



Option	Total	Percent of All
Support	<u>37</u>	8.132%
Object	<u>19</u>	4.176%
Support with observations	<u>31</u>	6.813%
Other	<u>13</u>	2.857%
Not Answered	355	78.02%

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

Policy SS5 – Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood					
Name	User ID	Issue or comment	What changes would you like to see made to this policy? - Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
Robert Ian Lockey	ANON-BHRP-4H3G-2	This is what a plan ought to be about; doing the necessary to create or develop a community. In this case, given the congestion in Melton town centre, I can support measures to reduce dependence on cars.	There is a need for cheaper housing. Exceeding 'building regulations for energy efficiency and carbon emissions' and general over-specification of houses should be a lower priority than affordability.	Noted. The Council is seeking a proportion of affordable housing through policy C4.  It is accepted that the Local Plan Policy cannot 'require' new development to exceed the Building Regulations.	Amend the policy wording to 'encourage' developers who wish to exceed current building regulations and energy efficiency standards and for new houses to have x% of their energy from renewable sources and energy efficiency standards that exceed the energy requirements of building regulations.
Angus Smith	ANON-BHRP-4HZK-D	Well thought through and structured in delivering the community to the North of Melton, though again, needs to consider the impact of traffic on the Neighbour areas of Asfordby Hill and Ab Kettleby, Thorpe arnold	Define traffic management controls that will be necessary as the northern neighbourhood is developed and expanded,	The transport impacts of the proposed development have been considered and mitigation measures will be identified.	
Mr Julian Evans	ANON-BHRP-4H43-F	You can't keep building on this side of the Town; thankfully we have the Country Park that you can't build on.	None.	The Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood is a key element of the Local Plan strategy and is required to help deliver housing in a sustainable location. The proposed development would not encroach on the Country Park.	
John David Smith	ANON-BHRP-4H4X-M	I have sufficient knowledge of the area to be able to respond to this question; I am in favour of the proposal.	None.	Noted.	
John William Fairbrother (MNAG)	ANON-BHRP-4H45-H	I object to housing development so close to the boundaries of the Melton country park. All the surrounding countryside views from the north corner (the highest corner of the park) will be lost to view for ever. This view of the countryside is marvelled by all who use the country park; the view consists of Thorpe Arnold round to Borough Hill and further to the right overlooking Melton to the Countryside of Bradgate park in Leicestershire.	None.	Policy SS5 requires a protection zone between Melton Country Park and any future development. It also requires the provision of new wildlife corridors specifically at Melton Country Park. The proposed development would therefore not encroach on the Country Park.  The landscape impacts have been assessed through the Council's Landscape sensitivity analysis.	
Siobhan Noble	ANON-BHRP-4HED-H	Will there be a requirement for a traveller site outside the town?	None.	The policy requirements for provision of three pitches for Gypsies and Travellers (G&T) will help to meet the needs set out in the Leicester and Leicestershire G&T Accommodation Assessment.	
John Mace	ANON-BHRP-4HEM-T	Completed bypass essential before major development occurs Resolution of impact on traffic flows into the town along Thorpe Road. Flooding risk at the Spinney Road and Grantham Road junction due to additional loading from the proposed development to the north of Thorpe Park	Against the enclosure of the Country Park, it will be fully surrounded by housing apart from a small corridor to the north. More land to the north should be free from housing to maintain the existing environment.	Delivery of the relief road in advance of the housing is not likely to be financially viable. Transport modelling will help to identify any necessary mitigation measures that will help to limit adverse transport impacts in advance of completion of the relief road. The agreed phasing of the relief road will be considered as part of an agreed master plan.	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

				Policy SS5 requires a protection zone between Melton Country Park and any future development. It also requires the provision of new wildlife corridors specifically at Melton Country Park. The proposed development would therefore not encroach on the Country Park.	
Lesley Judith Twigg	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HEH-N</b>	Again slight increase % of Borough total	None.	None. The comment is made in the context of increasing the percentage provision in Melton Mowbray to more than 65%. The Council considers that this is an appropriate distribution.	
Mark Colin Marlow	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HEJ-Q</b>		More thorough look into ecology and bio-diversity	The Council has commissioned a Bio-diversity and habitats survey in order to provide evidence of important habitats and species that should be protected.	
Anthony Thomas	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HFX-6</b>	Only will support the above if numbers of houses quoted and conditions outlined above are strictly adhered to.	Only will support the above if numbers of houses quoted and conditions outlined above are strictly adhered to.	Noted.	
Persimmon Homes	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HF3-1</b>	The allocation area lacks sufficient flexibility needed to ensure the alignment of the proposed relief road is engineered in a cost effective manner. Land either side of the relief road should be included to allow the route to deviate north or south pending detailed ground investigations. The merits of scheduled historic sites must be weighed in the balance against the benefits of the relief road.	<p>The quantum of houses should be increased to circa 2000 units to secure the necessary levels of revenue needed to pay for the link road and ancillary infrastructure.</p> <p>The % of affordable should be defined by viability study not prescriptive.</p> <p>Extra Care provision is subject to RP interest, and viability due to significant extra over costs associated with the construction of this specialised provision alongside additional land take.</p> <p>School provision should be subject to education reviews, provision will be required however the exact quantum may require variants or the exact tier category and numbers. Added flexibility must be employed until such time that an accurate infrastructure burden £ is known. Protection of historic assets must be measured against the benefits of any proposal, a level of discretion should be afforded to officers in this respect. No scheme should have to exceed building regulations, any expectation to the contrary must be supported by robust evidence that such an imposition doesn't harm viability, affordability, deliverability. Master planning between developers and promoters is contingent upon good relations. The lion share of SUE across Leicestershire have incurred significant delay where Councils have imposed requirements for a standalone application. Melton Mowbray can ill afford such delays in housing delivery. I</p>	<p>The alignment of the Relief road is for illustrative purposes. Leicestershire County Council is currently seeking to establish the most effective alignment of the Relief Road. This will be identified more specifically through effective master planning and submission of detailed schemes.</p> <p>The impact of the proposed Melton North SN on Historic Assets has been considered.</p> <p>1,500 houses are considered to be a realistic target to be delivered during the plan period. 2,000 houses is not considered to be a realistic level to be delivered up to 2036.</p> <p>The viability of the proposal is being assessed, including the financial implications of affordable housing and delivering the relief-road.</p> <p>Evidence of education requirements is informed through discussions with the Local Education Authority and assessment of the potential need arising from the proposed development and the capacity of existing facilities.</p> <p>It is accepted that the Local Plan Policy cannot 'require' new development to exceed the Building Regulations.</p>	Amend the policy wording to 'encourage' developers who wish to exceed current building regulations and energy efficiency standards and for new houses to have x% of their energy from renewable sources and energy efficiency standards that exceed the energy requirements of building regulations.

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

			therefore suggest the council give careful consideration to ways in which landowners / developers / promoters interface with the Council to deliver a unified scheme independent of one another but in conformity with an overarching design guide or AAP consultation process. Employing CIL / Design Codes / AAP would be all tools that can offer Melton Borough Council the levels of control and security they require while providing sufficient flexibility to developers.		
Stephen Denman	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HEU-2</b>	Comments made by the Planning Inspector as part of his review of the previous Core Strategy - he was unable to support the previous plan- he viewed it as not sustainable due to the unacceptable impact on landscape, agricultural land and biodiversity. Development is shown here on the same land as the previous Core Strategy, so am I right in thinking that his comments and views have now been "kicked into touch"? Also the farming land off Melton Spinney Road is of very high agricultural quality, how do this equate with the Authority's stance on sustainability (or has this been conveniently forgotten)?	Reduce drastically the housing development off Melton Spinney Road.	The context for the Local Plan has changed since the previous Core strategy examination. The plan period has extended to 25 years (from 12/13) and there has been a substantial increase in the overall housing requirements necessitating a north and south urban extension. The Council consider that many of the Inspector's concerns could be overcome with effective master planning and a high quality design. Policy EN1 encourages this approach. There is sufficient area to accommodate 1,500 houses whilst retaining important areas of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land and important habitats and species.	
Susan Love	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HZP-J</b>	Melton North could take more houses with the use of the SHLAA west of the proposed residential area.		1,500 houses is considered to be a realistic target to be delivered during the plan period. 2,000 houses are not considered to be a realistic level to be delivered up to 2036.	
John Moore	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HZS-N</b>	The Figure which accompanies draft policy SS5 shows a small area of proposed housing development to the north of the indicative line of the New Link Road. This is presumably because the figure reflects field boundaries. I consider it important that the New Link Road should mark the boundary for development throughout the period to 2036. Any land to the north of the New Link Road should be retained as open space.	The Figure which accompanies the policy should not be shaded for Proposed Residential above the line of the Indicative Link Road.	The Melton Mowbray North plan is for illustrative purposes. It is not proposed that there would be housing north of the proposed link road as this could form a strong defensible boundary. It currently reflects the extent of the proposed site promoted through the Council's SHLAA which often reflect land ownership. Detailed master planning will set out proposed land uses.	
Elizabeth Anne Taylor	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HMD-S</b>	The strategic road link connecting Scalford Road A606 to Nottingham Road and the rest of the Melton Mowbray Outer Western Relief Route MUST be completed in order to sustain any further development on this scale. The town is already overburdened with traffic and always congested at peak times. This can only be compounded by any further development.	None	Delivery of the relief road in advance of the housing is not likely to be financially viable. Transport modelling will help to identify any necessary mitigation measures that will help to limit adverse transport impacts in advance of completion of the relief road. The phasing of the relief road will be considered as part of an agreed master plan.	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

Mrs P Lapworth	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HUX-N</b>	<p>Current traffic on Thorpe Road is heavy, very often extremely heavy taking approximately 10 to 15 mins to get into Melton, This delay would increase if this development goes ahead.</p> <p>The development site is on a hill, therefore the houses would dominate Melton. Will Melton have enough schools, would the medical practice be able to cope. Would the Country Park withstand the increase in footfall, do we have money to support this facility.</p>	Development would be better on the other side of Melton - development would be in a dip.	<p>The Council's transport assessment considers the impact of the proposed Melton North SN on the local (and wider) road network. Transport modelling using the Leicester and Leicestershire Integrated Transport Model provides the best available evidence to understand the transport impacts and implications of development.</p> <p>The Council consider that a proposal which is sensitive to the landscape could be delivered with effective master planning and a high quality design. Policy EN1 encourages this approach.</p>	
Environment Agency	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HFU-3</b>	We fully support this policy especially in relation to the protection and enhancement of wildlife corridors, new corridors incorporating watercourses and Melton Country Park and the protection zone between any future development and the River Eye SSSI.	<p>We support this but would like to add the following to the section on the environment. "The redevelopment of brownfield sites is encouraged. Contamination issues must be addressed and the local water environment should be protected."</p> <p>This area is underlain by superficial deposits including the Oadby Member (secondary undifferentiated), and alluvium (secondary A). The bedrock geology of this area is the Charnmouth Mudstone which is classified as secondary undifferentiated. See above for an explanation of these definitions.</p>	<p>The Council agree in principle that redevelopment of brownfield land should be encouraged and the water environment protected. However, this is contained in the NPPF and need not be repeated in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	
Nick Farrow	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HUD-1</b>	None	link road from Nottingham road to Grantham road (A607)	The detailed route of the Relief Road has not yet been agreed. Transport Assessments will identify which sections of the relief road are necessary.	
M Howard	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HUW-M</b>	The link between Nottingham road and Scalford road is insufficient for this number of houses. The link needs to go from Nottingham road to Grantham road (A607) otherwise Scalford road and the town centre will grind to a halt!		The detailed route of the Relief Road has not yet been agreed. Transport Assessments will identify which sections of the relief road are necessary. The Relief Road is intended to take traffic out of the town centre.	
John A Herlihy	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HU3-G</b>	See above. (Unable to cut and paste.) The proposed 'green gaps' are pretty poor and will not offer natural corridors for wildlife. You say - A strategic road link connecting Scalford Road A606 to Nottingham Road forming part of the Melton Mowbray Outer Western Relief Route as part of a wider agreed scheme; Surely only proposed?? A piece meal package of 'relief roads' - each being constructed at different times and connecting to already overcrowded roads is not the best way to address the this complex problem.	In principle its fine. Very laudable aims and aspirations. But this does not address the severe problem of traffic congestion, pedestrian access, country corridors etc.	<p>The Melton Mowbray North plan is for illustrative purposes. Detailed master planning will set out proposed land uses including any green spaces.</p> <p>The detailed route of the Relief Road has not yet been agreed. Transport Assessments will identify which sections of the relief road are necessary.</p> <p>Delivery of the relief road in advance of the housing is not likely to be financially viable. Transport modelling will help to identify any necessary mitigation measures that will help to</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

				limit adverse transport impacts in advance of completion of the relief road. The phasing of the relief road will be considered as part of an agreed master plan.	
Dr Ian Chappell	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HUA-X</b>	Future development in the north sector would be more accessible to the major supermarkets/ cattle market than development to the south of Melton.	None.	There has been a substantial increase in the overall housing requirements necessitating a north and south urban extension.	
Craig Heaney	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HUY-P</b>	<p>My comments with regard to the link road remain valid in this section. Insufficient thought has been given to the impact of proposed development to the north on the Country Park as a whole. The park is of enormous (and undersold) benefit to the town and the diversity of wildlife both in the park and in its surrounding areas is huge. We must protect this wildlife ahead of any desire to build homes. 19 of the 60 species that appear on the UK Biodiversity Action Plan RED list inhabit the park and surrounding area. It is important that significant wildlife corridors are established as part of the plan.</p> <p>The local bus service (18) has recently been cancelled without prior notice or consultation. This service serves the estates and communities off of Thorpe Road and has subsequently already led to an increase use of cars as a result. How can any development be linked with a sustainable policy of using public transport when it can be removed at such short notice? What are the plans to re-introduce a bus service that support this sustainable policy?</p> <p>The area from Tesco and north up Melton Spinney Road is already noted on the Environment Agency website as being at high risk of flooding from surface water. This was evidenced earlier this year when a period of extended rainfall was enough the flood the ground at Thorpe Arnold cricket club and the brook that runs parallel with Thorpe Road. Any proposal for development to the north of town needs to include specific and realistic measures to prevent such flooding.</p>	None.	<p>The proposed development would not encroach on the Country Park. The landscape impacts have been assessed through the Council's Landscape sensitivity analysis.</p> <p>The policy seeks to protect areas that contain important bio-diversity.</p> <p>Noted. The area benefits from transport choice with the town centre being accessible by walking, cycling and public transport.</p> <p>The Council's Flood Risk Assessment identifies the areas at risk of flooding. The proposed site is of sufficient size to accommodate the level of growth outside of flood zone 3.</p>	
Moira Hart	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HU7-M</b>	It makes sense that development in and around Melton Mowbray should be on a larger scale as there is the existing infrastructure, jobs and transport system. This will allow sustainable development and environmentally friendly travel to town and neighbouring cities.	None.	Noted.	
Christine Larson	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HUU-J</b>	I welcome the protection of the Country Park and the environment and areas of separation. However, how soon in the development will the road links be improved? Already Scaford Road experiences high	None.	<p>Noted. The delivery of the Relief Road will be phased.</p> <p>The policy proposes three Gypsy and traveller</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

		levels of traffic that aren't manageable. Also three Gypsy/Traveller sites are too many in one relatively small area and these should be spread around the Borough with some in the south.		'pitches' (not sites). A pitch is the unit of accommodation for a single family (often no more than two caravans). The Melton South SN also has three pitches proposed.	
Clawson in Action - residents' group	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HBM-Q</b>	It is logical that development around Melton Mowbray should be on a large scale to take account of the existing infrastructure, the jobs and the transport system. This will allow sustainable development and environmentally friendly travel to town and neighbouring cities.	None.	Noted.	
Susan Herlihy	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HE3-Z</b>	No indication that the problems of using Scalford Road to get in to town has been addressed. Width of road in many places is inadequate. Many paths along Scalford Road are not adequate when the number of students going up and down to school is taken into account.	Change the allocation of the number of houses and their location.	Transport Assessments will identify any transport issues and proposed mitigation measures.	
Richard and Jane Heerbeck	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HBC-D</b>	See below.	The link road from Nottingham Road via Scalford Road should not end at Melton Spinney Road, but should continue onto the A607 Grantham Road. On the latest plan it has been moved further north and ends opposite Twin Lakes park. That is illogical because when funding becomes available the link road should continue across the valley up to the A607, in order to provide a proper relief road for the northern part of the town. Accordingly the link road should be moved back to the south of Twin lakes so that it can be continued onto the A607 across agricultural land, rather than having to go through or around Twin Lakes park.	The detailed route of the Relief Road has not yet been agreed. Transport Assessments will identify which sections of the relief road are necessary.	
Deborah Caroline Adams	<b>ANON-BHRP-4H38-K</b>	The road infrastructure in the north of Melton Mowbray is much worse than that for the south of Melton Mowbray with no scope for widening and improving the arterial roads from the north to the town centre. The junctions of Scalford Road with Norman Way, and Thorpe Road at Thorpe End are full to over-capacity already. Twinlakes Theme Park - a thriving business on Melton Spinney Road generates hundreds of vehicles using Melton Spinney Road (a country lane), the A607 Grantham Road and Thorpe Road regularly causing during school holidays half-mile to a mile queues of traffic trying to get through the town from Melton Spinney Road. The 'rush hours' for Twinlakes are at a different time to the traditional rush hour generated by workers going to and returning from work. Therefore up to 4 separate 'rush hours' can be experienced by residents living in the north of the Town. As with the proposed southern SUE, the northern SUE in order to be sustainable will rely on a Melton Outer Western Relief Road from the Scalford Road to Nottingham Road and using St. Bartholomew's Way to join up to the A6006 Asfordby Road. The funding for this Outer Relief Road is supposedly coming from developers, but as with the	Far more emphasis being placed on the provision of a Melton Mowbray bypass running from the A607 Grantham Road across the north to the A606 Nottingham Road then down the western side to the A607 Leicester Road and finally round to the A606 Oakham Road. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) should be determined and the funding for the bypass comes from the CIL. That way ALL dwellings built in the Borough will pay a contribution to the bypass. Other funding should also be secured and assured to enable the bypass to be completed within the next 10 years.	The implications of the proposed development and Relief Road on the local and wider transport network will be considered through transport modelling. This includes the potential increase in traffic flows on Melton Spinney Road and the impacts on Melton Mowbray town centre.  The Council is working closely with Leicestershire County Council transportation Officers in order to identify a solution.	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

		<p>south, developers are expected to contribute significantly to other infrastructure and at the same time provide 37% affordable housing. The Outer Relief Road will have to be of a high enough standard to take HGVs and not just be a series of estate link roads with small roundabouts. There is NO guarantee of funding for the Outer Relief Road which is supposed to form part of a Melton Mowbray bypass. Therefore without the Outer Relief Road and the Melton Mowbray bypass, the proposed northern SUE will be unsustainable as the residual cumulative impacts of the development will be severe. (NPPF point 32) The link road between Scalford Road and Melton Spinney Road (dubbed "the road to nowhere" by residents) is only mentioned when talking about the "North Melton Strategic Road Link" as on page 150 of the Draft Local Plan. The phrase favoured in this public consultation is the "Melton Mowbray Outer Western Relief Road" as mentioned above (although it is more of a north-west link). The lack of consistency is confusing. Residents have been told that it is MBC's opinion that there is no requirement for a link from Melton Spinney Road to the A607 Grantham Road! Residents have also been told that the only traffic mitigation necessary to create a zero-effect from the northern SUE is a link road between A606 Nottingham Road to Scalford Road! There is inconsistency with regards to the northern SUE in that according to diagrams the 1700 homes will stretch across from the A606 Nottingham Road to Melton Spinney Road (a country lane). The SUE will enclose the Melton Country Park except for a narrow strip the width of the old railway embankment. The Country Park will then become a town park. There is no mention of how the Outer Relief Road will deal with traversing the wildlife corridor that should be maintained for the Country Park. There is inconsistency to the Relief Road itself.</p>			
Anthony Paphiti	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HBV-Z</b>	<p>Linked with the previous question, these are huge numbers of housing - a total of 3,700 (up to 15,000 people) added to the population of our town. This will not turn Melton into a desirable place to live. Quite the opposite.</p>	None.	Melton Mowbray is the most sustainable settlement in Melton Borough and is therefore the focus for growth. The policies of the plan seek to secure high quality developments that will maintain the desirability of the town.	
Clair Ingham	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HMZ-F</b>	<p>Again seems reasonable providing extra facilities but also protecting assets</p>	None.	Noted.	
Melanie Steadman	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HFE-K</b>	<p>Better transport links would be essential to this level of development north of Melton with the employment centres south of the town.</p>	None.	The proposed Relief road seeks to deliver better transport links to key employment areas.	
Michael Cavani	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HZ5-Q</b>	<p>4.5 Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood. Transport 4.5.4 Talks about how cycling connectivity will be significantly improved,</p>	<p>Policy SS5 Conclusion It is very difficult to consult on something that has so little detail I can only hope that when we get to the second round of public</p>	<p>Noted. The implications of the proposed development</p>	

	<p>however it gives no detail as to what these improvements will look like.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When we consider the housing which is proposed between Nottingham Rd and Scaford Rd how will cycle routes be built? Will they allow for safe and secure access into the centre of town and the employment land which has been earmarked to the west?</li> <li>• Will the upgrade to Bartholomew Way and Welby Road include separate cycling and pedestrian pathways? 4.5.4 Makes reference to a link road between Nottingham Rd and Scaford Rd, but makes no reference to any such link Rd between Scaford Rd and Melton Spinney Rd, why is this? Let's assume that there will be a link road right across from Nottingham Rd and Melton Spinney Rd. There is no information in any of the consultation documents or reports that expands on the construction of the link road. There is no information about the width of the link road,</li> <li>• Will it be constructed to take HGVs?</li> <li>• Will it have separate cycle and pedestrian paths?</li> <li>• Will it continue over to the A607 Grantham Rd and if not why not? If not how will the Melton Spinney Road be upgraded to take the increase level of traffic including HGV while still managing the Twinlake traffic.</li> <li>• How will the Melton Spinney Rd / Thorpe Rd junction be redeveloped to take the increased level of traffic including HGV traffic? Policy SS5 Makes reference to Melton Outer Western Relief Road.</li> <li>• At the time of writing no decision has been made by council as to the preferred route, be it west or east.</li> <li>• Policy S55 makes reference to 'Securing a route' this is an unfortunate turn of phrase. Are the council trying to mislead the people in a consultation of such importance? Securing a route is hugely different to constructing a route. Also the consultation gives the reader no clue as to how the Western or Eastern route will be funded, or is that the reason why the council have used the phrase 'securing the route' as it has no visibility as to where the funding will come from.</li> <li>• Policy SS5 makes reference to mitigating the impact</li> </ul>	<p>consultations later in the year we will have far more meat on the bones. Without any visibility of any plans or layouts it's difficult to agree to the proposal. If we are to have Sustainable housing developments then we must design and build within the National Policy Framework and ensure that the proper infrastructure is in place. Which means that funding for the Outer Relief Road needs to be secured and in place before the Local Plan is adopted.</p>	<p>and Relief Road on the local and wider transport network will be considered through transport modelling. This includes the potential increase in traffic flows on Melton Spinney Road and the impacts on Melton Mowbray town centre.</p> <p>The Council is working closely with Leicestershire County Council transportation Officers in order to identify a solution.</p> <p>The detailed design of the development (including proposed cycle links) will be the subject of detailed master planning and submitted planning applications. Detailed highway specifications are not appropriate in a local plan which seeks to set out broader principles.</p> <p>There are however, existing opportunities for off-road cycle links from the development to Melton Mowbray town Centre through the Country Park.</p>	
--	---	--	---	--

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

		<p>on the existing road infrastructure while the developments are being constructed. All the traffic reports commissioned by the authorities have made it clear that due to the severity of the traffic congestion in and around Melton very little can be do in the way of mitigation. So what is the document referring too? Environment Makes reference to Establishing a protection zone between the Country Park and any future development, but give no detail as to how that will look and what size the protection zone will be. It also talks about a wildlife corridor, but again gives no detail. What will a wildlife corridor look like at the point where it crosses the Relief road? By encircling the Country park with developments it has effectively become a town park, that being the case should we now review what a town park should look like. Proper tarmacked cycle tracks and footpaths. Path lighting for safe access to the town and schools in the early mornings and late afternoons. Proper access from every development into the park from all developments Master planning and delivery A master plan, including a phasing and delivery plan, should be prepared and agreed in advance of, or as part of, submission of a planning application for the Melton North Sustainable Neighbourhood (NSN). The master plan should have been available for this consultation process and without question for the next round of public consultations.</p>			
Laura Smith	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HB7-1</b>	<p>I am concerned that the North end of the Country Park will be surrounded by housing development and any "corridors" for wildlife will be too limited. An adequate connection with the open countryside is vital for the natural environment and biodiversity of the Country Park. A protected green space, or similar specific safeguard should be identified and incorporated in the plan.</p>	None.	<p>Policy SS5 requires a protection zone between Melton Country Park and any future development. It also requires the provision of new wildlife corridors specifically at Melton Country Park.</p> <p>The landscape impacts have been assessed through the Council's Landscape sensitivity analysis.</p> <p>Detailed master planning and submitted planning applications will illustrate how the proposal will accommodate wildlife corridors linking to open countryside. Potential links along the river corridors could be used for wildlife corridors.</p>	
Russell Pride	<b>ANON-BHRP-4H6H-6</b>	<p>Policy SS4 - South Melton Mowbray Sustainable Neighbourhood - Transport. Policy SS5 - Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood - Transport Page 26: Fig.4 Emerging Options (Draft Plan) key diagram Maps on pages 43 (North) and 49 (South) Sections 4.3.6 and 4.4.4</p>	<p>I find it extraordinary that the proposals planned for the next 20 years for North and South are not properly linked together. I see no logic in proposing a scheme of bypasses that have no direct connectivity between the East and the West, but are instead left just "hanging". Action: These issues must be addressed and resolved before the plan is sent for government approval.</p>	<p>The proposal is to create a north south link. The detailed route of the link is currently being considered.</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

<p>Thorpe Park Residents Association</p>	<p><b>ANON-BHRP-4H67-N</b></p>	<p>Environment and Flooding 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 makes reference to landscape in paragraph 109: "The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils. Melton Country Park and its surrounding area is a rich environment for wildlife and is of significant ecological value. A good number of Britain's most endangered species inhabit the area, both within the park boundaries and on surrounding land, and would be at threat from any proposed development. (19 of the 60 species that appear on the UK Biodiversity Action Plan Red List, inhabit the area.) 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. The Environment Agency web site indicates a high risk of flooding from surface water along Thorpe Brook, adjacent to Thorpe Road and Melton Spinney Road. Thorpe Park Residents are concerned about the increased risk of flooding that may arise as a result of any further building along Melton Spinney Road. Transport The current draft Local Plan indicates 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.</p>	<p>Environment To preserve the landscape and maintain the current levels of biodiversity it is essential to retain significant and sustainable wildlife corridors to the north and east of the Country Park. Further housing development off Melton Spinney Road, without an effective plan to combat the increased likelihood of flooding will have a significant impact on the lives of not only Thorpe Park residents, but residents and businesses on Thorpe Road and beyond. Transport The link road that is currently shown to terminate on Melton Spinney Road should be extended through to the A607 Grantham Road at a point north of Thorpe Arnold.</p>	<p>Policy SS5 requires a protection zone between Melton Country Park and any future development. It also requires the provision of new wildlife corridors specifically at Melton Country Park.</p> <p>The Council consider that a proposal which is sensitive to the landscape could be delivered with effective master planning and a high quality design. Policy EN1 encourages this approach.</p> <p>A desire to protect landscapes needs to be balanced with the NPPFs key objective of significantly boosting housing.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned a Bio-diversity and habitats survey in order to provide evidence of important habitats and species that should be protected. Because of the scale of the site, there is potential to retain important habitats and species within the development.</p> <p>The implications of the proposed development and Relief Road on the local and wider transport network will be considered through transport modelling. This includes the potential increase in traffic flows on Melton Spinney Road and the impacts on Melton Mowbray town centre.</p> <p>The Council is working closely with Leicestershire County Council transportation Officers in order to identify a solution.</p>	
<p>Robert Anthony Fionda</p>	<p><b>ANON-BHRP-4H13-C</b></p>	<p>Bypass urgently required (like yesterday) to avoid gridlock to the town.</p>		<p>A relief road is proposed through the emerging plan.</p>	
<p>Bottesford Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group</p>	<p><b>ANON-BHRP-4HUB-Y</b></p>	<p>Supported with observations and evidently some way on in planning.</p>	<p>The policy whereby all supported commercial development is to be located in Melton Mowbray surrounding villages is fully supported as the most sustainable option. Rather than leave the western development (MOD Animal Centre SS6) as a fall back, start the planning now for development to take place within the Plan period. This additional development may aid the effective completion of the ring road.</p>	<p>Noted. The plan contains a policy that considers alternative strategy options should the sustainable neighbourhoods not be delivered, including west of Melton Mowbray.</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

Richard Simon	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HZC-5</b>	All supported commercial development is going to Melton Mowbray and satellite villages. Opportunity to increase development in these areas as the most sustainable in the Borough. Start to consider western development rather than leave it as a fall back	Consider and plan MOD Animal Centre for development now for a quick start on them vacating the site.	Noted. The plan contains a policy that considers alternative strategy options should the sustainable neighbourhoods not be delivered, including west of Melton Mowbray.	
Bottesford Parish Council	<b>ANON-BHRP-4H1W-G</b>	,,,obviously some way on in planning	The policy whereby all supported commercial development is to be located in Melton Mowbray surrounding villages is fully supported as the most sustainable option. Rather than leave the western development (MOD Animal Centre SS6) as a fall back, start the planning now for development to take place within the Plan period. This additional development may aid the effective completion of the ring road.	Noted. The plan contains a policy that considers alternative strategy options should the sustainable neighbourhoods not be delivered, including west of Melton Mowbray.	
John Rust	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HUV-K</b>	Extract It is logical that development around Melton Mowbray should be on a large scale to take account of the existing infrastructure, the jobs and the transport system. This will allow sustainable development and environmentally friendly travel to town and neighbouring cities.	Extract: I welcome the protection of the Country Park and the environment and areas of separation. However, how soon in the development will the road links be improved? Already Scalford Road experiences high levels of traffic that aren't manageable. Also three Gypsy/Traveller sites are too many in one relatively small area and these should be spread around the Borough with some in the south.	Noted. Potential transport impacts are being assessed. The delivery of the Relief Road will be phased.  The policy proposes three Gypsy and traveller 'pitches' (not sites). A pitch is the unit of accommodation for a single family (often no more than two caravans). The Melton South SN also has three pitches proposed.	
Melton North Action Group	<b>ANON-BHRP-4H1Z-K</b>	The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that "Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised." (Point 34 of NPPF). MNAG believes that the North Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood (NMSN) is unsustainable as the main employment areas in Melton Mowbray are in the west and south west of the town.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no direct bus links to the employment areas from the north of the town, and although there is a limited bus service along parts of Scalford Road and Nottingham Road, these do not continue into the evenings.</li> <li>• Leicestershire County Council (LCC) withdrew its funding for the Centrebus Service no.18 in February 2016. There is now no town bus service for residents living in the Thorpe Road and Melton Spinney Road area.</li> <li>• The arterial roads into Melton Mowbray from the north of the town are narrow and congested. There is no room for a dedicated cycle way on any of the roads.</li> <li>• The only safe area to cycle from the north of the</li> </ul>	None.	Melton Mowbray is the most sustainable location in the Borough to accommodate growth. It has the greatest range of access to jobs, services and facilities and transport choice.  Transport impacts and implications are being considered through the Leicester and Leicestershire Transport models.  The Council recognise that any development as part of the MNSN would require substantial additional infrastructure. This is set out in the policy and the accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan.  The Council acknowledge that previous transport reports have indicated alternative options. The Council will for different quantities of growth and transport solutions. The Council will require sufficient evidence to demonstrate that it has assessed the preferred options in order to have the plan found 'sound' at examination.  The final route of the Relief Road has not yet been finalised. MBC are working with LCC Highway Authority regarding the potential impacts of the Northern Relief Road and mitigation measures.	

	<p>town into the town centre is through the Country Park, but there is no lighting provided in the Country Park which severely impacts on the use of the Country Park as a cycle way after dark.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The individual developments which would make up the NMSN would all be more than one mile from the centre of town where the doctor's surgery, dentists, leisure facilities and the town shopping area are located. Walking therefore would not be considered a favourable option. The NPPF states in point 32 that "Plans and decisions should take account of whether:</li> <li>• the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;</li> <li>• safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and</li> <li>• Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that effectively limits the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe." MNAG believes that the NMSN has only one opportunity for sustainable transport modes and that is to make use of the Country Park as a cycle and/or pedestrian route to the town centre.</li> <li>• However the Country Park has areas of habitat which are of a highly sensitive nature and encroachment of those areas (which are predominantly in the northern area of the Country Park) would adversely affect the flora and fauna of those areas.</li> <li>• Access to the NMSN off the Scalford Road would be in an area very close to John Ferneley School. There are already problems in that area due to the narrowness of the road and the inability of the existing footpaths to cope with upwards of 1,000 school children at the start and end of school time. There have been several accidents on the road involving school children, and to exacerbate the situation by introducing many more vehicles onto the Scalford Road would make it unsafe, unsuitable, dangerous and undesirable.</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On Melton Spinney Road the site access would be very close to the Twinlakes Park entrance. During school holidays, several thousand people visit the Park each day and the vast majority of visitors arrive by car. This causes daily road congestion both going into the Park from 10.00 a.m. and coming out of it from 4.00 p.m. to 7.00p.m.</li> <li>• The distance from the Melton Spinney Road site entrance to the town centre would be at least 1.5 miles so not a reasonable walking distance. Much of the walk would be along a road where cars are parked half on the pavement, half on the road, leaving insufficient pavement width for buggies, trolleys or wheelchairs.</li> <li>• Neither Melton Spinney Road nor A607 Thorpe Road has any space for cyclists (in several places there is not room for two coaches or HGVs to pass each other). The only reasonable mode of transport therefore would be the car. Several hundred cars converging on Melton Spinney Road and the A607 Thorpe Road on top of the high number of vehicles already using the roads, would give unacceptable levels of congestion in and around those roads. The other 'opportunity' for sustainable travel (public transport) was taken away from the Melton Spinney Road/A607 Thorpe Road area due to cutbacks in funding the service by LCC in February of this year.</li> </ul> <p>Taking the above into account, MNAG believes that the residual cumulative impacts of the development of the NMSN would be so severe as to make it unsustainable, and that the only sensible option would be to reject the Plan in its current state. In a report of the House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee session to review the operation of the NPPF published on 16th December 2014, it was reported that "In our view, development can only be sustainable if it is accompanied by the infrastructure necessary to support it." Also "It is important that infrastructure provision takes place at the same time as housing development, or the development will be unsustainable." MNAG is concerned that there is no commitment in the draft Emerging Options Local Plan to force developers to agree to the development of the Melton bypass at the same time as housing development. Therefore the proposed NMSN is unsustainable.</p> <p>Anomalies and contradictory/confusing</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>terminology/data There is a lack of consistency in the draft Emerging Options Local Plan with regards to the NMSN. For example on pages 47 and 50 of the draft, there is mention of the "link road" from Scalford Road to Nottingham Road, whereas on page 49 there is a picture of the proposed "link road" going across the north of Melton to Melton Spinney Road. The Jacobs report of 29.4.2015 on the "Melton Western Bypass Options Testing" did not deal with a link from Scalford Road to Melton Spinney Road. In fact the Jacobs report was based on a different plan of residential development for Melton Mowbray. The Jacobs reports of 13.10.2014 and 29.4.2015 plus the Melton Mowbray Transport and New Development Position Statement issued by MBC and LCC in February 2015 all worked on the basis of there being a development of 150 dwellings off Melton Spinney Road (not the 200 in the Draft Local Plan with a further possible 400 after 2036); 950 between Nottingham Road and Scalford Road (no mention at all of the several hundred homes between Scalford Road and the north of the Country Park which appear in the Draft Local Plan, plus the two Persimmon developments).</p> <p>In the south of Melton the reports were based on 800 dwellings west of the Oakham Road and 650 dwellings off the Leicester Road. All three reports were therefore based on there being a total of 2,550 new dwellings in Melton Mowbray as opposed to the 4,000 proposed in the Draft Local Plan. All three reports are therefore of no use as supporting documentation for the Draft Local Plan as they are based on incorrect and out-of-date data. However MNAG consider it is worth pointing out that even though Jacobs were working on the assumption of 2,550 dwellings as opposed to the now proposed 4,000 dwellings for Melton Mowbray, Jacobs still concluded that: "...any development coming forward in the town - irrespective of size - requires a detailed transport assessment undertaken to ensure that suitable mitigation is proposed." Jacobs go on to say: "Given the limited spare capacity, and amount of development proposed, this mitigation needs to be of demonstrably sufficient magnitude to not only mitigate the impacts of the development itself, but also contribute to a wider benefit for residents and as part of the overall growth strategy for the town. If this is not achieved, then the evidence within this document shows that the development cannot be considered sustainable." There is a lack of consistency in the draft Emerging Options Local Plan with regards to the Melton Bypass. It has been</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>referred to as a "bypass" (page 19), a "Melton Outer Western Relief Route" (page 51), a "Melton Outer Relief Road" (page 149), a "Melton Outer Relief Route - a series of the strategic road links which connect the A606 (Burton Road) to the A607 Nottingham Road" (page 150), the "North Melton Strategic Road Link -a strategic connection between the A607 (Nottingham Road), Scalford Road and Melton Spinney Road" (page 150), a "strategic road link connecting Scalford Road to A606 Nottingham Road" (page 50), and a "new link road connecting the Scalford Road with Nottingham Road ..... as part of the wider Melton Outer Relief Route". MNAG is concerned that with such inconsistency, how can residents take MBC seriously when the council talks of providing a bypass for Melton. The variation in names does indicate a variation in the standards required for the road. A "link road" does not have the same high standard requirement that a "bypass" does. There are a number of questions to be asked:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First and foremost, exactly what sort of road is MBC aiming for across the north and south of the town? It must surely be of a bypass standard, to take HGVs, and have separate cycle and pedestrian paths, anything short of that standard will not do the job of diverting traffic away from the town centre or mitigate against the effects of the development;</li> <li>• There is an assumption that all developers will contribute to or build their portion of the bypass. What happens if a developer refuses to comply? Will they be refused planning permission, and what happens to their 'stretch' of the road as a result?</li> <li>• What procedures will be put in place so as to ensure that the bypass will be complete with an east or west connection linking the north and south routes before 2036? In the absence of any development in either the east or the west one assumes there will be no developer contribution for this connecting stretch of road. Without the certainty of an (albeit delayed) bypass it is difficult to comprehend how the proposed developments in and around Melton envisaged by the draft Local Plan can be considered remotely sustainable.</li> <li>• it has been pointed out time and time again by local residents that to have a bypass that stops at Melton Spinney Road is a "road to nowhere". When will MBC start to listen to the residents? Why does MBC insist</li> </ul>			
--	---	--	--	--

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

		that the final section from Melton Spinney Road to the A607 Grantham Road is not needed when it is obvious that: (a) Melton Spinney Road will not be able to cope with HGVs at its junction with the A607; (b) no sensible driver will use the bypass if it means joining a long queue of Twinlakes Park traffic to get out on to the A607 Grantham Road; (c) it doesn't matter if you turn left or right out of Melton Spinney Road on to the A607 Grantham Road at the bottom of Thorpe Arnold Hill as in both directions the road narrows and is hazardous to negotiate particularly with HGVs; (d) on a significant number of occasions each year when the A1 is closed or partially closed between Grantham and Stamford, traffic is diverted through Melton specifically using the A607 Grantham Road.			
Colin Love	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HBR-V</b>	See below	Unsure of the intended housing details - I would like to see that the proposals include Local Authority housing to rent - including bungalows. I would like to see a reversal to the 40% so-called 'affordables'. The new development, its totality, should have sufficient 'green' planting - trees and hedges - to absorb the inevitable increase in vehicle pollution. This will require a full scientific investigation to achieve the objective. Great care should be taken to ensure that any industrial development is required to be in an attractive building style and materials (not the cheap fabrications) - with appropriate greenery. Industry can be made an attractive addition to the architectural scenery of the Borough - not blots on the landscape.	Affordable housing is proposed as part of the development. The tenure mix is to be agreed.  The provision of green infrastructure will be necessary to secure a 'sustainable' development.  No employment allocation is proposed in the MNSN.	
Anthony Edward Maher	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HUS-G</b>	I cannot support this as it stands as stated in Chapter 4 There is no bypass /relief road extending to A607 to link the two major routes in the North i.e. A606 and A607 also on ecology and landscape issues listed below. TRANSPORT: Linking the A606 to Salford and Melton Spinney Road only is NOT sustainable and as indicated in the recent Jacobs 'Cumulative Transport Impact Study' as to be detrimental to an already at capacity road network section. This Northern development should not go ahead without firm and funded plans to extend this to the A607 Grantham Road. Also recent reduction in bus services including the cancellation of the No. 18 services to Thorpe Park adds to the transport impact. Any link roads that can constitute a bypass should be built to that standard. ie able to accommodate HGVs and have suitable walkway and cycle route. ECOLOGY: The park contains approximately 30% of species on the 'At Risk' register of the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. It is essential that wildlife corridors and development impact are kept to a minimum. The NPPF States that 'the planning system should contribute and enhance the natural and local	An extension to the relief road to A607 (in the funding plan) as well as a sound plan for the relief of traffic in this area. Designated and specified protection for the country park and wildlife / biodiversity further flood protection for the area around Melton Spinney Road Protection for the landscape with well-designed developments. SS5 makes reference to mitigating the impact on the existing road network while the developments are being constructed. All the traffic reports conducted conclude that very little can be done to mitigate this so what is the statement referring to ?	The final route of the Relief Road has not yet been finalised. MBC are working with LCC Highway Authority regarding the potential impacts of the Northern Relief Road and mitigation measures.  The Council has commissioned a Bio-diversity and habitats survey in order to provide evidence of important habitats and species that should be protected. Because of the scale of the site, there is potential to retain important habitats and species within the development.  The landscape impacts have been assessed through the Council's Landscape sensitivity analysis. The Council consider that an effective design solution can be delivered that helps the proposal sit within its landscape context.  Flooding impacts have been assessed through the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and more detailed Flood Risk Assessments.	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

		environment.' LANDSCAPE: The NPPF states 'The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing local landscapes geological conservation interests and soils' The proposed development could have a huge impact on the country Park with Buildings built on some of the highest points in the area towering over the park. There would also be a loss of very high grade agricultural land off Melton Spinney Road. FLOODING: There are concerns about the impact of building off Spinney road as the area lower down i.e. Culvert that currently goes under Spinney road floods the road and adjacent gardens under prolonged periods of rain. The effect further downstream is flooding of Tesco's access road and car park and petrol station area which did happen as recently as 09.03.16 As part of the planning inspectors summary from the previous Core Strategy He was unable to support development in this area due to the impact on Landscape, Agricultural land and biodiversity.		The proposed development would not encroach on the Country Park.  The context for the Local Plan has changed since the previous Core strategy examination. The plan period has extended to 25 years (from 12/13) and there has been a substantial increase in the overall housing requirements necessitating a north and south urban extension. The Council consider that many of the Inspector's concerns could be overcome with effective master planning and a high quality design.	
Mick Jones	<b>ANON-BHRP-4H6N-C</b>	See comments on previous section.	Extend the link roads east and west, thin development on the north and south sectors.	Noted. The detailed route and alignment of the Relief Road will need to be agreed.	
Alison Thurley	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HGG-P</b>	Only support if there is a full outer relief bypass for Melton and traffic calming measures for residential areas.	None.	Noted. The proposed Relief Road is not a complete ring road, but seeks to alleviate traffic congestion at pinch-points in Melton Mowbray town centre.	
Burton & Dalby Parish Council	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HU6-K</b>	This part of the town has the advantage of good links to the wider transport network e.g. the A1, M1 and East Midlands Airport.	None.	Noted.	
Joanne Belcher	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HHM-W</b>	Valuable green belt land and wildlife areas will be destroyed. I do not believe the previous concerns from the last consultation and planning enquiry have been addressed.	Implementation of the comments from the last planning enquiry and consultations to protect valuable greenbelt land/ environmental areas. The development of an infrastructure including roads to cope with proposed developments prior to them happening.	The context for the Local Plan has changed since the previous Core strategy examination. The plan period has extended to 25 years (from 12/13) and there has been a substantial increase in the overall housing requirements necessitating a north and south urban extension. The Council consider that many of the Inspector's concerns could be overcome with effective master planning and a high quality design.	
John William Coleman	<b>ANON-BHRP-4H6C-1</b>	Same qualified support, with the same caveats, as for SS4 - maintenance of green separation zones and insistence on road links ONLY as part of a Melton relief road scheme.	None.	The link road seeks to be part of a wider relief road for Melton Mowbray.	
Melton North Landowner Consortium	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HGQ-Z</b>	Please see paragraphs 3.29 to 3.62 of the 'Representation on the Melton Emerging Options Draft Plan' (Melton North Landowner Consortium).	Please see paragraphs 3.63 and supporting bullet points of the 'Representation on the Melton Emerging Options Draft Plan' (Melton North Landowner Consortium Version).	Noted.	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

<p>Sport England</p>	<p><b>ANON-BHRP-4HGE-M</b></p>	<p>The strategy allocation does not appear to lead to the loss of any sports facilities therefore it is supported in this respect.</p> <p>However new housing will generate a need for indoor and outdoor sports facilities - how is this to be met/provided for? No ref. has been made to the BFS/PPS and the policy/master plan scope excludes provision of sport?</p> <p>A BFS and PPS are in place, yet there are no clear proposals for provision of sport and recreation in relation to the strategic allocation (off site or onsite)? Is the New Leisure and Sports Village (Leisure vision) supposed to meet the needs arising from this development for both indoor and outdoor sport? This is not clear? Is it in the right location?</p> <p>The LP chooses to adopt standards for playing field provision which is not supported by Sport England (clear site specific proposals being preferred and identified in policy, clearly linked to planned development proposals - in terms of its scale and location, and identified in the IDP or CIL charging schedule).</p> <p>If the PPS has identified deficiencies in pitches for example ... (which there appears to be for football according to par. 7.13) where are these deficiencies located and in what location are they to be met? Should sports pitches - and if so what type of pitch, how many etc. - be provided as part of the master plan exercise? It is not clear how the BFS or PPS have informed this policy/allocation and what is needed to be provided by this specific development and where?</p> <p>The IDP mentions some sports provision but it is not clearly linked to the allocations, there is no clear linkage with the BFS/PPS and those facilities are listed as 'desirable' (not essential) even though in principle there is an evidence base demonstrating their need to deliver the vision/strategic objectives for health improvements?</p> <p>Analyst notes: Tags: Comments: A clear link between the scale and location of the allocation and what indoor and outdoor sports facilities are required to meet the additional demand generated, as informed by the PPS and BFS. This needs to be cross ref. to the IDP and regarded as essential.</p>		<p>Policy SS5 seeks encourages the provision of a 'network of high quality functional green spaces' in accordance with policy EN7 which refers to the provision of different open space typologies. It is envisaged that the more detailed master planning work will help to provide greater detail and clarity on the type of play and open space facilities that will be provided.</p> <p>It is not envisaged that new 'built facilities' will be provided on site, but financial contributions will be required where necessary and reasonable.</p> <p>It is envisaged that the more detailed master planning work will help to provide greater detail and clarity on the type of play and open space facilities that will be provided with specific reference to the Melton North SN.</p>	<p>Amend policy SS5 to refer specifically to playing pitches and contributions to built leisure facilities.</p> <p>Amend IDP to refer specifically to playing pitch provision at Melton South SN.</p> <p>Amend justification to refer to Sport England Playing Pitch Strategy and Built Facilities Strategy.</p>
----------------------	--------------------------------	---	--	---	--

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

Martin Alderson	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HHU-5</b>	This development must not proceed until a proper ring road is up and running.		Delivery of the relief road in advance of the housing is not likely to be financially viable. Transport modelling will help to identify any necessary mitigation measures that will help to limit adverse transport impacts in advance of completion of the relief road. The agreed phasing of the relief road will be considered as part of an agreed master plan.	
Christopher John Noakes	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HBK-N</b>	As commented elsewhere, an increase in the overall provision of housing within the Plan period (at MM) would improve the achievement of sustainable objectives. Could this be achieved by 'pushing' the MORR northwards? No comments on the detailed provision of the Plan	Any potential to increase the overall number of new dwellings, without compromising the separation of MM from Thorpe Arnold. Para 2 of pre-amble: Is it not possible to achieve the full complement of 1700 homes in the Plan period? E.g. by sub-division of allocations to more developers. This might well secure a completion rate in excess of the 100/year identified in para 4.6.2.	Noted. The northern extent of the development will be informed by the final alignment of the Melton Northern Relief. 1,500 houses is a realistic number to be delivered during the plan period.	
The Freeby Estate & Various other Landowners	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HHC-K</b>	Support both North & South SUEs in order to secure a relief road which links north, south and west but with reduced housing over the term of the plan but total number of 30-40 years.	None.	The housing numbers are required to meet the Objectively Assessed Need.	
Eric Smethurst	<b>BHLF-BHRP-4H25-F</b>	I wish to register my comments regarding the proposed bypass termination point on Melton Spinney Road. In addition, I am re-iterating my objections regarding the now lapsed Taylor Wimpey Development off Melton Spinney Road, for which I have added photographs demonstrating the flooding potential of the site together with my earlier letter of objection to Application 14/008808/OUT which still applies. Bypass termination Point at Melton Spinney Road. I find it incomprehensible that a major bypass route could be proposed that terminates at a junction with Melton Spinney Road, (MSR) an unclassified road. Whilst heartily supporting the need for a bypass, the logical termination point surely would be on the A607 beyond the village of Thorpe Arnold. The current junction of MSR and the A607 can barely handle traffic with additional traffic coming at peak times from the Twin Lakes Play Park. To take traffic from a bypass, add it to Twin Lakes Traffic together with potential housing development traffic and then route it up Thorpe Hill and through the village with an intervening crossroads invites congestion and hazard and beggars belief. A further issue would be for traffic leaving the proposed bypass to transit to the A606 via Scalford, another local bottleneck. Conclusion. As it is understood that developers have offered to support a bypass start up road to the south of the town, the logical process would appear to me to be for	None	Transport impacts and implications are being carefully through the Leicester and Leicestershire Transport models.  The final route of the Relief Road has not yet been finalised. MBC are working with LCC Highway Authority regarding the potential impacts of the Northern Relief Road and mitigation measures.	

	<p>development to the south and west of the town to be the start point of meeting the Local Plan; completion of the northern development area with a bypass terminating on the A607 when funds become available. Re: PLANNING APPLICATION 14/008808/8OUT Taylor Wimpey development on Melton Spinney Road. OBJECTION To whom it may concern. Eric and Louise Smethurst wish to register their objection to the above planning application proceeding for the key reasons that are explained in the following text; KEY ISSUES 1. Quality of the farmland on which the development would be sited. 2. A range of traffic issues relating to a B class road with a junction to the A 607 3. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Planning Practice Guidance – conserving an area of high grade landscape sensitivity. 4. Flooding potential 5. Accessibility – referring to Core Strategy Evidence regarding housing being better sited south, east and west of the town centre. 6. School catchment area oversubscribed. BACKGROUND REASONS Farmland. It is understood that survey evidence states that the land is made up of Grade 3a quality land(60%) and most likely 40% Grade b. Para 112 of the NPPF clearly states that Grade 3a land should be safeguarded. We know from personal experience that the field is cropped every year and provides a good yield. Accordingly, it is our view that if for no other reason this land should be protected and retained for agricultural output only. Traffic. Apart from the application ignoring the density of traffic emanating from the Twin Lakes Leisure Park that causes peak time congestion, the B class Road servicing the site (Melton Spinney Road) is of insufficient width in places to allow for large vehicles to pass safely. Furthermore, at peak times, the access on to the A607 from Melton Spinney Road is regularly congested. The addition of a potential 400 additional cars using Melton Spinney Road at peak times can only add to the existing congestion in the absence of any relief infrastructure. Transport. The current hourly bus servicing the Thorpe Park Area is hardly going to satisfy the needs of a further two hundred homes or reduce the use of the motor car. Other Users In addition, the lack of a footpath from the northerly access to Carnegie Crescent up to the Twin Lakes site, it is self-evident that, together with pedestrians (workers at Twin lakes) horse riders and cyclists using this route, present a significant safety issue National Planning Policy Framework(NPPF) As Melton Mowbray is approached from the north on the A607, the first boundary to the town is Thorpe Arnold Village and in</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

		<p>sight, the outer edge of the LE13 developed postcode area and, agricultural land preserving the appearance and first impressions of Melton Mowbray as that of a rural market town historically based upon agriculture. The addition of the current proposal as phase one of a larger development can only detract from the character of the town boundaries. Flooding. The southern boundary of the proposed development is a ditch and hedge owned by the homes on Carnegie Crescent, Hunt Drive and Hilary Close. As planned, the proposed development does not allow access to the rear of the properties on the roads referred to which is necessary to be able to care for the hedge and the ditch. An access corridor of some 4 meters from the outer edge of the ditch to the start of the development was suggested to but ignored by the Developer. Following heavy rainfall, over the years, it has been noted that from time to time a natural stream occurs from the northerly corner of the field (from beyond the northerly edge of the proposed development) down to the southerly edge which leads to road flooding – the developer has taken no account of this natural phenomenon. The proposal to plant trees into the boundary between the existing properties and the new development offers no realistic solution to the need for an access corridor. Accessibility. The access to the development being the B class Melton Spinney Road – traffic will, in attempts to avoid the town centre congestion use the route via Scalford; Thorpe Road already backing up past the Tesco entry road at peak time. The main business developments around Melton Mowbray are sited away from the North of the town and as such, to site more and more housing to the north only adds to the congestion through the town (until a relief road is built). Schools. Given the likelihood of 200 new families having children, their needs for schooling must be met. At present, the catchment schools and the Ferneley Academy are already oversubscribed. Children being taken to other nearby schools will, inevitably add to traffic congestion, accessibility and transport issues. Finally, we understand this application to be in contravention of the Melton Local plan saved policy OS2 Accordingly, Eric F. Smethurst and Louise R.L.M. Smethurst wish to register their objection to the proposed development to the north of Carnegie Crescent proceeding.</p>			
Keith Allen	<b>BHLF-BHRP-4HDX-4</b>	The Country Park Appears though it is surrounded by housing and should have part to the North be adjacent to open Country. This would allow for the possibility for future expansion In the Planning Inspectors report	None.	The emerging Local Plan is considering growth up to 2036. Any further expansion would need to be considered through an updated plan or submitted application where opportunities	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

		about the previous Core Strategy he was against That part of the North having the best visual approach to the town. The area shown in Purple for housing, is very significant relative to the size of the town .However the Town Centre cannot be increase significantly The increase in population would perhaps make the town bus route more viable, Melton Spinneys Road and Thorpe Road would have much increased traffic. Better a link to a by-pass to the East Going south and then linking up with the two industrial estates and housing to the south		would exist for comments to be made.  The context for the Local Plan has changed since the previous Core strategy examination. The plan period has extended to 25 years (from 12/13) and there has been a substantial increase in the overall housing requirements necessitating a north and south urban extension. The Council consider that many of the Inspector’s concerns could be overcome with effective master planning and a high quality design.	
George Simpson	<b>BHLF-BHRP-4HDF-J</b>	I also think the north and south roads should be links up so there are plans for a full ring road.		Noted. The proposed Relief Road is not a complete ring road, but does seek to alleviate traffic congestion at pinch-points in Melton Mowbray town centre.	
Soni Simpson	<b>BHLF-BHRP-4HD1-W</b>	I also think the north and south roads should be links up so there are plans for a full ring road.		Noted. The proposed Relief Road is not a complete ring road, but does seek to alleviate traffic congestion at pinch-points in Melton Mowbray town centre.	
Gary Reek	<b>BHLF-BHRP-4HQ7-G</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 site of the proposed development off Spinney Road rises up by 40' to the northern edge of the site.)</li> <li>• The NPPF makes reference to landscape in paragraph 109: "The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils" • Land to the north of Melton has the highest quality landscape surrounding the town and any development would have a negative impact on all aspects the NPPF looks to protect.</li> <li>• The grading of the agricultural land off Melton Spinney Road is detailed in the ADAS report as mixed grade (approximately 60% 3a and 40% 3b - with 3a being the higher grade.) • In his letter to Melton Borough Council about the Core Strategy (11 April 2013), the Planning Inspector, Mr Harold Stephens considered factors relating to landscape, agricultural land and biodiversity and concluded, ‘the plan is not consistent with national policy in that it does not enable delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF.’ Flooding</li> </ul>		<p>Policy SS5 requires a protection zone between Melton Country Park and any future development. It also requires the provision of new wildlife corridors specifically at Melton Country Park. The proposed development would not encroach on the current Country Park.</p> <p>The landscape impacts have been assessed through the Council’s Landscape sensitivity analysis.</p> <p>The policy seeks to protect areas that contain important bio-diversity.</p> <p>The area benefits from transport choice with the town centre being accessible by walking, cycling and public transport.</p> <p>The Council’s Flood Risk Assessment identifies the areas at risk of flooding. The proposed site is of sufficient size to accommodate the level of growth outside of flood zone 3.</p> <p>The context for the Local Plan has changed since the previous Core strategy examination. The plan period has extended to 25 years (from 12/13) and there has been a substantial increase in the overall housing requirements necessitating a north and south urban extension. The Council consider that many of</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local residents are concerned about the increased risk of flooding that may arise as a result of any further building along Melton Spinney Road.</li> <li>• The Environment Agency web site indicates a high risk of flooding from surface water along Thorpe Brook, adjacent to Thorpe Road and Melton Spinney Road.</li> <li>• The proposed development site to the north of Thorpe Park slopes down to the south-eastern boundary of the field where it terminates in a dyke. Water in the dyke then passes through a culvert under Melton Spinney Road into Thorpe Brook. During periods of heavy rain, this culvert is unable to cope with the large volume of water resulting in flooding in the gardens in the adjacent houses and accumulation of water on Spinney Road.</li> <li>• Further housing development off Melton Spinney Road, without an effective plan to combat the increased likelihood of flooding will have a significant impact on the lives of not only Thorpe Park residents, but residents and businesses on Thorpe Road and beyond.</li> <li>• Melton Country Park and its surrounding area is a rich environment for wildlife and is of significant ecological value. A good number of Britain's most endangered species inhabit the area, both within the park boundaries and on surrounding land, and would be at threat from any proposed development. (19 of the 60 species that appear on the UK Biodiversity Action Plan Red List inhabit the area.)</li> <li>• The current draft Local Plan states: o "The Borough Council will seek to achieve net gains for nature. It will protect and enhance biodiversity, ecological networks and geological conservation interests throughout the Borough and beyond its boundaries by supporting proposals which: ♣ contribute to the provision of coherent wildlife networks ♣ promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats as listed in the UK and Leicestershire Local Biodiversity Action Plans" o "The Borough Council will support the need for the appropriate management and maintenance of existing and created habitats through the use of planning conditions, planning obligations and management agreement" (p113).</li> <li>• To maintain the current levels of biodiversity it is</li> </ul>		<p>the Inspector's concerns could be overcome with effective master planning and a high quality design. Policy EN1 encourages this approach. There is sufficient area to accommodate 1,500 houses whilst retaining important areas of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land and important habitats and species.</p>	
--	---	--	---	--

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

		<p>essential to retain significant and sustainable wildlife corridors to the north and east of the Country Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>			
Friends of Melton Country Park	<b>BHLF-BHRP-4H8X-R</b>	<p>We note the planned provision of a Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood and whilst we understand the need for 1500 new homes in the north, we have major concerns about the impact that some aspects of the plan will have on Melton Country Park. Transport A strategic link road connecting Nottingham Road A606 to Scalford Road forming part of the Melton Outer Relief Route as identified in SS5 and also in accordance with the recommendation of the Jacobs Melton Western Bypass Options Testing (April 2015) will have limited impact on Melton Country Park. The report indicates and supports a route from A606 Burton Road to Scalford Road clearly stating on page 60 that “no further extensions of bypass are needed on the contrary, using Wilton Road as the key north-south route through the town suggests that a further 50% in development over and above the 2550 presently tested” and further states with “localised improvements the modelling suggests an outer bypass likely to facilitate around 4000 dwellings.” Page 49 of the plan (Melton Local Plan) shows a proposed route extending from Scalford Road to Melton Spinney Road. This will be disastrous for Melton Country Park as it will cut off the park from the surrounding countryside, something the Planning Inspector identified when making his Core Strategy recommendations (April 2013), “The cutting off from the open countryside of the Country Park will also have an adverse effect upon biodiversity.” Accordingly, the Friends do not support proposals to include an outer bypass cutting across the north of the Melton Country Park following a similar route to the one included in the withdrawn Core Strategy. We are intrigued and concerned as to why this is still being considered, despite the evidence in the Planning Inspector’s comments and the Jacob’s Melton Western Bypass Options Testing document which clearly does not support it. We must add that to terminate the proposed outer bypass route on Melton Spinney Road is short sighted and that an outer relief road should terminate on the main Grantham Road if it is to have any positive impact for the town. Environment The Friends note and support the provision of new corridors and the creation of a</p>		<p>Transport impacts and implications are being carefully through the Leicester and Leicestershire Transport models.</p> <p>The final route of the Relief Road has not yet been finalised. MBC are working with LCC Highway Authority regarding the potential impacts of the Northern Relief Road and mitigation measures.</p> <p>The proposed development would not encroach on the Country Park. The landscape impacts have been assessed through the Council’s Landscape sensitivity analysis.</p> <p>The policy seeks to protect areas that contain important bio-diversity.</p> <p>There is sufficient area to accommodate 1,500 houses whilst providing a buffer to the Country park and protecting important habitats and species.</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

		<p>coherent network of biodiversity and green infrastructure specifically Melton Country Park, Scalford Brook and Welby Brook and the disused railway line. However as Melton Country Park is destined to become a cycle and walking route we strongly recommend that access points from housing developments are kept to a minimum and are included and identified in the MNS master plan after careful consideration of the impact on the biodiversity and geodiversity of Melton Country Park. The Friends do not support a number of ad hoc access points proposed by developers which ultimately will have an extreme negative impact on the park's ecosystem. The Friends support the proposal to include a protection zone between Melton Country Park and any further development but note this is not specifically referenced in Policy EN2 which we would have thought should be the case. The Friends are aware of the need to build homes but note that the land available is considerably more than is required and believe that there is sufficient capacity to include a substantial protection zone around the park. We recommend that a minimum distance would be 500m, which should be clearly included in the MNS master plan and be mandated by MBC for any planning application abutting Melton Country Park. In 2012 the Bingham to Melton Wildlife Corridor project promoted wildlife friendly management of land along a 2 km wide corridor either side of the line of the disused railway from Bingham to Melton which was supported by MBC. Melton Country Park is currently surrounded on the north and east by open countryside which provides enhancements to biodiversity and geodiversity. We include several photographs of wildlife tracks/pathways through the hedge along the eastern boundary illustrating the supportive role of the open countryside. Although the field is agricultural land there is a significant biodiversity strip around this field which is adjacent to Melton Spinney Road. The inclusion of a significant protection zone of 500m around to the north and east of the park will mitigate any harm to Melton Country Park and add further protection to known Schedule 1 species.</p>			
Home Builders Federation	<b>BHLF-BHRP-4H8N-E</b>	<p>It is noted that in Policies SS4, SS5 and C1 the Council refers to policy requirements on energy efficiency and carbon emissions standards exceeding existing Building Regulation requirements. It is accepted that the Council can specify the proportion of energy generated from on-site renewables and / or low carbon energy sources but the Council cannot set a local standard for energy efficiency above the current</p>	None.	<p>Noted. The wording should be amended to reflect the Deregulation Act which allows Local Councils to include policies imposing reasonable requirements for—</p> <p>(a) a proportion of energy used in development in their area to be energy from renewable</p>	<p>Amend the policy wording to 'encourage' developers who wish to exceed current building regulations and energy efficiency standards and for new houses to have x% of their energy from renewable sources and energy efficiency standards that exceed the energy requirements of</p>

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

		<p>2013 Building Regulations standard. The Deregulation Act 2015 specifies that no additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings should be set in Local Plans other than the nationally described space standard, an optional requirement for water usage and optional requirements for adaptable / accessible dwellings. The Deregulations Act removed the power of authorities to require residential developments to exceed the energy performance requirements of Building Regulations therefore the Council should not be setting any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the performance of new dwellings. It is recommended that these policy requirements are deleted from the pre submission Plan. Moreover the Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) dated 25th March 2015 confirmed that “the optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the NPPG”.</p>		<p>sources in the locality of the development;</p> <p>(c) development in their area to comply with energy efficiency standards that exceed the energy requirements of building regulations.</p> <p>If the ‘Zero carbon’ amendments are introduced in advance of production of the publication plan, an energy efficiency policy will not be required.</p>	<p>building regulations.</p>
Jelson Homes	<b>BHLF-BHRP-4H8Z-T</b>	<p>We would encourage the Council to extend the proposed “North Sustainable Neighbourhood” (NSN) and allocate a greater number of dwellings in this location</p>	<p>Draft Policy SS5 seeks to deliver 1,500 homes as well as employment, community facilities, a link road and other transport improvements in an extension to the north of Melton. As discussed above, we would encourage the Council to extend the proposed NSN and allocate a greater number of dwellings in this location. Land immediately to the east of the proposed NSN (to the east of Melton Spinney Road) is available, suitable for development and deliverable. The land extends to approximately 12 hectares (see enclosed Land Registry Plan). The site could accommodate approximately 360 dwellings based on a density of 30 dwellings per hectare. It would appear logical to include this land, along with a wider land parcel to the east between Melton Spinney Road and the A607, in the NSN. This would provide an opportunity to extend the link road to meet the A607. It would also allow for an increase in housing numbers which would provide the Plan with greater flexibility.</p>	<p>1,500 houses is a realistic number to be delivered during the plan period.</p>	
Historic England	<b>BHLF-BHRP-4H8Q-H</b>	<p>The omission of any housing allocation to the west, between Top Road, Nottingham Road and St Bartholomew's Way is welcomed in order to prevent impact on the Grade II* listed Church of St Bartholomew and Synsonby Grange Scheduled Monument. The omission of allocation to the north-east including land around the Scheduled Moated Grange at Spinney Farm is also welcomed. Limiting development to the Melton side of the proposed new</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>The impacts of the MNSN on Heritage Assets have been carefully assessed and MBC continue to work with historic England in order to address any concerns. The options for a Melton Relief Road currently favour an eastern route reducing impacts on Welby church.</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

		<p>bypass appears sound in order to protect these designated heritage assets. Harmful development within the setting of either Scheduled Monument should be avoided. A review of available documentary and cartographic sources for the historic core land holdings associated with the two monastic granges may provide useful information to inform the line of development. The Sustainability Appraisal appears to relate to an earlier draft allocation. It is noted that the Welby site allocation map (also shown on the Melton Mowbray North allocation map within the Policies Maps Appendix) shows an area of orange proposed development adjacent to Sysonby Grange Scheduled Monument, without a reference number. If this site is to be proposed, Historic England would object in principle due to the impact upon the historic landscape setting of Sysonby Grange and on any further archaeological remains beneath the site itself and surrounding area. Please see Tim Allen's letter of 23 October 2015 in relation to application 15/00593/OUT and the extent of development which may be acceptable.</p>			
<p>Melton North Action Group (Debbie Adams)</p>	<p><b>BHLF-BHRP-4H8T-M</b></p>	<p>The Melton Local Plan Emerging Options (Draft Plan) states in point 4.3.1 that development in Melton Mowbray will be focussed in two new large scale 'sustainable neighbourhoods', one in the north and one in the south of the town. This was discussed as part of an exercise to find potential development sites across the Borough in one of the Reference Group sessions. There was some agreement that large-scale development was the solution to the housing requirement for Melton Mowbray but it was also agreed that for this to happen "transport infrastructure needs to be in place" (page 26 of Draft Local Plan). The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that "Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised." (point 34 of NPPF). MNAG believes that the North Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood (NMSN) is unsustainable as the main employment areas in Melton Mowbray are in the west and south west of the town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no direct bus links to the employment areas from the north of the town, and although there is a limited bus service along parts of Scalford Road and Nottingham Road, these do not continue into the evenings.</li> </ul>		<p>Melton Mowbray is the most sustainable location in the Borough to accommodate growth. It has the greatest range of access to jobs, services and facilities and transport choice. The Melton North SN has a range of transport choice to access these services.</p> <p>A new school and local centre are proposed within the SN to maximise trips by walking and cycling.</p> <p>Transport impacts and implications are being carefully through the Leicester and Leicestershire Transport models.</p> <p>The Council recognise that any development as part of the MNSN would require substantial additional infrastructure. This is set out in the policy and the accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>The Council are pursuing CIL.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge that previous transport reports have indicated alternative options for growth and potential transport solutions. The Council will require sufficient evidence to demonstrate that it has assessed the preferred options in order to have the plan</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leicestershire County Council (LCC) withdrew its funding for the Centrebus Service no.18 in February 2016. There is now no town bus service for residents living in the Thorpe Road and Melton Spinney Road area.</li> <li>• The arterial roads into Melton Mowbray from the north of the town are narrow and congested. There is no room for a dedicated cycle way on any of the roads.</li> <li>• The only safe area to cycle from the north of the town into the town centre is through the Country Park, but there is no lighting provided in the Country Park which severely impacts on the use of the Country Park as a cycle way after dark.</li> <li>• The individual developments which would make up the NMSN would all be more than one mile from the centre of town where the doctor's surgery, dentists, leisure facilities and the town shopping area are located. Walking therefore would not be considered a favourable option. The NPPF states in point 32 that "Plans and decisions should take account of whether:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;</li> <li>• safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people</li> <li>• improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe." MNAG believes that the NMSN has only one opportunity for sustainable transport modes and that is to make use of the Country Park as a cycle and/or pedestrian route to the town centre.</li> <li>• However the Country Park has areas of habitat which are of a highly sensitive nature and encroachment of those areas (which are predominantly in the northern area of the Country Park) would adversely affect the flora and fauna of those areas.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p>found 'sound' at examination.</p> <p>The final route of the Relief Road has not yet been finalised. MBC are working with LCC Highway Authority regarding the potential impacts of the Northern Relief Road and mitigation measures.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to the NMSN off the Scalford Road would be in an area very close to John Ferneley School. There are already problems in that area due to the narrowness of the road and the inability of the existing footpaths to cope with upwards of 1,000 school children at the start and end of school time. There have been several accidents on the road involving school children, and to exacerbate the situation by introducing many more vehicles onto the Scalford Road would make it unsafe, unsuitable, dangerous and undesirable.</li> <li>• On Melton Spinney Road the site access would be very close to the Twinlakes Park entrance. During school holidays, several thousand people visit the Park each day and the vast majority of visitors arrive by car. This causes daily road congestion both going into the Park from 10.00 a.m. and coming out of it from 4.00 p.m. to 7.00p.m.</li> <li>• The distance from the Melton Spinney Road site entrance to the town centre would be at least 1.5 miles so not a reasonable walking distance. Much of the walk would be along a road where cars are parked half on the pavement, half on the road, leaving insufficient pavement width for buggies, trolleys or wheelchairs.</li> <li>• Neither Melton Spinney Road nor A607 Thorpe Road has any space for cyclists (in several places there is not room for two coaches or HGVs to pass each other). The only reasonable mode of transport therefore would be the car. Several hundred cars converging on Melton Spinney Road and the A607 Thorpe Road on top of the high number of vehicles already using the roads, would give unacceptable levels of congestion in and around those roads. The other 'opportunity' for sustainable travel (public transport) was taken away from the Melton Spinney Road/A607 Thorpe Road area due to cutbacks in funding the service by LCC in February of this year. Taking the above into account, MNAG believes that the residual cumulative impacts of the development of the NMSN would be so severe as to make it unsustainable, and that the only sensible option would be to reject the Plan in its current state. Since the demise of the Core Strategy in 2013, Melton Borough Council (MBC) and LCC have commissioned Jacobs U.K. Limited to prepare a Melton Mowbray Cumulative Development Transport Impact Study looking at options to alleviate the growing congestion problems</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>in Melton Mowbray. The findings of the study recommended an "Outer Bypass" running from Scalford Road in the north, across to the A606 Nottingham Road, the A6006 Asfordby Road, the A607 Leicester Road, the B6047 Dalby Road and finally linking with the A606 Oakham Road. The costs of such a bypass were estimated to be in excess of £50 million (Jacobs' report of 29.4.2015, page 10). According to Jacobs this would mean that the cost of the outer bypass per dwelling, based on 2,550 dwellings, would be £18,500. MNAG believes that this should come out of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which would then enable the 6,000+ homes in the Town and Borough to contribute to the Melton Outer Bypass. It is evident that this will have a detrimental impact on the contributions from developers to other forms of infrastructure and the percentage of affordable homes they will be prepared to build. It says in the draft Emerging Options Local Plan on page 147 point 8.1.4 that: "It should be remembered that new development cannot be used to fund an existing lack of infrastructure or address current shortfalls in provision but is solely required to address its own needs." MNAG are concerned that if this is the case, then developers will only be obliged to build an estate link road for their particular development. An estate link road will not be of sufficiently high standard to become part of an Outer Bypass which would be expected to accommodate HGVs and be an attractive alternative to the current route through the Town Centre. In a report of the House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee session to review the operation of the NPPF published on 16th December 2014, it was reported that "In our view, development can only be sustainable if it is accompanied by the infrastructure necessary to support it." Also "It is important that infrastructure provision takes place at the same time as housing development, or the development will be unsustainable." MNAG is concerned that there is no commitment in the draft Emerging Options Local Plan to force developers to agree to the development of the Melton bypass at the same time as housing development. Therefore the proposed NMSN is unsustainable. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which was brought into force in 2010 enables councils to charge developers of new development in their areas and use the proceeds to fund infrastructure. Under regulations made in 2013, parish and town councils receiving new development are allocated a proportion (15% or, if a neighbourhood</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>plan is in place, 25%) of the CIL collected in their area. (An extract from a report of the House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee session published on 16th December 2014). MNAG is concerned that: (a) whilst a number of villages in the Borough have been putting together their own neighbourhood plans, no attempt was made to create a neighbourhood plan for Melton Mowbray; (b) a CIL has not been put in place to-date, and apparently will not appear until the final draft version of the Local Plan; (c) projected costs of the various infrastructure requirements for the Town and Borough have not appeared in this latest draft of the Local Plan. Without these projected costs it is difficult to comprehend how MBC can hope to secure the correct level of funding to deliver the necessary infrastructure. Anomalies and contradictory/confusing terminology/data There is a lack of consistency in the draft Emerging Options Local Plan with regards to the NMSN. For example on pages 47 and 50 of the draft, there is mention of the "link road" from Scalford Road to Nottingham Road, whereas on page 49 there is a picture of the proposed "link road" going across the north of Melton to Melton Spinney Road. The Jacobs report of 29.4.2015 on the "Melton Western Bypass Options Testing" did not deal with a link from Scalford Road to Melton Spinney Road. In fact the Jacobs report was based on a different plan of residential development for Melton Mowbray. The Jacobs reports of 13.10.2014 and 29.4.2015 plus the Melton Mowbray Transport and New Development Position Statement issued by MBC and LCC in February 2015 all worked on the basis of there being a development of 150 dwellings off Melton Spinney Road (not the 200 in the Draft Local Plan with a further possible 400 after 2036); 950 between Nottingham Road and Scalford Road (no mention at all of the several hundred homes between Scalford Road and the north of the Country Park which appear in the Draft Local Plan, plus the two Persimmon developments). In the south of Melton the reports were based on 800 dwellings west of the Oakham Road and 650 dwellings off the Leicester Road. All three reports were therefore based on there being a total of 2,550 new dwellings in Melton Mowbray as opposed to the 4,000 proposed in the Draft Local Plan. All three reports are therefore of no use as supporting documentation for the Draft Local Plan as they are based on incorrect and out-of-date data. However MNAG consider it is worth pointing out that even though Jacobs were working on the assumption of 2,550 dwellings as opposed to the now</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>proposed 4,000 dwellings for Melton Mowbray, Jacobs still concluded that: "...any development coming forward in the town - irrespective of size - requires a detailed transport assessment undertaken to ensure that suitable mitigation is proposed." Jacobs go on to say: "Given the limited spare capacity, and amount of development proposed, this mitigation needs to be of demonstrably sufficient magnitude to not only mitigate the impacts of the development itself, but also contribute to a wider benefit for residents and as part of the overall growth strategy for the town. If this is not achieved, then the evidence within this document shows that the development cannot be considered sustainable." There is a lack of consistency in the draft Emerging Options Local Plan with regards to the Melton Bypass. It has been referred to as a "bypass" (page 19), a "Melton Outer Western Relief Route" (page 51), a "Melton Outer Relief Road" (page 149), a "Melton Outer Relief Route - a series of the strategic road links which connect the A606 (Burton Road) to the A607 Nottingham Road" (page 150), the "North Melton Strategic Road Link -a strategic connection between the A607 (Nottingham Road), Scalford Road and Melton Spinney Road" (page 150), a "strategic road link connecting Scalford Road to A606 Nottingham Road" (page 50), and a "new link road connecting the Scalford Road with Nottingham Road ..... as part of the wider Melton Outer Relief Route". MNAG is concerned that with such inconsistency, how can residents take MBC seriously when the council talks of providing a bypass for Melton. The variation in names does indicate a variation in the standards required for the road. A "link road" does not have the same high standard requirement that a "bypass" does. There are a number of questions to be asked:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First and foremost, exactly what sort of road is MBC aiming for across the north and south of the town? It must surely be of a bypass standard, to take HGVs, and have separate cycle and pedestrian paths, anything short of that standard will not do the job of diverting traffic away from the town centre or mitigate against the effects of the development;</li> <li>• There is an assumption that all developers will contribute to or build their portion of the bypass. What happens if a developer refuses to comply? Will they be refused planning permission, and what happens to their 'stretch' of the road as a result?</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What procedures will be put in place so as to ensure that the bypass will be complete with an east or west connection linking the north and south routes before 2036? In the absence of any development in either the east or the west one assumes there will be no developer contribution for this connecting stretch of road. Without the certainty of an (albeit delayed) bypass it is difficult to comprehend how the proposed developments in and around Melton envisaged by the draft Local Plan can be considered remotely sustainable.</li> <li>• it has been pointed out time and time again by local residents that to have a bypass that stops at Melton Spinney Road is a "road to nowhere". When will MBC start to listen to the residents? Why does MBC insist that the final section from Melton Spinney Road to the A607 Grantham Road is not needed when it is obvious that: (a) Melton Spinney Road will not be able to cope with HGVs at its junction with the A607; (b) no sensible driver will use the bypass if it means joining a long queue of Twinlakes Park traffic to get out on to the A607 Grantham Road; (c) it doesn't matter if you turn left or right out of Melton Spinney Road on to the A607 Grantham Road at the bottom of Thorpe Arnold Hill as in both directions the road narrows and is hazardous to negotiate particularly with HGVs; (d) on a significant number of occasions each year when the A1 is closed or partially closed between Grantham and Stamford, traffic is diverted through Melton specifically using the A607 Grantham Road. Finally, it can be assumed that one of the reasons behind the decision to develop a Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy is that the Strategy "would best ensure the necessary coordination of potential future transport investments in the town. It would also provide a robust basis to underpin bids to secure funding from public and private sources." (minutes of LCC Cabinet meeting on 11.09.2015) The Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy was discussed at a special meeting of the Full MBC Council on 24th September 2015. The Strategy was deemed necessary as evidence of the need for an "Outer Relief Road" for Melton Mowbray. "The cost of a Transport Strategy that would include a definitive corridor for an 'outer' route is currently estimated in the region of £1.5m." (report to Special Meeting of Full MBC Council on 24th September 2015 para. 3.10). LCC, who would undertake the Study, agreed at an LCC Cabinet meeting on 11th September 2015 to commit £0.5m to the exercise, and on 24th September MBC committed £0.4m. There was still a</li> </ul>			
--	---	--	--	--

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

		<p>shortfall of £0.6m which has not been forthcoming/funded. The estimated cost comprised £1m in connection with the development of a preferred corridor for an "Outer Relief Road", and £0.5m for developing a full Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy (para. 3.10 ibid). MNAG have been informed that LCC were willing to progress on the "former element" (the development of the preferred corridor) despite the shortfall of funding. In an email from the Head of Regulatory Services to the Secretary of MNAG, Mr Worley said that "The focus of this work is to determine the most advantageous route for the bypass including whether the link between the northern and southern stretches indicated in the draft Emerging Options Local Plan would be most feasibly and effectively joined either to the east or to the west of Melton Mowbray." He said that the work was underway and MBC expected to be in receipt shortly. MNAG would like to know whether MBC agree with the comments of the LCC Cabinet in connection with the Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy. LCC as quoted above stated that the full Strategy, inter alia, provides a robust basis to underpin bids to secure funding from public and private sources. Presumably the absence of a full Strategy reduces the prospects of securing such funding and eliminates the prospect of a bypass. As a result any future large-scale development in Melton Mowbray would be considered by the NPPF as unsustainable.</p>			
<p>Savills (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)</p>	<p><b>BHLF-BHRP-4H8U-N</b></p>	<p>The representations relate to the proposed North Sustainable Neighbourhood to the north of Melton Mowbray as set out in Policy SS5 and also the Policies Map which relates to Melton Mowbray North. The representations support the principle of major residential development (1,700 dwellings) to the north of the town in conjunction with a new link road. Taylor Wimpey is very supportive of future residential development in this location as evidenced by the current outline planning application west of Melton Spinney Road for 200 dwellings (Application Reference 14/00808) which is currently being considered by the Borough Council. The land to the north of the town is well related to existing development and is already identified in Paragraph 4.5.2 as a future location for longer term growth beyond the plan period (200 dwellings). Taylor Wimpey is working with the Borough Council and other with land interests to ensure that the proposals are deliverable in a comprehensive and phased way, but also seeking to ensure that the proposals are financially viable This area has the capacity to accommodate a greater level</p>	<p>It is recommended that 'Policy SS5 be amended to state that the overall allocation has capacity for 2,000 dwellings of which 1,500 dwellings are proposed within the plan period.' It is also recommended that the 'Policies Map should be amended as shown on the attached plan to allow the provision of the link road on a more northerly route to allow a northward extension of the allocation, but maintain a defensible boundary in the long term.' The proposed amendment to Policy SS5 and the Policies Map would increase the likelihood of the Local Plan securing a significant contribution to the delivery of an outer relief road to relieve traffic congestion in the town centre as set out in Paragraph 5.4.11 of the document. Taylor Wimpey is also supportive of the need to ensure that affordable housing is provided as part of the housing mix in the area subject to Policy SS5. The precise proportion of affordable housing will need to ensure that the proposed allocation remains financially viable mindful of the significant infrastructure costs which will be associated with a development of this scale including the proposed northern link road and educational</p>	<p>1,500 houses is a realistic number to be delivered during the plan period.</p> <p>The final route of the Relief Road has not yet been finalised. MBC are working with LCC Highway Authority regarding the potential alignment.</p> <p>Viability assessments will be required in order to demonstrate deliverability. Including impacts of affordable housing and other infrastructure.</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

		of housing development beyond the plan period and could accommodate an additional 300 dwelling completions in that period, consistent with the assumed annual level of completions of 100 dwellings per annum as set out in Paragraph 4.6.2. This represents a potential total capacity of 2,000 dwellings, of which 1,500 could be completed within the plan period. This increase in capacity would increase the financial viability of the proposed North Sustainable Neighbourhood and increase the likelihood of significant planning benefits being secured in conjunction with a phased development of land to the north of Melton Mowbray. The increase in residential capacity of 300 dwellings could be facilitated by a northern extension of the proposed allocation in which the proposed link road could follow a more northerly route and continue to act as a long term defensible boundary to future development.	provision. The proposed amendments set out in this objection do not undermine the strategy set out in the Melton Local Plan – Emerging Options, nor do they undermine the assumptions about the proposed trajectory and assumed dwelling completions. The proposed amendments would result in a more robust and financially viable approach to the North Sustainable Neighbourhood and it would also provide more certainty about the future direction of growth beyond the plan period.		
Leicestershire County Council and Richborough Estates	<b>BHLF-BHRP-4H8K-B</b>	The developers support the principle of allocating the NSN for residential-led development, as defined on the supporting Policies Map. However, an overriding objective will be to ensure that the development of this area can be brought forward without any impediment to its viability. This requires sufficient flexibility to be inherent in the wording of Policy SS5 to ensure that supporting facilities of the development are delivered in accordance with market requirements. The individual components of Policy SS5 are considered overleaf. As set out in respect of our recommendations for Policy SS2, the developers’ site is able to deliver approximately 680 residential dwellings over the plan period, with the remaining area having capacity for an additional 1,520 dwellings at an approximately density of 30 dwellings per hectare. The latter includes land off Melton Spinney Road which is currently the subject of a planning application for 200 dwellings (LPA Ref: 14/00808/OUT) but excludes the consented Persimmon and Davidson Homes sites (comprising a combined total of 253 dwellings). The Illustrative Development Framework Plan (enclosed at Appendix II) demonstrates how an overall total of 2,200 dwellings could be accommodated within the NSN. This level of development could be accommodated without amending the allocation site boundary as currently identified on the Policies Map. A Land Use Budget to aid the interpretation of the plan is provided below: Land Use Component / Quantum Area Provided (Hectares) Residential (Class C3) 2,200 dwellings across the NSN 69.68 ha Extra Care Housing (Class C2) Extra Care housing to meet the needs of the ageing	In order to address the matters raised in paragraphs 3.29 to 3.64, the following amendments to Policy SS5 are proposed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Substitute at least 2,200 for 1,500 homes as referenced under the Housing sub-heading;</li> <li>• Revise the second bullet point under the Housing sub-heading to read: “A viable mix of homes to help meet identified needs in the Borough, in accordance with Policy C2”</li> <li>• Revise the third bullet point under the Housing sub-heading to read: “Extra care housing where viable and supported by an identified need within the Borough, in accordance with Policy C2”</li> <li>• Revise the bullet point under the Employment sub-heading to read: “An opportunity for small-scale employment uses within Class B1(a) where viable, to complement the delivery of employment generating development elsewhere within the Borough”</li> <li>• Revise the first bullet point under the Community Facilities sub-heading to read: “Either a new primary school on-site or improvements to off-site provision, to be secured through a financial contribution, in order to meet identified need. The mechanism for provision will be subject to agreement with the Council”</li> <li>• Revise the second bullet point under the Community Facilities sub-heading to read: “An accessible local centre that will incorporate a mix of uses, including</li> </ul>	1,500 houses is a realistic number to be delivered during the plan period.  The final route of the Relief Road has not yet been finalised. MBC are working with LCC Highway Authority regarding the potential alignment.  Viability assessments will be required in order to demonstrate deliverability. Including impacts of affordable housing and other infrastructure.  A new primary school is necessary to maximise sustainability credentials, otherwise the proposal would just be a ‘bolt-on’ housing estate with limited potential to minimise walking and cycling.  The proposed trajectory appears optimistic and further evidence of deliverability would be required. Cambridgeshire and Stratford are highly desirable areas and not good examples for comparison of delivery rates.  The mix of housing and other uses will require further discussions.	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

	<p>population 0.55 ha Link Road Link Road to link Nottingham Road with Melton Spinney Road (2 sections) 5.94 ha Local Centre Local Centre to include 200 sq. m gross Class A1 convenience store 0.21 ha Employment site to comprise of B1(a) office uses 1.88 ha Primary School New First School (if required on-site) 2 ha Gypsy &amp; Traveller Site 3 pitches 0.17 ha Parks &amp; Gardens 1.92 ha /1,000 population 9.72 ha Natural and Semi- Natural Open Space 1.38 ha / 1,000 population 6.98 ha Amenity Green Space 0.77 ha / 1,000 population 3.90 ha Provision for children and young people 0.13 ha / 1,000 population 0.66 ha Allotments 0.38 ha / 1,000 population 1.92 ha Playing pitches* 1 ha / 1,000 population 2.53 ha Football pitches 0.41 ha / 1,000 population 2.07 ha Total Site Area 108.21 ha The total area of the NSN as defined on the Policies Map is 114.45 ha. With the consented Persimmon Homes site deducted (6.21 ha), the total land-take required to deliver 2,200 homes, supporting facilities and open space, is within the residual area of 108.24 ha. The rationale for accommodating a greater proportion of the Borough’s housing requirement within the NSN is set out in respect of Policy SS2. To accommodate the proposed uplift in provision within the wording of Policy SS2, the total number of residential dwellings identified for delivery over the plan period should be increased from 1,500 to 2,200. Deliverability Notwithstanding the proposed uplift in housing provision, the delivery trajectory set out for the NSN in Table 5 of the Draft Plan is not considered to be robust. The rates identified within Table 5 equate to just 100 dwellings being delivered throughout the entire allocation area per annum. This would indicate just two outlets delivering approximately 50 dwellings each per annum. Given the extent of the identified allocation area, which includes access and frontage to three main thoroughfares into Melton Mowbray (Nottingham, Scalford and Melton Spinney Roads), it is considered realistic to assume that development would be delivered through at least four outlets, two of which can be expected on the developers’ site given its size and frontages along the Nottingham and Scalford Roads. Table 3.3 overleaf provides an indicative sales trajectory to demonstrate how four outlets would deliver 2,200 dwellings within the NSN. Table 3.3: Indicative Sales Trajectory – Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood Year Apr- Mar) Year Private Unit Sales Affordable Unit Sales Year Total Cumulative Total 2019-2020 1 50 30 80 80 2020-2021 2 75 45 120 200 2021-2022 3 75 45 120 320 2022-</p>	<p>retail (up to 200 m<sup>2</sup> gross floorspace) office based employment uses and other community facilities and services, where viable”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise the first bullet point under the Transport sub-heading to read: “A comprehensive and viable package of transport improvements informed by an appropriate transport assessment...”</li> <li>• Revise the seventh bullet point under the Environment sub-heading to read: “A development that accords with building regulations for energy efficiency and carbon emissions”</li> <li>• Revise the first and second paragraphs under the Master planning and delivery sub-heading to read: “A master plan, including a phasing and delivery plan, should be prepared and agreed in advance of, or as part of, the submission of a planning application for land within the Melton North Sustainable Neighbourhood (NSN). In order to achieve a comprehensive and integrated approach, indicative master plan details for land forming part of the NSN which is outside the red line boundary of an application should be provided to and agreed by the Council” It is submitted that the above amendments are necessary in order to ensure that Policy SS5 is sound and that development can be viably delivered for the NSN within the plan period.</li> </ul>		
--	---	---	--	--

	<p>2023 4 75 45 120 440 2023-2024 5 75 45 120 560                  2024-2025 6 88 52 140 700 2025-2026 7 88 52 140                  840 2026-2027 8 96 54 150 990 2027-2028 9 96 54                  150 1140 2028-2029 10 96 54 150 1290 2029-2030 11                  96 54 150 1440 2030-2031 12 88 52 140 1580 2031-                  2032 13 88 52 140 1720 2032-2033 14 75 45 120 1840                  2033-2034 15 75 45 120 1960 2034-2035 16 75 45 120                  2080 2035-2036 17 75 45 120 2200 Total 1386 814                  2200 The trajectory set out above demonstrates that                  the delivery of 2,200 dwellings over the plan period to                  2036 is easily achievable, averaging circa 82 private                  dwellings and circa 42 affordable dwellings per annum                  (the latter being subject to viability and built-out                  alongside open market units). The projected delivery                  rates identified in Table 3.3 are corroborated by                  evidence of housing delivery identified in other local                  authority areas. One such example is Stratford-upon-                  Avon District, whose planning evidence base is                  informed by a ‘Viability and Deliverability of Strategic                  Sites’ report which was prepared by Peter Brett                  Associates (PBA) in 2014. The PBA report assessed the                  deliverability of sites whose capacity ranged from 800                  to 2,500 dwellings. This work drew upon evidence of                  past delivery rates obtained for schemes across the                  country, a few of which are summarised in Table 3.4                  below: Table 3.4: Delivery Rates for Other Major                  Schemes Scheme Total Number of Dwellings Annual                  achieved delivery rate (completions) Loves Farm, St                  Neots 1,200 150 (8yrs) Broughton Gate, Milton Keynes                  1,500 214 (7yrs) Cranbrook, East Devon 2,900 500                  (u/c) Centenary Quay, Southampton 1,600 160 (10yrs)                  Hindmarch Crescent, Hedge End 1,014 60 (u/c)                  Camborne, South Cambridgeshire 3,000 110 (u/c)                  Source: Peter Brett Associates, April 2014 Whilst there                  is a variance in the delivery rates for different sites,                  this is attributed to the number of outlets present. For                  example, land at Cranbrook had five different outlets,                  whereas Hindmarch had just a single outlet. It is also                  pertinent to note the findings of PBA’s report in                  respect of improving market conditions which have                  translated into increased annual delivery rates. In                  particular, it was reported within the report (Appendix                  3, paragraph 3.8.4) that average completions of 40                  dwellings per annum were being achieved during                  2013/14 for house builders such as Barratt’s,                  Persimmon and Redrow, with an expectation that                  sales rates would continue to rise. Against this                  backdrop, the NSN would deliver 24 private sales per                  outlet during the peak years of 2026 to 2030. The                  identified delivery rates for proposed strategic sites in                  Stratford-upon-Avon identified by PBA are set out in</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Table 3.5 below. Table 3.5: Delivery Rates for Proposed Strategic Sites in Stratford-upon-Avon District Site Average Delivery Rate Per Annum Number of Outlets Gaydon/Lighthorne Heath 170 4 Long Marston Airfield 140 4 Lower Farm Stoneythorpe 100 2/3 Southam North 135 3/4 South East Stratford 170 4 Source: Peter Brett Associates, April 2014 When comparing the above evidence with the Sales Trajectory for the NSN, a peak of 150 dwellings per annum (with 82 private sales) is achievable with up to four outlets. Affordable Housing Whilst the requirement for affordable housing provision is acknowledged by the Developers, it is important that the wording of Policy SS5, in seeking a policy-compliant figure of 37% to be provided within the NSN, makes clear that its delivery will be subject to viability. This is further addressed in respect of Policy C4 (please see paragraphs 3.70 to 3.73). Housing Mix Similarly, a flexible approach to the range of tenures, types and sizes of dwellings to be provided within the NSN is required. In this regard, housing mix should be determined on a site-by-site basis having regard to identified needs and market deliverability. Extra Care Housing There is scope within the Developers’ site to accommodate an Extra Care facility and this is identified on the Development Framework Plan (see Appendix II). However, the requirement for such provision must be substantiated by evidence of need, together with sufficient operator demand. With this in mind, the provision of Extra Care accommodation should not be a mandatory requirement of development within the NSN area under Policy SS5. The stance of Policy SS5 on this point must therefore be ‘supportive’ as opposed to ‘prescriptive’. Gypsy and Traveller Provision There is scope within the NSN to accommodate 3 pitches to contribute towards meeting the identified needs of gypsies and travellers within the Borough. Any such requirement should be determined on the basis of a proven need and full consideration should be given to a range of sites to ensure such provision is appropriately located. This will need to be addressed through the planning process and should therefore be identified as a potential requirement within the wording of Policy SS5. Employment Provision The Development Framework Plan makes provision for some employment-use development which could be accommodated within the Developers’ site, subject to commercial demand. Notwithstanding this, such provision is not required in order to meet the overall employment land requirement identified for Melton</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Mowbray (31 ha) under Policy EC1. In view of the above, the provision of Class B1(a) office development within the NSN should be treated as an aspiration and not a mandatory requirement of development for the purposes of Policy SS5, given that such facilities would be delivered as a result of market demand.</p> <p>Community Facilities Education Policy SS5 as currently worded requires the provision of a new primary school, with a stipulated site area of 2.5 ha. It is unclear within the supporting evidence to the Draft Plan as to how the site area requirement for this facility has been identified. Moreover, paragraph 8.4.2 of the Draft Plan indicates uncertainty as to whether a new primary school would be required in the NSN; the deficit identified in primary school provision as a result of housing growth at Melton Mowbray could be addressed through just one additional school being provided in the Melton Mowbray South Sustainable Neighbourhood. In view of the above, it is important that the stance of Policy SS5 remains flexible insofar as the provision of primary education facilities within the NSN area. To achieve this, the policy should avoid specifying a site area for the primary school; this will ultimately be determined by up-to-date school-place capacity projections and agreed with Leicestershire County Council at planning application stage. It should also be borne in mind that an alternative solution could be to secure developer contributions towards new provision off-site e.g. within the South Sustainable Neighbourhood area. Sufficient flexibility as to how such provision could be delivered should therefore be incorporated within the wording of Policy SS5. For the purposes of demonstrating the capacity of the Developers’ site and indeed the wider NSN area to accommodate an uplift of 2,200 dwellings, the Wider Development Framework Plan (see Appendix II) makes provision for a new primary school on a 2 ha site. This is considered sufficient to provide a two-form school, subject to demand which would be agreed with the County Council at the appropriate time. Contributions towards improvements in secondary school provision within Melton Mowbray would also be subject to agreement with the County Council and determined on the basis of viability assessment. It is therefore important that the wording of Policy SS5 incorporates reference to viability in this regard. Local Centre The provision of a local centre is supported in principle by the Developers. However, it is important that Policy SS5 is flexible in terms of the ultimate mix of uses to be delivered as part of this element. Retail uses will be determined by operator demand and appropriate to</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>the role and function of a local centre in terms of size and format. The provision of retail facilities will be dependent upon market demand and it is therefore not possible to predetermine the exact mix of uses which could be brought forward. Regard should also be had to comments made in respect of Policy EC7 (see paragraph 3.80 TO 3.83). Transport Strategic Link Road The Developers support the principle of a link road which connects Nottingham Road and Scalford Road around the northern boundary of the NSN, subject to viability modelling. The link road could be delivered by the Developers via a s.278 agreement as part of the development of their site, or alternatively via a financial contribution, secured through a s.106 agreement, which would enable such works to be procured and undertaken by the Highway Authority. It is important that the extent of the link road identified in Policy SS5 is consistent with that shown on the supporting Policies Map. The 'Indicative New Link Road', as referenced on the Policies Map, is shown to connect Nottingham Road and Melton Spinney Road. The second section of the link road will fall outside of the Developers' site and its funding / delivery will therefore be dependent of the viability of development within the wider NSN. Other Transport Improvements Developer contributions to be sought in respect of improvements to the wider transport infrastructure, including the provision of a connecting route to the planned Melton Outer Western Relief Route, will be subject to viability, taking into account the phasing of development. It will also be necessary to ensure that contributions secured through a s.106 agreement accord with the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2011 (as amended), in particular Regulations 122 and 123 in the absence of a CIL Charging Schedule being in place. Environment Energy Efficiency and Carbon Emissions Whilst the Developers are supportive of measures to maximise energy efficiency and minimise carbon emissions, these will be applied in accordance with Building Regulations. Section 43 of the Deregulation Act 2015 amends the Planning and Energy Act 2008, through the insertion of Section 1A, to consolidate technical requirements into the Building Regulations. The effect of Section 1A means that it will be no longer possible for local authorities' development plans to require residential development to exceed the energy requirements set out by Building Regulations. This is expected to take effect once the necessary commencement order has been made (this being expected in late 2016). Policy SS5 should therefore be amended in this regard.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

		<p>Master planning and Delivery The approach set out within Policy SS5 in respect of master planning and delivery implies that a single [outline / hybrid] application will be progressed for the entire NSN. As part of this, the policy, as currently worded, would require a phasing and delivery plan to be submitted for the entire NSN and would preclude the granting of planning permission until a comprehensive master plan has been produced for the entire area, to the satisfaction of the Council. The effect of the above could restrict the ability for separate planning applications to be progressed for the Developers' site and wider NSN at different stages. As such, it may not be possible to predetermine the phasing of development for the entire NSN should an early application be made on the Developers' site. In view of the above, Policy SS5 should be flexibly worded to enable planning applications for the respective parcels of land within the NSN to be made at separate times. As such, it should be sufficient to demonstrate that development on one part of the NSN can be integrated with, and not preclude, development being brought forward on the other part. Thus, the submission of details pertaining to the master planning, phasing and delivery for land in the wider NSN which is not included as part of an application should be 'indicative' Notwithstanding this, it is recognised that a comprehensive approach will be required, through collaboration with the respective developers / land owners, to ensure all necessary components of the NSN are delivered within the plan period.</p>			
Burrough Court Estate Limited	<b>BHLF-BHRP-4HAX-1</b>	<p>These two policies allocate large scale strategic development (Sustainable Neighbourhoods), which include a high level of large infrastructure development for the Borough. 65% of all planned residential development, totalling 3,500 dwellings, during the plan period will be directed towards the 'Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area'. The principle of strategic growth in the Borough is supported, however this 'putting your eggs in one basket' approach is not supported as this will not deliver much needed homes in a timely fashion as directed by the NPPF. The Borough Council are already unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply, largely as a result of lack of strategic sites not delivering as anticipated, yet the Borough still wish to pursue this method of housing distribution. The trajectory for the delivery of the housing within these development sites are seriously questioned. An assumption has been made that each of the sites will deliver 100 dwellings per year, based</p>	<p>Development should be more evenly distributed through the Borough with a variety of settlements accommodating development to meet local housing needs and support the requirements of the Borough. Appropriate housing delivery can be achieved across all settlement categories including 'Rural Settlements' where development is suitable and appropriate, which should not be restricted to such small scale delivery e.g. 3 dwellings or less, when appropriate development, such as 10-15 units may be more appropriate in some settlements, whilst none is appropriate in others.</p>	<p>Disagree. The strategy seeks to locate growth in areas that are best served by services, facilities and employment and access to transport choice. Distributing development more widely has been assessed through a sustainability appraisal and is not considered the most appropriate response.</p> <p>Delivery of infrastructure will be assessed to ensure viability and deliverability.</p>	

	<p>on two developers operating concurrently on each site (50 dwellings each). However Policy SS4 requires delivery of 2,000 dwellings, some 20ha of employment land for a mix of use classes, as well as provision of a new primary school, local centre (including parade of shops, A2-A5 use classes, small scale employment opportunities, and non-retail and community facilities), as well as a strategic road link connecting the A606 to the A607 to form the outer western relief road to Melton Mowbray, a number of new and enhanced bus services as well as important environmental objectives. Policy SS5 is similar in its requirement to deliver 1,500 dwellings, employment land, community facilities, a strategic road link connecting the A606 to Nottingham Road form the outer western relief road to Melton Mowbray. Both allocations requires comprehensive master plans preparing, as part of the requisite planning applications; incorporating all development elements into the master plan i.e. employment, housing etc... It is likely that the preparation of such work is likely to take at least 12 months (including survey work), followed by the application itself, which, including the S106 legal agreement is likely to take a further 18 months. Upon receipt of outline planning permission, should it be granted, reserved matters applications will need to be prepared (a further 6-12 months) with determination a further 6 months minimum. This process therefore could take a minimum of 4 years (on each Sustainable Neighbourhood) before gaining detailed permission. That would lead to at least 2020/21, when the Council have assumed delivery of 400 dwellings across the two Neighbourhoods. Neither site will have delivered any units by this stage. As set out above, large infrastructure will need to be in place as part of the allocations, relief roads, primary schools etc. prior to residential development being delivered. Delivery of the required infrastructure takes a significant amount of time and money. It may even be that residential development is not delivered in the period 2021-2016 where the council assumes a further 1,000 units will be delivered. In their 1999 Local Plan, the Council allocated a 'New Village' (Policy NV1) to deliver approximately 1,200 new homes, employment land, retail, community facilities including a village hall, public open space, landscaping , highway infrastructure including the provision of the Melton Mowbray southern and western bypasses and links to it; the 'New Village' was never delivered. Unfortunately the Council have not learnt from the non-delivery of strategic sites, now seeking to allocate</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

		65% of its requirements across just two large scale strategic sites. The need for large scale infrastructure to facilitate the planned strategic growth will cause delays, whilst small/medium scale sites in other settlements, including 'Rural Settlements', could come forward and deliver appropriate development with minimal delay since the level of infrastructure required will be far less. The Council are currently unable to demonstrate a requisite five year supply of housing. By distributing residential development as proposed the delays of delivering the infrastructure required prior to delivering the much need new homes, will only seek to further exacerbate the housing delivery issue within the Borough.			
Brown & Co – Property & Business Consultants LLP (on behalf of the landowners – M Hill, P Hill, M Hyde & P Pickup)	<b>BHLF-BHRP-4HA9-2</b>	In view of the findings of the Inspector on the Core Strategy Examination, we are staggered to see that Melton North is being proposed as a development site. It has higher grade land than other locations, more impact on the landscape and environment and the location of the land in question is less accessible to services, facilities and the town centre than other sites proposed including our clients' site MBC/049/13 which should be added to the Melton South SUE. The strategic road link proposed offers very little by way of community benefit by comparison to other sites and in particular, the possibility, through the inclusion of our clients' site MBC/049/13, to producing the much needed link between the A606 Melton Mowbray to Oakham Road round to the B676 and then in time to the A607. That will produce a direct link from east to west and to link the major employment areas to the east and west of Melton Mowbray.	The deletion of the Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood proposed through Site SS5. There are more deliverable and sustainable locations and as we see it, there is very little chance that this scheme will be able to overcome earlier objections in planning terms and on those which were evidenced by the Public Inquiry held leading to the Core Strategy being withdrawn by Melton Borough Council.	The context for the Local Plan has changed since the previous Core strategy examination. The plan period has extended to 25 years (from 12/13) and there has been a substantial increase in the overall housing requirements necessitating a north and south urban extension. The Council consider that many of the Inspector's concerns could be overcome with effective master planning and a high quality design.	
Natural England	<b>BHLF-BHRP-4HA7-Z</b>	We welcome the commitment in paragraph 4.5.4 to significantly improve walking and cycling connectivity to the town centre. We welcome the proposal in paragraph 4.5.6 to incorporate new Green Infrastructure to create a neighbourhood that is attractive and walkable which enhances the setting of the Town and is respectful of its heritage and designed in a way that development is sensitive to the Melton Mowbray landscape. We welcome the commitment to a development master plan for this area. Policy SS5 – Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood We welcome the environmental elements of this policy, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection and enhancement of historic assets and their settings;</li> <li>• Protection and enhancement to the existing green infrastructure, local wildlife sites, wildlife corridors</li> </ul>	None.	Noted.	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

		<p>and, where appropriate, provide new corridors to create a coherent network of biodiversity and green infrastructure specifically Melton Country Park, Scalford Brook and Welby Brooke and the disused railway line;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish a protection zone between Melton Country Park and any future development;</li> <li>• Establish a protection zone between areas of high ecological importance identified around Scalford Brook in the biodiversity study and any future development;</li> <li>• Seek to retain and mitigate any potential harm to notable areas identified in the biodiversity study;</li> <li>• Provide a network of new high quality of multi-functional green spaces in accordance with the council’s open space standards set out in policy EN7;</li> <li>• A development that exceeds building regulations for energy efficiency and carbon emissions, where viable;</li> <li>• Buildings and spaces which are adaptable to future climatic conditions including extremes of temperature, drought and flooding;</li> <li>• Development that provides appropriate sustainable drainage systems and flood alleviation measures and where possible reduces flood risk in downstream areas fully integrated into the green infrastructure strategy; all in accordance with the Melton North Site Assessment in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</li> <li>• Protecting and enhancing water quality.</li> </ul>			
<p>Leicestershire County Council Highways Authority</p>	<p><b>BHLF-BHRP-4H7Q-G</b></p>	<p>- Pg. 40 Para 4.3.5: Opportunities for improvements to the highway network within the town are limited and therefore significant infrastructure such as a MORR is required to support the level of growth outlined in the plan. As ‘it is expected that the full route will be delivered in parts’ there may be some ‘short term pain’ on the highway network during the plan period before all infrastructure is fully built. Through the development of the transport strategy for Melton Borough, consideration will be given to phasing and timing of potential improvements to the highway network to provide minimum impact on the local area. - Pg. 50/51 Transport: PT aspirations much less specific here compared to SSN – does consideration need to be given to connections to Grantham and Nottingham</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>Transport impacts and implications are being carefully through the Leicester and Leicestershire Transport models.</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

		in addition to the town?			
Leicestershire County Council Education Sufficiency, Children and Family Services	<b>BHLF-BHRP-4H75-M</b>	<p>PRIMARY PROVISION The Authority is pleased to note that a new primary school is included in both development areas. A 420 place school would be required in each location, the cost of each school is currently in the region of £5.35million, and each site would need to be a minimum of 1.7ha. SECONDARY PROVISION The additional secondary places required in Melton town could be provided by an extension of the John Ferneley College, to do this would require additional land and a contribution of approx. £10,993,740 based on current forecasts. Further expansion of the Long Field High school in the south of the town is not possible due to its location within the flood plain and the planning constraints this imposes. However given that a significant number of houses are planned for south of the town it would be advantageous to identify a potential site for a new secondary school in the southern location, or to re-locate the Long Field School to a new site in the south of the town and extend the school to cope with the additional pupils from the development. The lack of sufficient secondary places in the south may mean that a considerable number of pupils will have to travel to the north to access secondary education. The site may not ultimately be required and would be returned should that be the case, but the identification of a site of 7ha would safe guard the provision of secondary places for the long term.</p>	None.	Noted. The provision of a Primary school is a key part of the delivery strategy.	
Leicestershire County Council Strategic Property Services Asset Management	<b>BHLF-BHRP-4H7J-9</b>	<p>The proposed allocation of the Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood, including LCC owned land at Sysonby Farm, is strongly supported. Further, the site is deliverable and capable of making significant contribution to the infrastructure needs of the town. The key deliverables other than housing numbers are seen as desirable but should be brought forward in response to evidence base and/or commercial demand. It is essential to adopt a flexible approach to master planning of the Melton Mowbray NSN in order to expedite delivery. Within this process there is a need for landowners/ developers to commit to the location of uses and secure the line of the link road. Beyond that each should have the flexibility to bring forward development at a time appropriate to them within the context of the plan. . In particular, the land between Nottingham Road and Scalford Road (partly in LCC ownership) has the ability to be brought forward , as a standalone site, at an early date to enable the ‘pump priming’ of infrastructure delivery. This approach would also support the delivery of</p>	None.	<p>The MNSN should be delivered in the context of an agreed master plan to ensure that it is well co-ordinated and secures the highest quality development with all parties contributing to the necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>It accepted that the Council needs to develop a credible trajectory.</p>	

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – Spatial strategy – Policy SS5

		housing numbers in the early years of the plan which appear dependant on the delivery of other sites within the Borough which currently appears to be lagging behind the required 245 per annum.			
Leicestershire & Rutland Environmental Records Centre	<b>BHLF-BHRP-4H7P-F</b>	Melton North: Welcome the inclusion of biodiversity protection and enhancement within policy SS5 and the decision to plan the development at a master plan level. As identified within the plan, Melton Country Park, Scalford Brook and the adjacent Dismantled Railway provide a valuable habitat and wildlife corridor through the site. These will require significant protection/buffering and enhancement at the master planning stage. Water voles, great crested newts and badger have all been recorded inside this site boundary and are likely to require mitigation from the development. Updated habitat and protected species surveys will be required to inform the proposed master plan for this area.	None.	Noted. This is addressed in policy SS5 which seeks to protect and enhance wildlife corridors.	
Robert Hobbs	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HGP-Y</b>	None.	A comprehensive road plan for a complete ring road round Melton not a disjointed series a short sections of road that will only serve to move traffic pinch points and have little effect of reducing traffic flow through the town centre.	Noted. The proposed Relief Road is not a complete ring road, but does seek to alleviate traffic congestion at pinch-points in Melton Mowbray town centre.	
Nicholas John Walker	<b>ANON-BHRP-4HGC-J</b>	None.	A Ring Road policy for Melton has to be a priority issue, this will release land for housing and business centre to enhance Melton as a desirable community to live and do business in.	Noted. The proposed Relief Road is not a complete ring road, but does seek to alleviate traffic congestion at pinch-points in Melton Mowbray town centre.	
GVA (on behalf of Jelson Homes)	<b>BHLF-BHRP-4H8Z-T</b>	We would encourage the Council to extend the proposed “North Sustainable Neighbourhood” (NSN) and allocate a greater number of dwellings in this location	Draft Policy SS5 seeks to deliver 1,500 homes as well as employment, community facilities, a link road and other transport improvements in an extension to the north of Melton. As discussed above, we would encourage the Council to extend the proposed NSN and allocate a greater number of dwellings in this location. Land immediately to the east of the proposed NSN (to the east of Melton Spinney Road) is available, suitable for development and deliverable. The land extends to approximately 12 hectares (see enclosed Land Registry Plan). The site could accommodate approximately 360 dwellings based on a density of 30 dwellings per hectare. It would appear logical to include this land, along with a wider land parcel to the east between Melton Spinney Road and the A607, in the NSN. This would provide an opportunity to extend the link road to meet the A607. It would also allow for an increase in housing numbers which would provide the Plan with greater flexibility.	Noted and needs further consideration.	