

POLICIES MAPS APPENDIX

51 responses have been registered
for this appendix (11.2% of the total)

Answer	Behalf of	Response ID	If you would like to comment on the Policies Maps please do so here, stating which settlement map you are commenting on and why.- Comments	Officer Response	Further Actions
Mr Julian Evans		ANON-BHRP-4H43-F	Melton Mowbray North The local green space should extend to Scaford following the Jubilee Way. I cant believe the Council want to continue to build houses in this area of the Town, an area of constant development for years. Have a look at Saclford Road from 08:00 - 08:45 each morning.	We have based the Local Green Spaces boundaries on evidence in the 'Areas of Separation Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study'	
John David Smith		ANON-BHRP-4H4X-M	Stathern. According to the map, there are two sites which were considered, both of which are marked as being rejected. Locally we are being asked to comment on 10 areas around the village, one of which is part of a rejected area. I am confused.	The Emerging Options Local Plan has information linked to the SHLAA sites (up to 2015). The 2016 SHLAA will be released soon and will provide an update of the sites in Stathern.	
Alan Webster		ANON-BHRP-4H4Y-N	These comments concern Asfordby Parish Only. The Whitlock Way Garages Asfordby Village plus associated land should be included in a site for development. This is included in the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan. Asfordby Hill MBC 185/15 MBC 005/13 MBC 184/15 and MBC 183/15 should have green sig sag lines to protect the separation of Asfordby Hill and Valley. The sites MBC/073/13, MBC 112/13 and MBC 113/13 should not be included as if developed would be intrusive due to contours of the land. Also not included in the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted. In terms of your suggestion of the Area of Separation between Asfordby Hill and Asfordby Valley we have used the 'Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study' as evidence. The conclusions are that the AoS is not required. You can find the justification in the page 103 of the main document that can be downloaded in our website.	
Siobhan Noble		ANON-BHRP-4HED-H	Please re-visit the emerging options consultation draft with reference to Frisby on the Wreake, there are two more submissions for the SHLAA that are being assessed over the next 2 weeks.	The Emerging Options Local Plan has information linked to the SHLAA sites (up to 2015). The 2016 SHLAA will be released soon and will provide an update of the sites in Frisby on the Wreake.	
John Mace		ANON-BHRP-4HEM-T	Melton Mowbray North Too much development to the north of the Country Park. It will effectively become a "town park" which was not the original intention and its status/appearance should not be adversely affected by significant enclosing development. The road to Spinney Road seems pointless apart from benefiting Twin Lakes. Traffic will then have to travel south towards Melton, the junction of Spinney Road and Grantham Road is already overloaded when Twin Lakes is closing.	Noted. These matters are addressed by the policy SS5 and through development of a transport strategy for the town.	
Aidan Thatcher	Mr Herbert Daybell	ANON-BHRP-4HEA-E	Bottesford. The site put forward in this submission appears to have been discounted, I believe on the grounds of being within a flood Risk area. This is contrary to your proposed policy EN11 which confirms that development on such land is surrounded subject to criteria. As such this site should be reconsidered.	All the sites are currently being reassessed in lights of the new evidence and the most up to date SHLAA Leicester and Leicestershire joint methodology.	
Dr Leonard Richard Newton		ANON-BHRP-4HET-1	Frisby I object to the proposed housing development site off Great Lane	Noted.	
George Breed	Persimmon Homes	ANON-BHRP-4HF3-1	Melton Mowbray North The cost of the link road will reflect the quantum of cut and fill required during construction. The location of the link road must therefore be determined from engineered technical evidence. MBC/030/13 Orange is approved for 30 units however land associated with Hill Top haulage also lends itself to redevelopment served by existing access off Nottingham road. The rejection of this SHLAA site does not reflect the owners intentions at present nor pays any mind toward the extent of the proposed build line formed by the adjacent LCC / Richborough Estates application. The inclusion of MBC/030/13 would secure further contributions toward the link road and should engineering details support its movement further north constitute an additional option.	Noted. The Emerging Options did not include SHLAA sites in Melton Mowbray as potential options, other than those that are part of the SUEs. Further assessments are currently taking place and the conclusions for this site might change in the future (because of the new methodology, evidence and the recently approved planning application that you have mentioned in your response).	
Susan Love		ANON-BHRP-4HZP-J	Bottesford map I support the preferred SHLAA sites. Rectory Farm and the connected smaller Normanton lane site is a good choice for Bottesford. It offers: An opportunity for opening up a part of the river bank (Devon) which is not currently accessible to the residents - a linear park. Good connectivity with the rest of the village. It does not spoil an approach to the village. It does not spoil the setting of the	Noted.	

			village in the Vale of Belvoir and views of Belvoir castle. The pasture land lost there is of less benefit than the arable land on Belvoir Rd. The development would drain into the main waterway of the village, the Devon The Belvoir Rd site has been rightly rejected because it would spoil the setting of the village in the Vale of Belvoir and views of the Castle. It would also drain into the Winterbeck - a minor water course which runs under a low arch bridge on Belvoir Rd (Our house on Belvoir Rd was flooded from the Winterbeck in 2001) EA amp is not correct I support the areas of separation to the north and south-east of Bottesford - they protect the character of the settlement, its tourist attraction, and its setting in the Vale of Belvoir.		
Mrs Clarissa Sally Garden		ANON-BHRP-4HUG-4	I did look at the map for Bottesford. It would be of interest to know how and why the decisions to reject some sites and adopt the Rectory Farm development were made.	Site Assessment process followed where each site assessed against same criteria. Other sites have been discounted because of their constraints and some of them have been put forward due their potential benefits.	
Craig Heaney		ANON-BHRP-4HUY-P	Map 48 - North Previous comments remain valid: - not enough thought given to protecting the country park and establishing effective wildlife corridors - I recall the Planning Inspector commenting on his review of the Core Strategy advising that he was unable to support the development of housing to north of town as he viewed it as unsustainable due to the unacceptable impact on the landscape, agricultural land and biodiversity. NOTHING HAS CHANGED as part of this draft plan that would alter this view. - link road needs to join the Grantham Road	Issues relating to the Country Park and Wild Life Corridors are covered by Policy SS5. Planning Inspector for Core Strategy had concerns that the Northern SUE had not been tested against other options around the town. This has been done; the North together with South have been found to be the best options.	
Moira Hart		ANON-BHRP-4HU7-M	Long Clawson MBC/168/15, MBC/028/13 should not be considered for development due to the proximity of the conservation areas and heritage assets in the village. Development at MBC/155/15 etc would cause significant problems in terms of access round the village centre. Small scale development - not more that 10 houses could be considered in other sites.	Noted. Regarding the Conservation Areas: these are not areas exempt of housing, they are areas of special architectural or historic interest, and their character and appearance should be preserved or enhance. A correct design is the key to enhancing these Conservation Areas with new development.	
CHRISTINE LARSON		ANON-BHRP-4HUU-J	It would be useful to have an overall Borough map showing the areas of separation. These seem to apply only to a discreet group of villages - 7 in total but other green areas of separation are required to retain distinctiveness, particularly to the north of Melton. The criteria to reject SHLAA sites for villages is based on a flawed categorisation of villages. This needs a total review. What is the criteria for local green space? Is this owned by the Council or Parish? How have they been arrived at?	'Areas of Separation Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study' recommends Areas of Separation and Local Green Spaces across the Borough; the document can be found in our website and it includes other proposed Areas of Separations that have been discounted for specific reasons explained in the document. Settlement Role Review and Site Assessment work is ongoing.	
Moira Hart	Clawson in Action - residents' group set up to Keep Clawson Long and Rural and working to support the production of a Long Clawson Neighbourhood Plan	ANON-BHRP-4HBM-Q	We believe that the most suitable sites for small-scale development in Long Clawson are MBC/150/15, MBC/169/15 and MBC/144/15/13. All other sites should be rejected and no further development should be permitted on MBC/026/13/15 over the 10 dwellings approved. Development in Long Clawson should be small-scale - no more than 10 dwellings and should not be developer-led. The Long Clawson Neighbourhood Plan, which is underway, should be considered as the views and needs of the village residents in future planning development.	Noted.	
Deborah Caroline Adams		ANON-BHRP-4H38-K	I do not believe that the "rejected SCHLAA sites" should have been shown without a ready explanation as to why they were rejected. They should have been shown as possible sites after all some of the so-called "rejected" sites could be considered an option further down the line. Like everything in the DLP explanations and supporting documentation is very difficult to find. Some road numbers/names could have been added to the maps to help "get one's bearings". Thankfully personally, I am familiar with most of the villages but a lot of people won't be.	Noted.	
Anthony		ANON-	It would have been helpful to show where the proposed "link road" will go, from the A606 to A607.	Unfortunately we don't have that information	

Paphiti		BHRP-4HBV-Z		available. The route of the proposed link road is a Highways matter that hasn't been resolved yet.	
Shelagh Woollard		ANON-BHRP-4HB5-Y	Bottesford settlement map - no building should take place on the old tip on Grantham Road - health risks from all that has been dumped in the tip over the years and because it would affect the relationship with Easthorpe. There is only one field on the Easthorpe side of the river and if a precedent was set by building on the tip almost down to the river, then an application could be submitted from Easthorpe and then the two villages would be merged into one. Land north of the railway line should not be considered either as it would split the village into two parts. The suggestion that car parking spaces could be provided is of no consequence at all. A number of those parking at Bottesord travel from Grantham to park as the fuel used for the journey costs less than the daily parking fee at Grantham.	Sites currently being assessed in detail.	
Martin smith		ANON-BHRP-4H6A-Y	Ref Frisby on the wreake.....site MBC/191/15 Minimal fringe sensitivity likely as land falls away from existing buildings. No overshadowing of existing properties possible however good farming land Two other sites are currently being assessed in Frisby..... 1. Land by railway SW of road crossing. (Desmond's field). Flat. Muddy . Does not flood not good for crop growing. good road access 2. Land around school (Cook's field). Topography not good Land rises by approx 100-150 ft toward southern skyline , overshadowing caused by development would restrict sunlight to school fields/playground and neighbouring homes during winter months Field has grown crops on rotation for many years until recently. Also ancient track to main road from village is still evident, which together with protected (?). Hedge. (W side of field) is heavily habit end by various wildlife.	Sites currently being assessed in detail.	
Jane Wilson		ANON-BHRP-4H67-N	Melton Mowbray North The map shows that the proposed link road to the north of the town terminates on Melton Spinney road, an unclassified highway, near the entrance to Twin Lakes Park. The draft Local Plan does not consider the impact of significant increases in volumes of traffic along Spinney Road and either onwards into Melton town centre or through the villages of Thorpe Arnold and Scalford. This situation is further exacerbated during periods of significant traffic flow to and from Twin Lakes Park. The Council's own traffic reports show that the junction at Thorpe End is already saturated with current volumes of traffic at peak times. Following the recent Cumulative Transport Impact Study, in accordance with Paragraph 32 of the NPPF the Local Highway Authority has recommended that an existing application for housing off Melton Spinney Road be refused on the basis that the residual impact of the proposed development on transport infrastructure for the town as a whole is 'severe'. The link road should therefore be extended through to the A607 Grantham Road at a point north of Thorpe Arnold. The proposed residential development to the North of the town will completely enclose Melton Country Park, dominating the landscape and materially changing forever the character and rural aspect of park. The NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. Any development in the vicinity of the Country Park would contravene that guidance. To preserve the landscape and to maintain the current levels of biodiversity in this area it is essential to retain significant and sustainable wildlife corridors to the north and east of the Country Park.	Noted. LCC has recently decided to support an 'eastern' outer relief road that will connect Melton Spinney Road, Grantham Road to Burton Road, this alleviation traffic concerns on both Melton Spinney Road and at Thorpe End junction. Policy SS5 requires provision of a buffer to the Country Park and retention of Wild Life Corridors beyond the Country Park.	
JOHN RUST		ANON-BHRP-4HUV-K	It would be useful to have an overall Borough map showing the areas of separation. These seem to apply only to a discreet group of villages - 7 in total but other green areas of separation are required to retain distinctiveness, particularly to the north of Melton. The criteria to reject SHLAA sites for villages is based on a flawed categorisation of villages. This needs a total review. What is the criteria for local green space? Is this owned by the Council or Parish? How have they been arrived at?	'Areas of Separation Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study' recommends Areas of Separation and Local Green Spaces across the Borough; the document can be found in our website and it includes other proposed Areas of Separations that have been discounted for specific reasons explained in the document. Settlement Role Review and Site Assessment work is ongoing.	
Sharon Gustard		ANON-BHRP-4H6K-9	The number of areas proposed for development which have been rejected is astounding. What are the reasons for the rejections? Have these been publicised? Who was involved in the rejections? In the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan, there is only one proposed site and 20 rejected. This does not comply with any of the aspirations of the Consultation Questionnaire. There has been minimal consultation with the villagers and that which has taken place has been proposed on single days during family holiday periods; and therefore decisions made do not reflect a good cross section of the Bottesford demographic. The meeting was allocated such a timing that it could almost be described as clandestine. Why has the Six Hills Development been rejected when that site in its entirety could address the majority of the needs of the Melton Plan, creating new facilities and employment opportunities with good infrastructure links to Melton, Loughborough, Nottingham and Leicester. It could also be used to create a further Primary Rural Service Centre. The development of a new 'village' at Newton with strong links to the A46 has proved successful.	The decision to reject some sites has been done because of several different reasons: Physical constraints as flooding, ownership constraints, market interest, etc... Some of these sites could go forward with the appropriated mitigation measures: it means they are not definitively rejected. MBC has not involvement in Bottesford NDP events. Six Hills hasn't gone forward (at this stage) for several reasons most of them covered by the	

				Sustainable Appraisal (that can be downloaded from our website). In the page 393 you will find a summary of the conclusions for the site. However a development of a new village takes a considerable time in planning preparation. Such a development is unlikely to meet the Borough's housing requirement for short and medium term.	
Colin Love		ANON-BHRP-4HBR-V	<p>Bottesford and Easthorpe MBC/012/13 - I think as I try to read the number - essentially the land off Belvoir Road Bottesford. In 2001 we were flooded from water flowing across this area of land from the swollen Winterbeck. Subsequently there was a further high flood risk alert from the Environment Agency in 2012 - albeit that the anticipated rainfall did not materialise - although we had still taken many possessions upstairs. Since then the EA has confirmed that Bottesford is a HIGH Risk area for flooding - and, further, the EA is in the process of revising its 100 year model of flood risk - a national revision that will indicate increases in flood risk. The present water converging in to and from the attenuation pond of the current Barratt development has increased the quantity of water entering the Winterbeck and that increased the risk of flooding from that water course. The dyke from the attenuation pond to the Winterbeck has already evidenced high levels - photos of which have been submitted to MBC Planning Department. There is absolutely no way that this area of land should ever be developed. The Rectory Farm site is the site that was, quite independently of MBC, identified by Design Council CABE for the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan as being the most appropriate site for residential development. Not the least of its reasoning was that development on that location would have the least adverse affect on the approaches to the village and vistas within the village. Further, CABE considered that the development would allow for enhancement of the village through the opening up of the River Devon banks for community benefit - along with the prospect of a park-like development - Devon Park - with foot and cycle pathways in to the village. CABE's professional assessment thus confirms that of MBC.</p> <p>Six Hills - It is my understanding that a very ambitious proposal has been made for this site - and, again from my understanding, I think there is a very good reason why this site should be reconsidered by MBC. If the Six Hills development was to be approved it cold take a substantial number of housing units taken away from the present proposed allocation to Primary Rural Centres. Waltham - Waltham has a number of acceptable sites but a very low present proposed allocation of hosing. Yet, unlike Bottesford it has little or no flood problem, and is relatively close to Melton for travel to work and shopping to support the rural economy. I think there is a very good reason for Waltham to be considered for more housing and that this could be taken of the totally disproportionate number allocated to Bottesford.</p>	<p>SUDs and alternative founds are designed to take rainwater run-off and store it for slow release into the watercourse – they are therefore designated to have water in them.</p> <p>The SFRA considers the risk of potential development sites to flooding as well as potential flooding damstream from development. The SFRA is being up-dated in accordance with the most recently published EA guidance.</p>	
Paul & Shirley Swanwick		ANON-BHRP-4HGX-7	<p>Settlement Map - Eye Kettleby Our concerns mainly relate to the use of Kirby Lane, not only on completion of the Local Plan, but also during the construction phases. We believe the existing Kirby Lane will be used to route heavy construction traffic to & from the many phases of both residential & industrial construction, both at the Leicester Road & Burton Road end. The first phase of the new road will most probably be constructed from the Burton road end funded as part of the housing. We assume this won't be linked to Sandy Lane until a complete link is made possible to Leicester Road, otherwise it will route all traffic through to Kirby Lane. Kirby Lane is little more than a tarmac track weaving its way across farmland & is totally unsuitable for heavy construction traffic, having weight restrictions imposed up until recently. Although were not sure why these have been removed? We want your reassurances that whilst the construction of these houses is ongoing we are not going to be subjected to 15 to 20 years of heavy construction traffic routed past our house from dawn to dusk creating environmental health issues, it is not sustainable. You should not forego the quality of life of existing residents to provide the future needs of infrastructure, we do have human rights, you know! The Leicester Road to Burton Road link needs to be built first as a feeder road for all construction traffic with adequate noise bunding as with Oakham's bypass as an example. Melton Borough Council has a duty of care to existing residents to ensure that their quality of life is not impaired. In summary my concerns are:- A totally unsuitable road is going to be used for heavy construction vehicles for up to 20 years dawn till dusk resulting in disruption of our quality of life & health. Devaluation of property. The use of Kirby Lane as an entry into the industrial estates creating a rat-run. .</p>	Concerns noted and will be considered as a detailed masterplan/development plan for the SUE is developed.	
Mick Jones		ANON-BHRP-4H6N-C	<p>It was very hard to distinguish colour wise between Rejected SHLAA Sites and Potential Option in the printed document. This needs to be addressed when the plan is printed.</p>	The Final Plan will only show allocated sites and not the rejected sites.	The maps will be produced in the higher quality we can have in order to avoid these sorts of problems in the printed versions.
Beth	Burton & Dalby	ANON-	Melton Mowbray South: The Sustainable Southern Neighbourhood is hatched in yellow. No yellow	The Link Road is shown as an indicative route and	

Johnson (chair)	Parish Council	BHRP-4HU6-K	hatching should be shown to the south of the indicated Relief Road.	not as a final design. The route is likely to change as a detailed engineering solution is drawn up.	
Rosemary Barrett		ANON-BHRP-4H16-E	Burton Lazars The area marked on the map as potential residential development area clearly compromises the area of separation. To truly maintain the integrity of Burton Lazars as a separate village settlement I feel the proposed link road should be moved slightly north at its junction with the main Melton to Oakham road (A606) and that there should be absolutely no further development south of the proposed link road close to Burton Lazars. Any need to replace these proposed houses could be met by developing slightly more closer to the junction with Dalby Road, thus avoiding further encroachment on the villages of Burton Lazars and Eye Kettleby. In order to truly maintain an Area of Separation there should be no further development immediately either side of the A606 from its junction with Kirby Lane, Melton Mowbray and the village of Burton Lazars.	A final engineering solution in the road alignment is to be prepared. This route will determine the edge of development. No housing will take place beyond the route of the road.	
David A Haston	Mr Richard Chandler, Highfield Farm, Long Clawson, Melton Mowbray LE14 4NQ	ANON-BHRP-4HG5-4	Long Clawson Site MBC/169/15 - Canal Farm. The exact shape of the site has been modified slightly during the course of site evaluations.	Noted. We will update the site details during summer this year and the most updated information will be available on Autumn, including the amended boundaries of the site.	The amendments are already saved and the changed will be taken into account when reassessing the site.
Elizabeth Ann Johnson		ANON-BHRP-4HGR-1	Norther Sustainable Neighbourhood and Southern Sustainable Neighbourhood: The maps depicting the areas of housing on these maps should indicate the link roads forming the boundary to development to prevent 'creep' into open countryside. Areas of Separation: These should be clearly defined and with boundaries. A mere zig-zag offers no distinction, only confusion as to the precise line.	The Link Road is shown as an indicative layout and not as a final design. Regarding the Areas of Separation: as you have mentioned, a defined boundary could avoid confusions but it will also delimit the influence of the Area of Separation to an enclosed area where features as the skyline, natural contour or the housing design would be extremely difficult to delimit.	
Cllr Martin Lusty	Waltham on the Wolds & Thorpe Arnold Parish Council and Neighbourhood Planning Group	ANON-BHRP-4HBZ-4	The policy maps do not show the latest additions to the 2016 SHLAA. How will this be handled in the consultation process?	New SHLAA sites are being assessed together with the existing sites – these selected for allocations will be included in the new version of the Plan for consultation. Parish Councils and NDP groups have been asked to comment on sites during April-May this year.	
Gavin Simpson		ANON-BHRP-4HHQ-1	Melton Mowbray South. Areas of separation should be protected and provide large green spaces to enhance the built up areas. The eastern part of the new road should be close to the already built up area on the south east of the town where it joins Burton Road with only an island and green spaces .The relief road should form the southern boundary with no housing allowed to the south of it or the east. This would help to prevent 'creep' into open countryside and into the Area of Separation with Burton Lazars. As shown on the plan the new development threatens to undermine the area of separation.	Noted. An indicative route of the road will be determined by technical engineering solution. No housing development will take place beyond the defined route.	
Christopher John Noakes		ANON-BHRP-4HBK-N	Bottesford-Easthorpe: agree with the rejected SHLAA sites and areas of separation Branston: agree with rejected SHLAA sites Burton Lazars: area of separation (to MM) is essential Eaton: agree reject SHLAA sites Gaddesby ; agree reject SHLAA sites Goadby Marwood: ditto Harby: has potential for some limited growth as a potential Secondary level settlement, with relatively good level of facilities and close to employment area (but not housing on former dairy site - already rejected in former appeal decisions). Hose: agree reject large SHLAA sites Muston: agree reject SHLAA sites Plungar: reinstate protection of open spaces (formerly included in MLP 1999) Scalford: agree the SHLAA site (065) is unsuitable/unsustainable Stathern: the large SHLAA site (195) is clearly unacceptable in scale, location and impacts. Twyford: agree no justification for large SHLAA site Wymondham: no justification for the remote SHLAA sites (067;069) Normanton and Six Hills: No justification for these substantial 'new village' proposals - see comments on SS6. Note: lack of comment of any settlement does not necessarily imply support for the proposals/conclusions on the individual plan.	Noted.	
Anthony Barber		ANON-BHRP-4H6R-G	Frisby on the Wreake MBC/191/15 Significant amenity impact on existing residents, who enjoy open vies across the Wreake valley towards Kirby Bellars and Asfordby which would be ruined by any development behind them. Development of part only of the site which continues southwards along Great Lane to the northern end of Gaddesby Lane might be acceptable. Not shown on the policy map, but currently under assessment at Frisby are MBC/007/16 and MBC/004/16. I would not support either site as suitable for a	The Emerging Options Local Plan has information linked to the SHLAA sites (up to 2015). The 2016 SHLAA will be released soon and will provide an update of the sites in Frisby on the Wreake.	

			<p>single development. To retain the character and integrity of the village, any development in the village should be small scale and split across at least the 3 locations under assessment, in a way to minimise impact on existing residents. There is an area of land bordering and to the south of Rotherby Lane and adjacent to the western boundary of MBC/007/16 which would represent a more natural extension of the village boundaries. I have no interest in the land, nor do I have any knowledge of current ownership.</p> <p>Other sites currently under SHLAA assessment which are not yet included in the policy map: There should be greater recognition of local open space within individual settlements - hence its inclusion under policy EN5. Many villages contain such areas (which were subject to 'protection' under the MLP 1999).</p>		
Robert Ian Lockey		ANON-BHRP-4H3G-2	There is a serious need to designate new green spaces in Bottesford	Noted.	
Mr John Brown		ANON-BHRP-4H4Z-P	One map showing the whole bypass around Melton town, as well as the individual North/South/East/West constituents, would be useful.	Agree. This map will be included in the Pre-submission plan.	Production of a map for Melton Mowbray showing link roads and developments.