

Matter 2: Overall Spatial Strategy

2.1 ii) are they founded on robust evidence

No. Policy SS3 No 7 The development does not increase the risk of flooding in accordance with Policy EN11.

Policy EN11, No 1 - be informed by Melton Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the best available information covering all sources of flood risk ...

At no point does this document, which is at the very core of policies SS3 and EN11, mention the flood problems from watercourses and fluvial sources that affect Long Clawson. From their own records and reports, the Council are fully aware that the two culverts in Long Clawson are undersized and unfit for purpose. They are aware that both these watercourses cause property flooding and they are fully aware of surface water flooding and capacity problems in the sewerage and roadside drainage systems. None of this is considered or documented. Indeed, they state:-

There are clusters of smaller potential site options around the villages of Croxton Kerrial, Long Clawson and Waltham on the Wolds. The majority of these sites do not have watercourses flowing through them therefore development will not cause a loss of floodplain connectivity. However, the increase in permeable area if all sites were developed, could potentially increase surface water risk unless suitable SuDS are put in place.

Although these sites may not have watercourses flowing through them, no analysis has been undertaken to ascertain their drainage/water catchments areas and how they connect up with the Long Clawson culverts, which between them drain most of the land to the south of the village. There is no mention of watercourse flooding or fluvial flooding in Long Clawson.

If the core document to Policies SS3 and EN11 in the form of this Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is flawed, which our Sustainability Appraisal proves, then the credibility of the whole document is brought into question and with it the policies structured around its contents.

2.2 Policy SS3 2 Relates well to existing settlement.

Clawson is a linear village, the SHLAA puts forward numerous developments of between 20 and 55 houses, high-density, urban style housing estates tacked on to the edges of the village - this type of development does not respect the local vernacular of any village scene across the Borough or complement the setting and the character of the settlement and surrounding area. It seems the need to meet a 5 year house supply at this point, gives no consideration for the blending of development into existing, historic environments.

3.3 SS6 Melton should have stopped its Plan progressing 12 months ago and reviewed it as soon as the Six Hills Garden Village started to move forward. This proposal is now in for planning permission, but has not been included in the Plan's rural allocation. We are now faced with the following unsustainable situation:-

Continued/...

The Council has revised its housing needs upwards from the HEDNA figures so that it would still be able to build 4000 houses in Melton, a figure needed to justify a proposed by-pass. The Council could have gained the additional housing by reducing development away from Melton in the rural settlements.

The main development centre villages including Long Clawson, now have “permit” on 20 years supply of housing - the whole plan period - to be built in the next couple of years. How these villages are expected to absorb such a huge increase in housing in such a short space of time has not been assessed.

The capacity of the infrastructure in these locations to cope with such a dramatic increase has not been assessed.

The increase in traffic volumes traversing the Vale of Belvoir each day from the proposed main service centres of Waltham, Clawson and Bottesford has not been assessed.

The proposed main service centres are all north of Melton and most of the development land put forward for industrial development and the existing large employers in Melton are mainly based south of the town.

For the reasons listed above, we believe that the Melton Local Plan is unsound.

We request that the housing allocation for Long Clawson is reduced.

We request that “windfall” sites should be excluded from the village as this creep development is already contributing to property flooding (this is without 30% climate change factored in) and changing the village in an unplanned and wholly unsustainable manner.

As the Council has repeatedly ignored these issues and our correspondence, we appeal to you to protect Long Clawson from the impact of further unwarranted and unsustainable development.