C2 and C4 consider these issues, however the plan cannot be too prescriptive on issues of housing mix</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

				be stylish, well designed with space to breath.		
Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger & Co (one behalf of various landowner clients)	ANON-BHRP-4HHB-J	No	Support the overall strategy set out in the policy and the housing targets, however, as alluded to earlier in this submission, consider that the strategy for Rural Supporters needs to be amended.	<p>We do not believe that this level of growth for Rural Supporters can be delivered in the form of small sites of 5 dwellings or less and would be surprised if the opportunities for this type of development within village limits exists to such an extent as to deliver circa 34 new homes per Rural Supporter. In addition, it would be surprising if this approach delivered the required affordable housing throughout the District.</p> <p>We propose that the policy be changed to allow for this level of growth (at least 615 homes) to be delivered on larger sites, which are well related to the existing settlements and in keeping with the built character. Currently the policy suggests building out 7 or more sites per Rural Supporter to deliver 615 new homes on a basis of sites of 5 dwellings or less. This would have significantly more impact on existing villages than building out one larger site along with one or two other small sites in addition.</p>	See Settlement Role review	
Susan Green – Home Builders Federation)	BHLF-BHRP-4H8N-E	Yes	<p>Policy SS2 – Development Strategy proposes at least 6,125 dwellings (245 dwellings per annum) between 2011 – 2036. This housing requirement is based on an OAHN for Melton as set out in the Leicester &amp; Leicestershire SMHA Report by G L Hearn. This calculation comprised of 2011 SNPP data, 5 year migration trends, inclusion of UPC, adjustment of HFR to 2008 based tracking / mid-point to compensate for past housing undersupply and an Experian economic forecast re-distributed on current jobs distribution. Previously at the Charnwood Local Plan Examination the HBF was critical of this calculation of OAHN for the following reasons :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· 2012 SNHP should be the demographic starting point for the calculation of OAHN subject to sensitivity testing ;</li> <li>· Any uplifts applied for worsening market signals were overly modest ;</li> <li>· Economic growth was not aligned with the Leicestershire LEP SEP ;</li> <li>· No consideration of increasing housing requirements to help deliver affordable housing to meet significant affordable housing</li> </ul>	Before publication of the pre submission Local Plan it is recommended that the Council re-consider the calculation of the OAHN.	Comments noted. New OAN arising from the current HEDNA work will be incorporated into the Local Plan before it is submitted	Consider implications for the plan arising from HEDNA

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

			needs.			
Susan Herlihy	ANON-BHRP-4HE3-Z	Yes	proportion of development seems well thought out		Noted	
Susan Love	ANON-BHRP-4HZP-J	No	A 70 / 30 split between Melton and the rural areas would be more sustainable.		Noted consideration could be given to this change	
Tom Parry – Barkestone, Plungar and Redmile Parish Council	ANON-BHRP-4H1P-9	No	<p>The strategy is based to some extent on historic growth patterns in rural locations. The historic growth did not arise from a sustainable planning policy and has in fact led to unsustainable communities while depriving Melton of much needed development. The new Local Plan provides an opportunity to direct growth in a positive and sustainable manner with benefits to all.</p> <p>The original studies indicated a 70:30% split as appropriate but the draft plan suggests 65:35%. The allocation of the 5% difference to the Rural Supporter group (below the level of settlement currently seen as sustainable) does not appear to have any rationale and runs contrary to sustainability principles.</p> <p>The 15% proposed development in Rural Supporters and Rural Settlements is excessive and probably not achievable given the recognition in the evidence base that most current available sites in these villages could not be used for sustainable development.</p>	We would like to see the Plan direct development to sustainable communities i.e. Secondary Rural Service Centres and above. Development in smaller communities could be limited to that which would protect the well-being of those communities in term of existing facilities and enhancing buildings under threat e.g. redundant farm buildings.	See Settlement Role review	
Valerie Lever	ANON-BHRP-4HZY-U	Yes	The percentage seems reasonable. It should not be exceeded in villages unless services are improved		noted	
Vic Allsop – Hoby with Rotherby Parish Council	BHLF-BHRP-4HDH-M	Yes	Broadly agree although they should be proportionally adjusted if any locality has new approvals prior to the adoption of the plan. Agree that numbers are required; unclear as to when they must be achieved over 25 year period		Noted	
Victoria Kemp	ANON-BHRP-4HGK-T	No	There has been little or no consideration of a sustainable housing policy in the past and so I think it is inappropriate for the strategy to be based on historic growth patterns in rural locations. The development of a new local Plan gives MBC the opportunity to direct growth in a positive and sustainable way. I would have thought that a split which allocates a higher proportion of housing within Melton would have been much more appropriate - say 70/30 and which tends to be reflected more in other local authority areas. I cannot see how MBC have come up with the allocation of 5% difference to the Rural Supporter group and this appears to be contrary to the principles of sustainability.	I would like the Plan to direct development to sustainable communities that is those in the Secondary Rural Service Centres and above. Any development in smaller communities should be limited given the lack of sustainability and could be directed towards coexisting facilities and enhancing buildings under threat, particularly farm buildings which are no longer in use.	See Settlement Role review Consideration could be given to amending split to 70/30%	
Wayne Hickling	ANON-BHRP-	No	I object only on the possible interpretation of Rural Supporter and Rural Settlements. If this means the possibility of small	More clarity on the proposals / locations for Rural Supporter and Rural	See Settlement Role review	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial Strategy Policy SS2 (part 1)

	4H1R-B		unallocated developments in small villages that are unsustainable (i.e. already have insufficient infrastructure for its existing population, let alone further growth!), for example Burton Lazars, I would strongly object.	Settlements and the logic behind any further development.		
William Paul Alcock	ANON-BHRP-4HB1-U	No	The allocation of housing in Rural Settlements is too high. The larger settlements are able to accommodate developments in a more sustainable manner. Developments in the smaller villages have a disproportionate impact on the communities and the character of the villages.	I would suggest that new housing is only allowed in the smaller villages in exceptional circumstances such as the use of redundant buildings.  Melton has huge potential and provision of housing above the 65% figure would assist in the development of the town.	See Settlement Role review	