



**MELTON LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION:
DAVIDSONS DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED**

Response to M1-1-3 Alignment with Neighbourhood Plans

Pegasus Group
4 The Courtyard
Church Street
Lockington
Derbyshire
DE74 2SL

Telephone: (01509) 670806 Facsimile: (01509) 672247

PPG Ref: EMS.2650

Date: March 2018

COPYRIGHT

The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of **Pegasus Group**

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Statement is made on behalf of Davidsons Developments in response to the further papers M1-1, M1-2 and M1-3 prepared by the Council following the Examination sessions. This Statement should be read in conjunction with submissions made ~~by~~ Davidsons Developments in relation to the Examination sessions, particularly in relation to Matter 5.
- 1.2 In the additional paper M1-2, the Council set out the following four alternative approaches to aligning the Local Plan with Neighbourhood Plans that are well progressed:
- Approach 1: Local Plan Takes Precedence;
 - Approach 2: Local Plan sits alongside NDP's;
 - Approach 3: Local Plan to defer to post examination NP's;
 - Approach 4: Local Plan to defer to NP's whenever they are made.
- 1.3 The paper advises that the Council favours Approach 3 with the inclusion of additional sites as reserve sites.
- 1.4 Additional Paper M1-1 provides a table comparing Local Plan allocations with allocations in advanced Neighbourhood Plans.
- 1.5 Additional Paper M1-3 then sets out a list of Suggested Main Modifications to reflect the Council's preferred approach on this matter.

2. Comments on the Council's Preferred Methodology

- 2.1 The issues and implications associated with the relationship between the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans was discussed at length at the Examination sessions.
- 2.2 The key issue for the Council is the need to provide certainty in the delivery of housing to ensure the housing requirements for the Borough can be met. The allocation of sites in identified Service Centres and Rural Hubs is the best way to achieve this.
- 2.3 It should also be noted that the housing requirement is set as a minimum requirement and therefore additional provision resulting from additional site allocations in the Local Plan or advanced Neighbourhood Plans is not an issue.
- 2.4 At the Examination sessions, officers indicated that the most appropriate approach would be to add sites to the local plan where necessary to

- ensure alignment with those Neighbourhood Plans which are well advanced (Approach 2). This is considered to be the most appropriate approach given the need to ensure the delivery of housing and the housing requirement set as a minimum.
- 2.5 For Long Clawson, Paper M1-2 suggests that the Local Plan Allocation LONG 4 becomes a reserve site due to the Council's recent resolution to grant planning permission on the Local Plan Reserve Site LONG5, Canal Farm.
- 2.6 Alongside the publication of the additional papers relating to Neighbourhood Plan alignment, the Council published an additional paper, M6-2 on approaches to the calculation of the five year land supply. Davidsons has made separate representations on this paper. In our submissions we consider the correct approach to the calculation of five year land supply is to apply the Sedgefield approach and not to include a stepped provision of housing as proposed by the Council. This would require the Council to make some additional allocations to ensure it could demonstrate a five year land supply at adoption of the plan. We suggest that, to address this shortfall, the Council should upgrade a number of identified Reserve Sites to full allocations.
- 2.7 On this basis we consider that the allocation LONG4, Sandpit Lane, Long Clawson, should remain an allocation and should not be identified as a reserve site as proposed by the Council.
- 2.8 In terms of Waltham on the Wolds, papers M1-1 and M1-2 suggest that there is a commitment in the Neighbourhood Plan to match Local Plan allocations and commitments.
- 2.9 This statement is not correct. Page 17 of the Referendum version of the Neighbourhood Plan is clear that as the allocations within the Submission Draft Local Plan located within the Limits to Development as set out in the Neighbourhood Plan meet the housing target, the Neighbourhood Plan does not therefore allocate any additional sites.
- 2.10 The Neighbourhood Plan does not include the Reserve Site WAL3, East of Melton Road as included in the Submission Draft Local Plan and that site is not included in the settlement limits. In our submissions on Matter 5 we argued that land at Bescaby Lane represented a more appropriate site and should be included in the Local Plan in place of WAL3.

- 2.11 It should be noted that at its Special Meeting on the 17th October 2017, the Planning Committee resolved to refuse the planning application for the land East of Melton Road due to conflicts with the emerging Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan and highways impacts, but, importantly, also because the development is out of scale with the existing built form and there are insufficient facilities to support a development of this size (Minute PL47.3, Planning Committee, 17th October 2017). It is difficult to see how the Local Plan can continue to support this allocation on this basis.
- 2.12 As set out in our submissions to the Examination sessions, the land at Bescaby Lane represents a more suitable reserve site, providing a development at a scale more in keeping with the existing built form and also the scale of proposed allocations in the village.
- 2.13 In the light of our submissions on M6-2 on how the Council should address the five year land supply shortfall, rather than being included as a preferable reserve site, the land Bescaby Lane should be included as an allocation to address the five year land supply shortfall arising from the correct application of the Sedgfield approach to the calculation of five year land supply.