

Minutes

Meeting name	Extraordinary Full Council
Date	Tuesday, 4 July 2017
Start time	6.00 pm
Venue	Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair Councillor T. Bains (Chair)

Councillors	P. Baguley	P. Chandler (Vice-Chair)
	T. Beaken	R. de Burle
	P. Cumbers	J. Douglas
	P. Faulkner	A. Freer-Jones
	M. Glancy	T. Greenow
	L. Higgins	E. Hutchison
	J. Illingworth	S. Lumley
	A. Pearson	P. Posnett
	D. Wright	J. Wyatt

Officers

- Chief Executive
- Head of Communications & Monitoring Officer
- Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services
- Democracy & Involvement Officer
- Local Plans Manager
- GIS Technician

Minute No.	Minute
CO19	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Blase, Botterill, Holmes, Orson, Rhodes, Sheldon, and Simpson . Councillor Hurrell was not present. The Mayor advised that Councillor Greenow had given apologies for late attendance.</p>
CO20	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>Councillor Graham declared a pecuniary interest by virtue of being a representative on the Sir John Sedley Educational Trust and left the meeting before the discussion on the Melton Local Plan commenced.</p> <p>Councillors Pearson and Posnett, each declared a personal interest in any matters relating to the Leicestershire County Council due to their roles as County Councillors..</p>
CO21	<p>DRAFT MELTON LOCAL PLAN: PROGRESS AND ISSUES OVERVIEW - NEXT STEPS</p> <p>The Chair of the Melton Local Plan Working Group, Councillor Chandler presented the report before Members which had been prepared by the Head of Regulatory Services to update the Council on the progress and issues around the Local Plan preparation and to seek agreement for the next steps. Councillor Chandler made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the report represented an aide memoir to the journey travelled and brought Members up to date with activity up until now. A huge amount of work had been completed to keep up with the changes and all the representations. The task for this meeting was how to take all of this forward to produce a better and more up to date Plan; • the report explored different approaches that could be taken but was strongly influenced by the need to get a Plan in place as soon as possible but without taking excessive risk; it was not however a risk free exercise; • an approach of ‘focussed changes’, alongside much more modifications was proposed. The report speculated what these may be based upon the remainder of the agenda and calculated what a revised timetable might look like, leading to submission in the Autumn; • this was dependent on the content of the changes arising from debate at this meeting. Members were reminded that ‘focussed changes’ could only go so far: any fundamental changes to the Plan would not be the appropriate approach. <p>Without prejudice to all the difficult issues that needed to be considered at this meeting, Councillor Chandler moved the recommendations (i) to (vii) contained in the report. Councillor Illingworth, as Chair of the Planning Committee, seconded the motion, reserving the right to speak later in the debate should he so wish.</p> <p>The Deputy Leader, Councillor Higgins:</p>

- indicated his support for the motion. He thanked the members of the Local Plan Working Group, Officers, and the public and other stakeholders for submitting representations;
- highlighted the importance of progressing the Draft Local Plan without which there was no defence against large scale development in the Borough and the Council had to be guided by the national planning policy framework which presumed in favour of development;
- referred to the opportunity for communities to gain funding from development and potential for economic growth but without the Local Plan this would be in doubt;
- conveyed the support of Councillor Blase for the recommendations although he was unable to attend the meeting.

The Mayor called for a vote on the motion which was subsequently carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the progress and issues pertaining around local plan preparation since the Pre Submission Draft Melton Local Plan was published be noted;
- (2) the Addendum to the Community Consultation and Engagement Statement in Appendix 1 of this report be agreed;
- (3) the new information that is being taken into account in finalising the draft Local Plan for submission to the Planning Inspectorate for Examination be noted;
- (4) the steps that need to be taken up to and including submission of the draft Local Plan for Examination be agreed;
- (5) a Draft Melton Local Plan Addendum of 'Focused Changes' be prepared and subject to 6 weeks of public and other consultations, in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations 2012;
- (6) the broad scope of the proposed Addendum of Focused Changes referred to in recommendation (iv) above subject to consideration of the issues described be noted; and
- (7) the implications on the timetable to adoption of the additional step outlined in recommendation (iv) above be noted.

[Councillor Greenow entered the meeting during the following item.]

CO22

DRAFT MELTON LOCAL PLAN: HOUSING REQUIREMENTS

The Chairman of the Melton Local Plan Working Group, Councillor Chandler presented the report prepared by the Head of Regulatory Services which addressed the implications of two recent reports affecting the housing requirement

figure set out in the draft Local Plan and invited consideration of the appropriate housing requirement. Councillor Chandler stated:

- that the report concerned the latest evidence on housing need and considered its implications alongside the many representations received on this matter;
- housing requirements were a keystone of the Local Plan on which much else depended and was affected by. The HEDNA and related 'towards a housing target' report was new evidence based on the most up to date statistics. They represented a range of housing needs from 170 per year through to 280 and several levels in between;
- the report explored the pros and cons of the various levels in terms of what the Plan was seeking to achieve, and there were inevitably pros and cons with each approach; some objectives were served better from a smaller quantity, some required larger;
- when taken as a whole, it seemed clear that a figure of 245 was the best balance. It went a long way towards fulfilling the Council's ambitions for growth, including the ring road for Melton, providing a sustainable workforce to sustain businesses and allow them to grow whilst still providing a reasonable level of affordable housing;
- HEDNA did not provide evidence solely about Melton, it related to the whole of the housing market area and had forewarned of difficult issues to come in terms of the demands emerging outside of this Borough and the prospect of 'unmet need' arising elsewhere. The Council was committed to addressing this with its neighbours and was invited to join the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) recommended in the report;
- that it was therefore recommended that the Council publish this information for consultation purposes and also sign the MOU. However for the Plan going forward, the most important recommendation was that the Plan be based on a figure of 245 having regard to the contribution that level will make to the fulfilment of the Plan's aims and objectives.

Accordingly, Councillor Chandler moved the recommendations numbered (i) to (v) in the report. Councillor Illingworth, as Chair of the Planning Committee, seconded the motion, reserving the right to speak later in the debate should he so wish.

A discussion ensued during which points were made on:

- the Borough had the highest economic growth rate in the East Midlands and therefore it needed more housing to support this growth;
- meeting the housing needs of the Borough was key to boosting the economy, as was helping people to lead more prosperous lives, and supporting the development of the road infrastructure;
- the need for starter homes which would help residents invest in their local communities;
- a mix of housing types was needed to accommodate all ages and to help people, live, stay and work in the Borough;
- concern regarding the use of the Council owned garage sites for

development. The Chief Executive replied that the Council was dealing today with the overarching policies and the direction of travel. As landowner, the Council would be mindful of the overarching policies when considering any such sites for development in an appropriate way having regard to the need for localised parking as well as the need for homes.

The Mayor called for a vote on the motion which was subsequently carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That

(1) the following evidence documents as evidence to inform the production of the Local Plan be accepted and that they are published alongside a proposed 'Addendum of Focussed Changes':

- Leicestershire and Leicester Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (January 2017)
- Towards a Housing Requirement for Melton Borough (GL Hearn, Jan 2017) and its associated Addendum (GL Hearn, June 2017)
- SA Addendum (LUC, February 2017)

(2) the contents of this report be noted and the conclusions set out agreed;

(3) the housing requirement within the Local Plan of 245d.p.a. remains unchanged from the Pre Submission Draft Plan;

(4) the preparation of revised 'reasoned justification' for inclusion in a proposed Addendum of Focussed Changes be authorised; and

(5) the Joint Statement of Co-operation Relating to Objectively Assessed Needs for Housing (Appendix 4 of the report) be agreed for adoption.

CO23

DRAFT MELTON LOCAL PLAN: SPATIAL STRATEGY (CHAPTER 4 OF THE PRE-SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN WITH THE EXCEPTION OF POLICIES SS4 AND SS5 (SUSTAINABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS))

The Chairman of the Melton Local Plan Working Group, Councillor Chandler presented the report of the Head of Regulatory Services which highlighted the issues raised in the representations received to Chapter 4 Policies SS1 – SS3 and SS6, and recommended the suggested responses to the representations resulting in proposed changes to draft Policy SS2 and SS3 and the supporting reasoned justifications.

Councillor Chandler advised the Council

- this subject matter had attracted a great deal of interest through consultation period with very strong and conflicting views expressed on almost all aspects. This had led to the review of the spatial strategy from its key starting point – the 65:35 ratio between Melton Mowbray and the rural areas through to the inclusion of individual villages as service centres and rural hubs. There is little prospect of

satisfying everyone's aspirations but we remain convinced that the distribution within the last version of the plan was fair and justified and we do not propose a fundamental change in direction. However there is always room for improvement and it is in all of our interests to develop and improve the plan where we can;

- the report addresses some of those issue and identifies some key improvements we can make. It clarifies the balance between Melton and the rural area and our expectations of how the development will take place. Importantly, it addresses one of the issues that caused the greatest criticism in the last consultation to rework the village allocation so that we can avoid the need of redistribution between villages. This is possible because the work on sites – item 3E – has brought forward a better range of sites and in turn a closer fit to the approach of allocations it is based upon, allocating based on population size;
- on a new approach to SS3 unallocated sites: stepping away from prescriptive limits which would be hard to justify and may not stand the test of time. A new approach is proposed as a focused change which would allow a responsive approach to be taken on 3;
- a judgement based on need and impact not a tick box approach based on fixed numbers. Improving the review clauses in SS6 so that they are more precise and inclusive of the options available;
- the recommendation is to note the differences between the significant focused changes; recommendations parts 2 and 3 are less important modifications where it is proposed we take the opportunity to improve the text of 4, 5 and 6.

Councillor Chandler moved the recommendations numbered (i) to (vi) in the report. Councillor Illingworth, as Chair of the Planning Committee, seconded the motion, reserving the right to speak later in the debate should he so wish.

Discussion opened with the Deputy Leader thanking the Local Plan Working Group for listening to concerns previously raised regarding Policy SS3 as this would now allow Ward Councillors to drive through what was needed at the Planning Committee and empower that Committee to make a decision on a local basis. Another Member also stated she was pleased to see that Policy SS3 was not as restrictive and more tuned to local needs, commenting that any development must contribute to the sustainability of the community and be in keeping with the settlement.

A Member pointed out an inconsistency in the wording of the first and second bullet points of the second part of the recommendation pertaining to the percentage figures of housing need.

The mover of the motion and seconder accepted the amendment. Councillor Illingworth spoke about the frustration of the national planning policy framework overriding local concerns. As Members, Councillors were there to listen to and understand local views. When the Local Plan was in place, these local views could

be given real weight and the Committee could make decisions for the benefit of the people they were there to represent. He concluded by urging Members to support the recommendations before the Council.

A vote was then taken on the motion, subject to the amended wording on the second bullet point of recommendation (ii), and this was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That

(1) the responses to representations outlined in Appendix 1 be agreed;

(2) the amendments to Policy SS2 and its 'reasoned justification' as a 'Focussed Change' for consultation (full details are contained within Item 3I of this agenda) be agreed as follows:

- insert 'approximately' into Policy SS2 , i.e. :
"Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area is the priority location for growth and will accommodate approximately 65% of the Borough's housing need. The role and sustainability of Melton Mowbray will be significantly enhanced through the delivery of at least 3,980 homes....."
- the first sentence of the fourth paragraph of Policy SS2 be reworded to read – "Service Centres and Rural Hubs will accommodate approximately 35% (1822) of the Borough's housing need"
- amend the content of Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification (para 4.2 to 4.22 including the tables) to reflect the revised site capacities;

(3) a focussed change for consultation comprising of a revised approach to the content of Policy SS3, 'Unallocated Sites' (full details are contained within Item 3I of this agenda) be agreed;

(4) a modification to paragraph 4.7.4 of the Draft Plan to include reference to Dalby Airfield be agreed;

(5) modifications to update paragraphs 4.7.6 and 4.7.7 of the Draft Plan to reflect the updated evidence (HEDNA and the Strategic Growth Plan) be agreed;

(6) paragraph 4.7.8 relating to Policy SS6 be amended to clarify that the plan review referred to would be "commenced within 12 months of any adoption by the Council of the Strategic Growth Plan".

CO24

DRAFT MELTON LOCAL PLAN: POLICY C4 - CHAPTER 5, POLICY C4: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The Chairman of the Melton Local Plan Working Group, Councillor Chandler presented the report prepared by the Head of Regulatory Services which outlined the new evidence available about the amount of new affordable housing needed and the amount of such housing that can be viably sought as part of new housing developments. The report went on to summarise the key matters raised in the representations received to draft Policy C4: Affordable Housing Provision of the Pre

Submission Draft Melton Local Plan, and to suggest responses to the representations in the light of the new evidence. The final section of the report set out the resulting proposed change to draft Policy C4 and its supporting reasoned justification.

In commenting on the report, Councillor Chandler

- drew Members' attention to the new policy proposed (full details of which were contained under the later report on Focussed Changes) that would be put out to consultation;
- stated that there were a host of details associated with affordable housing and a changing landscape driven by Government policy and various initiatives, all of which changed over time. It was therefore proposed that the Council commits to a Supplementary Planning Document to back up the policy in which these were set out. This was because this was a more flexible tool to produce planning policy at a detailed level and would enable the Council to respond more quickly to changing circumstances.

Councillor Chandler then moved the recommendations contained in the report numbered (i) to (iv). Councillor Illingworth seconded the motion, reserving his right to speak later in the debate should he so wish.

A Member referred to para 3.6.1, subsection (vi) in the report which listed the Value Area 2 (north of the Borough) as 32.4% and queried whether this could be rounded down to 32%. The Head of Regulatory Services agreed to this amendment.

The Deputy Leader raised a number of points on the issue of affordable housing, stating:

- that the subject could be misinterpreted;
- the housing market was not working in favour of people in this area;
- starter home schemes represented a form of empowerment for individuals as it allowed the transfer of wealth from the developer;
- he had been asked to make comments on behalf of Councillor Simpson who was unable to attend the meeting: starter homes were popular in the wards of both Somerby and Gaddesby. These wards were in Value Area 1 and accordingly excluded some people from being able to afford properties. Both he and Councillor Simpson would work with officers to develop the Supplementary Planning Document to support starter homes in their respective wards.

The Mayor then called for the vote on the motion as presented, which resulted in the motion being carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That

(1) the new evidence relating to affordable housing contained in the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (January 2017) (HEDNA) and the Revised Melton Local Plan and CIL Viability Report be noted;

(2) the relationship between the provision of affordable housing and the amount of CIL that could be collected from new housing developments be noted;

(3) the detailed responses to representations, taking account of this new evidence (Appendix 1 of the report) be agreed;

(4) the proposed change to Section 5.8 of the draft Local Plan, including Policy C4, as set out in the Focused Changes Appendices (contained in agenda Item 31 - minute CO29 refers), be agreed as part of a consultation on an Addendum of Focussed Changes to the Draft Melton Local Plan (para 3.7.6 of the report refers).

CO25

DRAFT MELTON LOCAL PLAN: HOUSING SITE ALLOCATIONS AND RESERVE SITES (POLICIES C1(A) AND C1(B) OF CHAPTER 5) AND POLICIES SS5 AND SS6 OF CHAPTER 4 (SUSTAINABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS) OF THE PRE SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN

The Chairman of the Melton Local Plan Working Group, Councillor Chandler presented the report prepared by the Head of Regulatory Services the purpose of which was to highlight the issues raised in the representations received to Chapter 5 Policies C1(A) and C1B and Policies SS5 and SS6 of Chapter 4, and to recommend responses to the representations. The report also included the update to the site assessment work and the proposed amendments as a result.

In presenting the report, Councillor Chandler advised:

- site allocations were perhaps the highest profile part of the Plan in terms of public interest and had attracted a large quantity of representation. The report before Members addressed sites of all sizes, from sustainable neighbourhoods in Melton, the smaller sites in and around Melton, and all of the housing sites in villages;
- the report contained a ‘root and branch’ review of all of the sites in the previous Plan, taking into account the representations received and also newer sites that had been submitted since last November’s consultation. The update took into account the latest information relating site constraints such as flooding, recently granted planning permissions and calculations relating to their capacity;
- the Council was being asked to present a revised set of site selections following this process. The significance could not be under estimated – fairly few sites remained unchanged, several had modest changes to their exact boundaries or a revised estimated capacity but there were examples of sites being removed altogether and others taking their place. This was all set out in the appendices, appendix 4 in particular set out the changes in map form;
- that there would be ‘winners’ and ‘losers’ and all changes would need to be presented for consultation as a ‘focused change’;
- as a consequence of this exercise, sites had come forward in locations where previously none were proposed, and in some locations sites were calculated to be able to accommodate a different number. This in turn enabled stepping away from the redistribution exercise that was a feature of the previous version of the Plan that had been widely criticised. Instead, between them, all of the sites in both

Service centres and Rural Hubs met the necessary quantity without having to transfer the burden elsewhere, and it was proposed therefore to delete the complex tables explaining the reallocation process;

- the report also addressed the Sustainable Neighbourhoods north and south of Melton. To the north, various amendments were proposed to the Policy to offer greater protection to Melton Country Park to place the references to the Greenway in a different section of the Plan and to reduce affordable housing to 15%;
- in respect of the South Sustainable Neighbourhood, there was a particular issue regarding the alignment of the South boundary. It was depicted as a jagged line following various hedgerows in the Plan to date, but if it was realistically to become a significant road forming the edge of the town, it needed smoothing out. The process for doing so moves closer to the St Lazarus scheduled monument near Burton Lazars and this had attracted objection from Heritage England who were concerned about harm to its setting. However, there was a contrary view and a study had been carried out that reached an opposite conclusion and on this basis it was considered that a new line, a little further south, could be accepted. This would coincide with the current planning application, which had a strong prospect of determination in advance of the Local Plan being adopted and would resolve the issue;
- all of these changes and the evidence they were based upon were significant amendments to the Plan and needed to be treated as 'focussed changes' going forward which would be publicised through the consultation period.

Councillor Chandler proposed the recommendations numbered (i) to (v) in the report. The motion was seconded by Councillor Illingworth.

Councillor Baguley moved an amendment to part (ii) of the motion to delete the site reference LONG4, Sand Pit Lane, Long Clawson. In support of the amendment, she stated that the view of Heritage England was that building on that site would be harmful to the 3 designated heritage assets; Manor Farm House which was one of the few Grade 2 listed buildings in the Borough, the church which was also Grade 2 listed, and the scheduled ancient monument which was near to the site. The amendment was seconded by Councillor Cumbers.

The Mayor invited the Head of Regulatory Services to respond. The officer began by explaining that he would first comment on the background rather than the amendment itself: the representations from Heritage England were actually in relation to a comment on a current planning application submitted for that site for a very specific design and layout to which Heritage England had lodged an objection on a number of aspects. When Heritage England had been consulted on the Local Plan as a whole in relation to the principle of building on these sites, they had not raised comments on LONG4. The officer said he would therefore deduce that Heritage England was not against LONG4 being built on per se but that they objected to the current application in the form submitted. Evidentially the case was not made based on contributions from Heritage England.

The Head of Regulatory Services referred Members to the item previously considered, particularly paragraphs 3.11.4 and 3.11.5 of the accompanying report.

The report included some tables about how the housing numbers added up across various categories of settlements. This, he explained, was not just a comment on the amendment, but also on any other amendments which may be put forward at the meeting: he highlighted the figures on the bottom line of the tables which demonstrated the flexibility to allow some modest changes to the housing sites. Obviously, if there were to be an accumulation of housing sites taken out for one reason or another, at some point a line would be crossed whereby the Council would have not only departed from its own spacial strategy which had just been agreed but also in relation to the focussed changes meaning the Local Plan itself would be different. Members were strongly advised to bear this in mind should any further changes be proposed.

As seconder of the original motion, Councillor Illingworth concurred with the advice of the officer stating that the comments of Heritage England on LONG4 needed to be put into context. A vote was then taken on the amendment and subsequently defeated.

Councillor Hutchison indicated he wished to move a further amendment to the motion. Councillor Hutchison stated that following the release of the agenda documents the residents of Frisby had highlighted concerns regarding the content of item 3E. Their issue, which he supported, was that the revised capacity allocation of FRIS3 had grown to 68. This had been discussed at the Members' Briefing and the Frisby Parish Council Neighbourhood Planning Group and it appeared that the development area was larger than it was because of the inclusion of non housing content i.e. land for a future school extension, a proposed school drop off area and additional parking, an open play area and community orchard. The amendment proposed was therefore to add to part (ii) of the motion the following words: "with an amendment to the identification of the site and capacity of site ref. FRIS3 to reflect the current planning application, i.e. to be annotated to depict the 'developable area' proposed by the planning application and resultant reduction in capacity to 48.". The amendment was seconded by Councillor Higgins who confirmed it had been addressed in the Working Group.

The Head of Regulatory Services was invited to respond. The officer agreed with Councillor Hutchison's summation and added that FRIS3 was a very large site in terms of its land take. The somewhat blunt instrument of measuring estimated capacity of these sites simply applied a 'houses per hectare' measure and delivered a large figure. In this particular case, the figure was completely artificial as that site included a number of other uses apart from housing. Members were referred to paragraphs 5.14 and 5.15 of the report and it was confirmed that the proposal was for 48 houses not the 67 that the measurement indicated. The Head of Regulatory Services also confirmed that he had no concerns about reducing 20 houses as a result of this amendment. The physical changes to the documents could be made during the round of focused changes.

Upon being put to the vote the amendment was carried.

Councillor Wright then referred to paragraph 3.20.2 of the report concerning site

EAST2 which was he said a garden and not a field and had resulted in objections from residents and the Bottesford Neighbourhood Steering Group. He proposed an amendment that it be removed. Councillor Wyatt seconded the amendment. The Head of Regulatory Services responded that the Member was correct that EAST2 did fall within the area of separation but when actually viewed on site with its boundary features, officers were of the opinion that it was not making a physical contribution to the area of separation between Easthorpe and Bottesford.

Concern was expressed about removing particular sites without fully understanding the background. Councillor Higgins therefore agreed that this site could be referred back to the Working Group for further consideration. Upon being put to the vote this amendment was lost.

Councillor Freer-Jones thanked officers for the preceding overview sessions on the Local Plan and moved an amendment to part (iv) of the motion in order to protect the identity of the area to the southern boundary between the town and Burton Lazars. It was proposed to add the following words to Policy SS4 subsections en1 and en3 to read “with particular regard to the ridgeline to the south of Melton Mowbray that separates the visual connection between Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars”. The amendment was seconded by Councillor Glancy who expressed the view that it was important to protect development on the fringes of the town to ensure it would fit well with the area of separation. The Head of Regulatory Services confirmed that the wording proposed would add more prescriptive protection to that area. Upon being put to the vote the amendment was carried.

RESOLVED: That

(1) the responses to representations outlined in the Schedule of responses for individual settlements (Appendix 1 and 1a, as made available in the Members Room) be agreed;

(2) amendments proposed to Policies C1(A) and C1(B) be agreed based on updated site assessment work and suggested changes and its associated ‘reasoned justification’ as a ‘Focussed Change’ for consultation (full details are contained within Item 3l of this agenda) with an amendment to the identification of the site and capacity of site ref. FRIS3 to reflect the current planning application, i.e. to be annotated to depict the ‘developable area’ proposed by the planning application and resultant reduction in capacity to 48;

(3) the responses outlined in the schedule of responses for Policies SS4 and SS5 (Appendix 2a, 2b and 3 of the report) be agreed;

(4) amendments proposed to the policies be agreed as outlined in paragraph 7.23 of this report and its associated ‘reasoned justification’ as a ‘Focussed Change’ for consultation (full details are contained within Item 3l of this agenda (Minute CO29 refers) and the addition of the following wording to Policy SS4 subsections en1 and en3 to read “with particular regard to the ridgeline to the south of Melton Mowbray

that separates the visual connection between Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars”;

(5) the modifications identified elsewhere in this report be agreed.

CO26

DRAFT MELTON LOCAL PLAN: CHAPTER 8 - ARRANGING DELIVERY, INCLUDING THE MELTON MOWBRAY TRANSPORT STRATEGY AND OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE MATTERS

The Chairman of the Melton Local Plan Working Group, Councillor Chandler presented the report prepared by the Head of Regulatory Services the purpose of which was to outline the representations received in respect of the draft Local Plan policies and reasoned justification of Chapter 8 – Managing Delivery of the Melton Local Plan.

Councillor Chandler informed Members:

- the report proposed changes which had been brought about by the very good news on funding for the Melton Distributor road and the progress being made in partnership with the County Council;
- the County Council had received an award to design the road and submit a business case to the Department of Transport and indications received for its completion in 2022. For clarification, this funding bid relates to the stretch from Burton Road heading north and then west across Thorpe Road, Melton Spinney Road, Scalford Road and connecting with Nottingham Road. These were the key sections that would alleviate congestion in the town centre and facilitate the growth the Plan proposes;
- the changes were required because the Council could address the Distributor road and the benefits it would bring in much greater detail now that it was a firm proposition. This description and its firm appearance in the Local Plan, describing the economic and housing growth it would release, would in turn assist the bid. Aligned to this, a new policy was proposed, which would protect the possible routes of the road so that it does not become obstructed, physically or financially;
- alongside this, the Council had been able to revisit the question of infrastructure and develop the Policies to reflect up to date needs and priorities associated with them. This required a new policy IN1 and IN2 and the recommendations proposed the inclusion of these along with the explanation of the value of the road and maps to depict the corridor of search for the precise route of the road. It is close to being a replacement chapter and as such needs to be one of the 'focused changes' to be published and consulted upon.

Councillor Chandler moved the recommendations numbered (i) to (iv) as set out in the report and this was seconded by Councillor Illingworth.

The Deputy Leader spoke in support of the motion, pointing out:

- that it was important to recognise previous work on this subject undertaken by Councillors Rhodes, Pearson, and Posnett;

- the issue of the distributor road continued to generate much debate in the town. The eastern part, when finally in place, would provide £102m of gross added value to the local economy. Government funding would support the northern and eastern section whilst the southern section would be funded from the Davidson's planning application for 1,500 houses;
- the Council was united in making a case for the Government funding with support from the County Council representatives, the County Highways Department and the local MP, Sir Alan Duncan;
- representations from Councillor Glancy making the case that the road needed to be sited further out from Thorpe Arnold to protect that settlement from pollution;
- that following the decisions at this meeting, this would set a marker for the County Council in their bid for Government funding.

The Chief Executive clarified that the Council was at the first stage of focused consultation to make the public aware of the possible corridor of the distributor road. That corridor had been worked up in consultation with the County Highway Authority who would take into account the outcome from this meeting. This would form part of the overall process for setting the corridor for the distributor road subject ultimately to the examination of the Melton Local Plan.

A brief discussion ensued during which several Members spoke on the vital importance of the distributor road for the economic growth of not just the town but the wider area. It had been a topic of discussion at the recent Community Forum and a request was made for co-ordinated thinking in moving the project forward so that it did not add to the traffic congestion during its delivery. A Member welcomed the inclusion of Policy IN1 to the Local Plan as a positive step.

A vote was then taken on the motion which was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the responses to representations received on the pre-submission draft Local Plan in respect of Chapter 8, as set out in the schedule at Appendix 1 be agreed;
- (2) the changes to the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan that are described in section 3.3 of this report be subjected to public consultation as part of a 'Draft Melton Local Plan Addendum of Focused Changes' in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (full details are available in Item 31 of this Agenda);
- (3) a clause in the proposed new Policy IN1 be included that makes it clear that the Council would be prepared to use compulsory purchase order powers to assist in securing the delivery of sections of the Melton Mowbray Distributor Road be noted;
- (4) the suggested modifications identified elsewhere in this report be agreed.

DRAFT MELTON LOCAL PLAN: PROVISION FOR GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS (POLICY C6)

The Chairman of the Melton Local Plan Working Group, Councillor Chandler presented the report prepared by the Head of Regulatory Services the purpose of which was to outline the findings and implications of new evidence contained in the Leicester City and Leicestershire Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Show people Accommodation Assessment (GTAA 2017). It also summarised the key matters raised in representations received to draft Policy C6: Gypsies and Travellers of the Pre Submission Draft Melton Local Plan, and suggested responses to the representations in the light of the new evidence. The final section of the report set out the resulting proposed focussed change to draft Policy C6 and its supporting reasoned justification.

Councillor Chandler advised

- that the findings of the GTAAA 2017 on permanent pitch requirements were unchanged from those in the draft version of the GTAA 2016 (as cited in the Pre Submission Draft Local Plan). Melton's permanent pitch requirement from April 2016 to March 2021 was 2 permanent residential pitches, and between April 2021 and March 2026, it was 1 permanent residential pitch. There was no further requirement for any permanent pitches from April 2026 to 2036 in the Borough following recent permissions;
- if subsequent GTAA reviews established an unmet need (or the planning permissions were not implemented), a review of this policy would be carried out;
- for public transit pitch provision, the GTAA 2017 had identified a current need for a minimum of 36 caravan spaces spread over 2 to 3 sites in Leicestershire (or the managed equivalent e.g. through Negotiated Stopping Agreements rather than infrastructure provision). This would be dealt with via a countywide project group;
- a regular review of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Show people permanent pitch and plot requirements (including transit pitch requirements) will be undertaken. The most recent GTAA would be used to identify pitch and plot requirements and where a need was found, steps would be taken to deliver sites;
- the GTAA together with the criteria within the most up to date national Planning Policy for Traveller Sites would be used as a basis for determining windfall planning applications.

Councillor Chandler moved the recommendations numbered (i) to (iii) in the report and this was seconded by Councillor Illingworth. In support of the motion, the Deputy Leader highlighted the importance of having robust measures in place to deal with unauthorised encampments as this could involve a very costly legal process.

Upon being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That

(1) the Leicester City and Leicestershire Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Show

people Accommodation Assessment (GTAA 2017) be accepted as evidence to inform the production of the Local Plan, and that it be published alongside a proposed 'Addendum of Focussed Changes';

(2) the detailed responses to representations, taking account of this new evidence, be agreed (Appendix 1);

(3) the proposed change to Section 5.10 of the draft local plan, including Policy C6, as set out in the Focused Changes Appendices (item 3I of this agenda), be agreed as part of a consultation on an Addendum of Focussed Changes to the Draft Melton Local Plan (para 3.6.9. of the report refers).

CO28

DRAFT MELTON LOCAL PLAN: NEW EVIDENCE NOT PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED

The Chairman of the Melton Local Plan Working Group, Councillor Chandler presented the report prepared by the Head of Regulatory Services the purpose of which was to outline the findings and Local Plan implications of the remaining new evidence that had not yet been presented to Members. It sought Member agreement for the evidence to be published alongside an Addendum of Focused Changes to the Draft Melton Local Plan, and that the proposed changes and/or suggested modifications recommended to address the implications of the new evidence.

Councillor Chandler clarified that

- this item was something of a safety net addressing issues that had not been covered under other headings. There were various documents that needed to be produced alongside the Plan and its evidence and these were addressed in this report. They were not policy changes or modifications to the Plan in their own right but needed to be published alongside the changes in order to allow comment in the same way;
- many of these were produced as follow ups to the issues already discussed at this meeting and fulfilled various statutory requirements. Amongst them was the revised Housing Land trajectory which was based on the revised set of sites for this stage. Members were asked to note that it retained a healthy 5 year land supply position of in excess of 7 years, based on the new sites composition discussed earlier.

Councillor Chandler moved the recommendations numbered (i) to (x) in the report and the motion was seconded by Councillor Illingworth.

The Head of Regulatory Services drew Members' attention to the erratum to recommendation (v) in the previously circulated report to include reference to Habitats Regulations Assessment. The officer then responded to a request for clarification regarding the table in Appendix 2 to the report showing the number of dwellings with planning permission compared with the total allocations as at 30 May 2017. He confirmed that the number of real applications was outstripping the Local Plan process and that the total was now 2020.

A vote was then taken on the recommendations, including the amendment to (v) which was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the findings of the Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy 2016-2021 be noted and that it be published alongside any consultation on a Melton Local Plan Addendum of Focused Changes;
- (2) the suggested amendments to the draft Local Plan set out in section 3.2 of this report be agreed and that these be included in an Addendum of Focused Changes (full details are provided in item 3l of this Agenda);
- (3) the purpose and content of the Sequential Test of Potential Development Sites be noted and the finalised report be published alongside an Addendum of Focused Changes;
- (4) the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal of the options for an overall housing requirement for Melton be noted and the SA Addendum setting out these findings be published alongside any consultation on a Melton Local Plan Addendum of Focused Changes;
- (5) the findings of the sustainability appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the proposed changes be noted and the SA and the HRA of the Proposed Changes setting out these findings be published alongside any consultation on a Melton Local Plan Addendum of Focused Changes;
- (6) the requirement to undertake HRA screening be noted and the appropriate documentation published alongside any consultation on a Melton Local Plan Addendum of Focused Changes;
- (7) the Equalities Impact Assessment of the Draft Local Plan attached at Appendix 1 be accepted;
- (8) an addendum to the draft EIA that will set out an assessment of the proposed changes to the local plan be published alongside any consultation on a Melton Local Plan Addendum of Focused Changes;
- (9) the updated Five Year Land Supply and Housing Trajectory Position document at Appendix 2 be agreed and published for consultation alongside any Melton Local Plan Addendum of Focused Changes;
- (10) the other updated documents described at para. 3.9.1 be published alongside any Melton Local Plan Addendum of Focused Changes.

[The Mayor here adjourned the meeting at 7.45pm for a break. The meeting

resumed at 8.13pm]

CO29

DRAFT MELTON LOCAL PLAN: ADDENDUM OF FOCUSED CHANGES AND PROPOSED CONSULTATION

The Chairman of the Melton Local Plan Working Group, Councillor Chandler presented the report prepared by the Head of Regulatory Services the purpose of which was to seek the Council's agreement to the content of a 'Draft Melton Local Plan Addendum of Focused Changes' document, and that it be published for public and other consultations prior to its submission as part of the Local Plan for Examination.

Councillor Chandler explained:

- the report essentially brought together all of the focused changes previously discussed except those devised afresh at this meeting which could be added and treated in the same way;
- the appendices showed how they could be physically presented and were designed to identify what was new and what was being changed through a series of new pages, and where relevant for the route of the road and the Sustainable Neighbourhood boundaries, new maps;
- all the evidence documents and the updated supporting documents which needed to go alongside the changes were also described;
- the essential purpose of the recommendation was to proceed on this basis with a package of focused changes as set out, along with those added at this meeting. However, Members were also invited to consider the extent to which consultation should be carried out and a suggestion from the Working Group was contained at paragraph 3.21 very much on similar lines as earlier phases. The consultation events were very time consuming and it was suggested that the 'drop in' events were limited to 4 or 5.

Councillor Chandler then moved the recommendations numbered (i) to (v) in the report and this was seconded by Councillor Illingworth.

The Head of Regulatory Services responded to points raised by the Deputy Leader about the Somerby sites 2 and 3 clarifying that some changes had been included in the narrative of the policy for consultation, and confirmed that the areas of separation contained within appendix 4 pertaining to Bottesford were only indicative with no hard and fast boundaries.

Councillor Lumley then expressed his thanks to Councillor Glancy for the revision of the Northern SUE in relation to the Melton Country Park. The Member stressed that a boundary of at least 100m was needed between any development and the Country Park. The site was a key wildlife corridor. Reference was made to the petition organised by the Friends of Melton Country Park backing a protection zone between the Country Park and any future development. This petition would be formally presented to the Council at its next meeting on 19 July 2017. Councillor Glancy questioned whether there would be any benefit to producing a supplementary planning document to guide the development of the SUE's so that

the Council could give a clear indication to developers about what was expected. The Head of Regulatory Services gave assurances to the Member that this objective was being worked on but by a different route.

The Mayor then called for a vote on the motion which was carried.

RESOLVED: That

(1) the content of the Draft Melton Local Plan Addendum of Focused Changes (at Appendix 1) be approved;

(2) the Addendum of Focused Changes and new evidence be published;

(3) the proposals for consultation and community engagement outlined in paragraphs 3.19 to 3.22 of this report be agreed;

(4) consultations be undertaken on the Addendum and its associated supporting documents as soon as possible after this Council meeting, in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012;

(5) delegated authority be granted to the Head of Regulatory Services to make any necessary changes required for clarification or typographical corrections to the text of the Addendum which do not change the overall sense or purpose of the document, prior to its publication.

CO30

DRAFT MELTON LOCAL PLAN: OUTSTANDING LOCAL PLAN REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AND SUGGESTED RESPONSES

The Chairman of the Melton Local Plan Working Group, Councillor Chandler presented the report prepared by the Head of Regulatory Services the purpose of which was to:

(a) set out and consider the main issues raised in representations not already considered by the Council in reports on this agenda, and suggest responses to them; and

(b) provide an opportunity to revisit any issues arising from representations made or new information received.

Councillor Chandler advised

- the report addressed the remaining representations not covered by earlier reports. There were generally fewer in number and addressed less controversial aspects of the Plan;
- Members to note that the representations were listed and considered but in the Working Group's view there were no further focused changes arising as a result. However, there were a series of modifications that could be put forward to the Examination.

Councillor Chandler moved both the recommendations contained in the report and these were seconded by Councillor Illingworth. There being no discussion arising, the Mayor moved to the vote and the motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That

(1) the responses to representations outlined in Appendix 1 of the report be agreed;

(2) the recommended modifications identified in the report be agreed.

CO31

MELTON BOROUGH COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY AND DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE

The Chairman of the Melton Local Plan Working Group, Councillor Chandler presented the report prepared by the Head of Regulatory Services the purpose of which was to present the findings of the Revised Local Plan and CIL Viability Study (May 2017) and the implications of the Independent Panel's CIL Review (February 2017), and to seek authority to accept two documents as evidence to inform the formulation of the Local Plan, and to seek the Council's agreement to pursue the establishment of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) for the Borough, including authorisation of an initial consultation on the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule.

Councillor Chandler advised Members

- the report invited the Council to launch the CIL consultation alongside the Local Plan. This was regarded as good practice as CIL was intended to support the essential infrastructure for which the Local Plan identified a need. This was closely related to the previous item on affordable housing and relied on the same approach to assessing viability across the value areas. However, the CIL paper went further and sought to identify what headroom was available for CIL over and above the Affordable Housing percentages that had been discussed;
- that this closely followed the 'value areas' and that what was known as a 'schedule 123 list' had been developed, reflecting policies in the Plan regarding priorities for infrastructure. Also included was a 'preliminary charging schedule' which set out what the Council believed was achievable across the value areas depending on different types of development;
- an unusual quirk appeared in this because CIL was universal and applied to development of all scales. This included smaller housing schemes of under 11 units which offered a healthy prospect because, due to other legislation, they were not making a contribution to affordable housing;
- the report set out a timetable for the development of the CIL related to the anticipated Local Plan programme to Examination and after. Accordingly the recommendations proposed the launch of the CIL alongside the Plan based on the documents and appendices to the report.

Councillor Chandler accordingly moved the two recommendations contained in the report. This was seconded by Councillor Illingworth.

The Deputy Leader made a number of points regarding CIL:

- the CIL empowered ward Councillors in dialogue with developers
- in community neighbourhood areas up to 25% of CIL could be levied on each house built. Parish Councils were then accountable for how this was spent;
- it was vital that during the consultation, the Council heard from residents and community groups as to their needs as development would provide funding for infrastructure and amenities in their communities.

As seconder of the motion, Councillor Illingworth clarified that all Parish Council's received 15% of CIL but if a neighbourhood plan was in place, they received the enhanced rate of 25%.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That

(1) consultation be held in July and August 2017 on the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (timetable at section 11 of the report and Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule at Appendix A refers);

(2) the Revised Local Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Study (May 2017) and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (March 2017) be agreed as adopted evidence for the formulation of the Local Plan and to inform other planning decisions, and that they be published alongside a proposed Addendum of Focussed Changes.

CO32

MELTON LOCAL PLAN: REVISED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME 2017-2020

The Chairman of the Melton Local Plan Working Group, Councillor Chandler presented the report prepared by the Head of Regulatory Services the purpose of which was to seek the Council's agreement of a Local Development Scheme 2017-2020 to update the 2016-2019 version agreed in April 2016. The 2017-2020 LDS reflected a new Local Plan timetable that included a consultation on an Addendum of Focused Changes to the draft Local Plan, and consideration of the representations received to this. This would take place prior to seeking the agreement of Full Council to submit the plan to the Government for examination.

Councillor Chandler stated that this item had to follow all of the others as it depended upon the conclusions reached by the Council. It was a statutory requirement that the Local Development Scheme was updated each time the timetable for the Local Plan was adjusted. The recommendation proposed by the officers, which she so moved, sought authority to do so and publish a revised LDS accordingly. The motion was seconded by Councillor Illingworth.

The Deputy Leader referred to the dates for the Examination in the report and stated that all interested parties could make representations to the Inspector. Ward Councillors could ensure that any representations received would be reflected in

the Plan.

The Mayor then called for a vote on the motion which was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the Melton Borough Local Development Scheme 2017-2020 (Appendix A to the report) be agreed.

Before closing the meeting, the Mayor wished to place on record his thanks and appreciation to the Local Plan Working Group, officers – in particular the Head of Regulatory Services, Mr Jim Worley, the Chief Executive, and the members of the public who had attended the meeting.

The meeting closed at: 8.42 pm

Mayor