

Response ID ANON-MWX6-MJD3-Z

Submitted to Melton Local Plan Update: Issues and Options Consultation
Submitted on 2024-01-04 11:55:32

About you

What is your name?

Name:
Jessica Herritty

What is your organisation? (if relevant)

Organisation:
Turley

What is your Job Title/Role (if relevant)

Job title/role:
Associate Director

What is your email address?

Email:
[REDACTED]

Are you making a submission on behalf of someone else?

Yes

If you are submitting on behalf of someone else, please provide details:

Name (on behalf of):
Taylor Wimpey UK Limited

Organisation (on behalf of):
Taylor Wimpey UK Limited

About you (equalities questions)

Please provide the first 5 digits of your Postcode (for example LE13 1).

Enter the first 5 digits of your postcode:
[REDACTED]

Gender: How do you identify?

[REDACTED]

If self-describe, please state :

Would you describe yourself as transgender?

[REDACTED]

What is your sexual orientation?

[REDACTED]

If other, please state:

What is your age?

[REDACTED]

Do you consider yourself to have a health problem or a disability which has lasted, or is expected to last at least 12 months?

[REDACTED]

If you selected other, please state:

What is your ethnic origin?

Please describe your ethnicity and race:

██████

What is your religion?

██████

Please state your religion:

Vision and objectives

Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 1: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 1 - Option 1: No change:

Strongly disagree

Question 1 - Option 2: Refocused and simplified version [preferred option]:

Somewhat agree

Question 2: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this section

Please, provide further context:

The Vision and Objectives should be reflective of the plan as a whole and as such, should be updated to draw upon the amended plan. It would benefit from simplicity, and should focus on the key objectives, including a need to deliver sustainable new homes to meet the current and future needs of the Borough and help address the housing crisis.

Question 3: What do you think are the most important objectives to be covered by our Vision? Please select your top 3

Question 3 - Improving facilities for all of the community and providing the new infrastructure needed to support our growing population:

3

Question 3 - Addressing the causes and effects of climate change:

Question 3 - Ensure local housing meets the local communities current and future needs:

1

Question 3 - Supporting a diverse, competitive and innovative rural economy:

Question 3 - Enhancing Melton Mowbray's town centre:

Question 3 - Promoting high quality and well-designed development to help create healthy, sustainable and safe communities:

2

Question 3 - Enhancing nature and minimising harm to the natural environment:

Question 3 - Other (please specify below):

Please, provide further context:

As above, ensuring current and future housing needs are met is a crucial objective and accords with paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which supports the objective of "significantly boosting the supply of houses". This is considered to be the number one priority for the Borough and therefore should be a core objective. Objectives 2 and 3 as above complement the first objective and would help to ensure and deliver a sustainable pattern of development to "meet the development needs of their area; align growth and infrastructure; improve the environment; mitigate climate change (including by making effective use of land in urban areas) and adapt to its effects", as set out by Paragraph 11 of the NPPF.

Policy SS1. Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development

Policy SS1: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 4: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 4 - Option 1: Delete the policy:

Neither agree nor disagree

Question 4 - Option 2: Amend the policy [preferred option]:
Neither agree nor disagree

Question 5: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

There is no need to reproduce the presumption in favour of sustainable development given it is contained within the NPPF.

Policy SS3. Sustainable Communities (unallocated sites)

Policy SS3: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 6: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 6 - Option 1: Delete the policy:

Question 6 - Option 2: Review the policy to better define meeting local need:

Question 6 - Option 3: Review the policy to enhance wider sustainability [preferred option]:

Question 7: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

Question 8: Under what circumstances do you think new homes in the borough's smallest and least sustainable settlements are justified?

Please, provide further context:

Question 9: Do you think criteria should be introduced to require homes built in the borough's smallest and least sustainable settlements to be built to the highest sustainability standards? If yes, what types of criteria do you think the policy should consider?

Please, provide further context:

Policy SS4. South Melton Mowbray Sustainable Neighbourhoods

Policy SS4: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 10: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 10 - Option 1: Delete the policy:

Question 10 - Option 2: Amend to reflect the 2021 Masterplan [preferred option]:

Question 11: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

Policy SS5. Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood

Policy SS5: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 12: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 12 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

Question 12 - Option 2: Amend to reflect the 2021 Masterplan [preferred option]:
Strongly agree

Question 13: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

The Melton North Sustainable Neighbourhood is a key part of the delivery strategy for the Local Plan and will help to deliver 1,700 dwellings, which constitutes almost 25% of the overall housing requirement. The provisions set out in the Masterplan have informed development which is already

underway. It is therefore appropriate to ensure the amended policy has reference to this Masterplan, with sufficient flexibility to account for potential changes in the future given the size of the allocation and its development timeframe. Some degree of flexibility will ensure the development can adapt to changes to market conditions and the needs of the local community.

Since adoption, revised education needs evidence has been produced which should be taken into consideration as the plan is updated. This notwithstanding, the overall viability of development must be a key consideration to ensure ultimate delivery of the Melton North Sustainable Neighbourhood.

The adopted policy also includes a requirement for "extra care housing" to meet the needs of the ageing population in accordance with Policies C2, C3 and C8. To support the planning application (Ref: 21/01198/OUT) for "Fields South of Spinney Farm, Melton Spinney Road, Melton Mowbray", Taylor Wimpey, Barwood Land and William Davies Ltd commissioned JLL to assess the extra care provision in relation to the delivery of the Melton North Sustainable Neighbourhood. This report (dated July 2020) forms Appendix 3 of the submitted Planning Statement (dated October 2021) supporting this application.

As part of their assessment JLL approached a number of care and extra care providers to assess the delivery of the site for a care or extra care facility. The care home providers analysed the key demographic data for Melton Mowbray as well as the development pipeline around the site. The providers concluded that the market is oversupplied. The extra care providers also noted the gradient of the site does not lend itself to flat access, a requirement which care providers and Government Guidance seeks to ensure for such development. In conclusion the Report suggested delivery of smaller adaptable housing within the allocation to deliver the extra care requirement would be more appropriate, which has informed the proposed development. As such, Policy SS5 should be amended to allow flexibility and enable development to cater for the needs of the ageing population as they arise, as opposed to explicitly referencing "extra care" accommodation as being a requirement of development to meet these needs.

Policy SS6. Alternative Development Strategies and Local Plan Review

Policy SS6: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 14: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 14 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

Question 14 - Option 2: Reduce to locally specific criteria only [preferred option]:
Somewhat disagree

Question 14 - Option 3: Additional criteria:
Somewhat agree

Question 15: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

It would be beneficial to acknowledge the importance of cross-boundary issues, including any unmet housing and employment needs that could be apportioned across the Housing Market Area. Having a policy which is responsive to this arising need would ensure there is no gap in strategic planning, and that the plan supports sustainable growth and the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes.

Definitions

Policy C2. Housing Mix

Policy C2: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 16: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 16 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

Question 16 - Option 2: Amend the policy [preferred option]:
Somewhat disagree

Question 17: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy
Please, provide further context

Please, provide further context:

We agree the policy may benefit from amendments to clarify when departures from the latest evidence on mix are appropriate and justified. However, we fundamentally disagree with the removal or revision of exclusion clauses in the policy such as "having regard to market conditions and economic viability". Criteria such as this are essential to ensure that challenging sites are deliverable and are responsive/can adapt to changes in the economy, locally and nationally. Removing this clause could threaten the delivery of major SUE sites contained in the plan, particularly given the significant costs they shoulder including the provision of major new infrastructure, and the time it takes for delivery of these sites. These sites form key parts of the

housing supply for the plan and therefore are intrinsic to meeting housing needs.

Should the policy be amended, we would instead recommend including additional clarifications around site specific characteristics or considerations (alongside market conditions and economic viability). This would reflect the fact that not all sites are alike, and not all sites can deliver the Council's optimal housing mix, particularly if they are required to provide substantial contributions or investment in major infrastructure.

Policy C3. National Space Standard and Smaller Dwellings

Policy C3: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 18: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 18 - Option 1: Delete the policy:

Somewhat disagree

Question 18 - Option 2: Amend the policy [preferred option]:

Somewhat disagree

Question 19: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

We support the objective of the policy but would caution against an inflexible policy which has no reference to specific site characteristics or considerations. Without any flexibility this could risk delivery of housing.

Definitions

Policy C4. Affordable Housing Provision

Policy C4: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 20: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 20 - Option 1: Delete the policy:

Somewhat disagree

Question 20 - Option 2: Amend the policy to reflect National Planning Policy Framework and new evidence [preferred option]:

Somewhat agree

Question 21: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

The amendment of this policy would bring it in line with the provisions of the NPPF and the local evidence base for the District. Providing the policy ensures consideration of viability.

Definitions

Policy C7. Rural Services

Policy C7: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 22: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 22 - Option 1: Delete the policy:

Question 22 - Option 2: Amend the policy [preferred option]:

Question 23: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

Policy C8. Self Build and Custom Build Housing

Policy C8: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 24: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 24 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Neither agree nor disagree

Question 24 - Option 2: Address increasing needs:
Neither agree nor disagree

Question 24 - Option 3: Address increasing needs and add local-specific criteria [preferred option]:
Somewhat disagree

Question 24 - Option 4: Adding the two optional local eligibility tests:
Neither agree nor disagree

Question 25: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

Reducing the threshold may introduce challenges for many sites, but we would welcome the inclusion of the exception criteria to address this.

Given the 5 year review identified issues with the effectiveness of the policy on the Sustainable Neighbourhoods, we would recommend this is reflected in any updated policy wording.

Policy C9. Healthy Communities

Policy C9: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 26: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 26 - Option 1: Delete the policy:

Question 26 - Option 2: Revise the policy but also make health and wellbeing a key thread that runs throughout the entire plan [preferred option]:
Somewhat agree

Question 27: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

The proposed amendments would bring the policy in line with the approach throughout the NPPF and particularly in relation to the social objectives of achieving sustainable development.

Question 28: Do you think the Local Plan should require Health Impact Assessments for large scale developments?

Unsure

Question 29: If you answered 'yes' to question 28, what size and types of development do you think should require them and why?

Please, provide further context:

It depends on the context. Some strategic allocations may justify a HIA, but a sensible trigger may be if the proposals are EIA Development, and it could be incorporated into the Environmental Statement (unless scoped out).

Policy EC1. Employment Growth in Melton Mowbray

Policy EC1: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 30: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 30 - Option 1: Delete the policy:

Question 30 - Option 2: Amendments to reflect Use Class Order, new evidence and National Planning Policy Framework:

Question 30 - Option 3: Create separate policies for employment allocations and employment development in Melton Mowbray:

Question 31: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

Question 32: Unless submitted already as part of the Employment-only Call for Sites (June-July 2023), is there any employment site you want us to consider as a potential allocation? If there is, please submit the details, including a location plan showing the boundaries to planningpolicy@melton.gov.uk and add a note in this section

Please, provide further context:

Definitions

Policy EC2. Employment Growth in the Rural Area (Outside Melton Mowbray)

Policy EC2: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 33: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 33 - Option 1: Delete the policy:

Question 33 - Option 2: Policy Wording Amendments [preferred option]:

Question 34: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

Policy EN2. Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Policy EN2: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 49: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 49 - Option 1: Delete the policy:

Strongly disagree

Question 49 - Option 2: Amend the policy:

Somewhat disagree

Question 49 - Option 3: Split the policy:

Somewhat agree

Question 50: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

In the interests of avoiding overcomplicating one policy, separating the policy out would potentially make the key requirements and criteria clearer for applicants and decision makers.

Definitions

Policy EN7. Open Space, Sport and Recreation

Policy EN7: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 56: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 56 - Option 1: Delete the policy:

Question 56 - Option 2: Update the policy, particularly the standards [preferred option]:

Somewhat agree

Question 57: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

Option 2 will bring the policy in line with the provisions of chapter 8 of the NPPF. However it must ensure that some flexibility is included, for instance in relation to new applications on sites which were allocated / approved in accordance with the current standards. It is suggested that site constraints are also included in the amended policy as a consideration for whether or not open space/recreation space can be provided or if off site contributions would otherwise be required.

Policy EN8. Climate Change

Policy EN8: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 58: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 58 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

Question 58 - Option 2: Delete the policy, and make climate change a 'core thread' that runs throughout the entire plan:
Somewhat disagree

Question 58 - Option 3: Retain but update policy EN8 and make climate change a core thread that runs throughout the entire plan [preferred option]:
Somewhat agree

Question 59: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

We agree with the identified need to update the policy, and the overall objectives. However, we would advise that policies around the sustainability of buildings should reflect the Government's policy for national technical standards (as per NPPF paragraph 159).

In addition, consultation on the Future Homes Standard is ongoing (concluding in March 2024). As such, this policy should avoid duplicating national policy in relation to energy efficiency and the reduction of carbon emissions for new homes since this would overburden the Local Plan and is considered unnecessarily repetitive.

Policy EN9. Ensuring Energy Efficiency and Low Carbon Development

Policy EN9: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 60: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 60 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

Question 60 - Option 2: Refocus the policy and split it into new more specific policies as required [Preferred approach]:
Strongly agree

Question 60 - Option 3: Make the policy more robust and specific, to ensure all new development meets the highest standards:
Strongly disagree

Question 61: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

Given the lack of clarity in the current policy as a result of regulatory changes, it is agreed that the policy should be revised to provide greater detail as to its requirements. We agree separating out the policy would make sense, and that it should largely reflect other standards, as advised by the NPPF.

As set out previously, consultation on the Future Homes Standard is ongoing (concluding in March 2024). As such, this policy should avoid duplicating national policy in relation to energy efficiency and the reduction of carbon emissions for new homes since this would overburden the Local Plan and is considered unnecessarily repetitive.

Policy EN10. Energy Generation from Renewable and Low Carbon Sources

Policy EN10: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 62: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 62 - Option 1: Delete the policy:

Question 62 - Option 2: Review the policy to ensure it works well for all types of renewable energy schemes [preferred approach]:
Strongly agree

Question 63: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

Given the requirements of the NPPF to address climate change and its approach to delivering sustainable development/environmental objectives, the updating of this policy is agreed.

Notwithstanding this, and as previously set out, consultation on the Future Homes Standard is ongoing (concluding in March 2024). As such, this policy should avoid duplicating national policy in relation to energy efficiency and the reduction of carbon emissions for new homes since this would overburden the Local Plan and is considered unnecessarily repetitive.

Policy EN11. Minimising the Risk of Flooding

Policy EN11: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 64: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 64 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

Question 64 - Option 2: Add new elements of national policy:
Somewhat disagree

Question 64 - Option 3: Restrict policy to strategic overview and local matters:
Somewhat agree

Question 65: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

Given that the NPPF and Practice Guidance have been updated since the drafting of this policy, along with the upcoming preparation of a new Strategic Flood Risk Assessment by the Council, it is agreed that this policy needs updating. There is no need to reproduce policy and guidance (e.g. NPPF/PPG) within the policy and therefore it should be drafted from a strategic perspective rather than increasing the length of the policy through greater detail.

Definitions

Policy EN12. Sustainable Drainage Systems

Policy EN12: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 66: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 66 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Somewhat disagree

Question 66 - Option 2: Incorporate additional requirements:
Somewhat disagree

Question 67: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

As with flood risk, there is sufficient drainage guidance set out elsewhere, such as in Planning Practice Guidance, which itself has reference to non-statutory technical standards that are available to guide decisions about the design, maintenance and operation of sustainable drainage systems (for example, Paragraph: 056 Reference ID: 7-056-20220825). As this best practice may change, we would recommend keeping the policy as simple as possible and avoiding any repetition of national policy and guidance.

Policy IN1. Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy

Policy IN1: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 68: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 68 - Option 1: Delete the policy:

Question 68 - Option 2: Reflect the latest position in the policy [preferred option]:
Somewhat agree

Question 69: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

Given the passage of time since the drafting of the adopted policy, it is agreed that it is revised to provide clarity regarding the current position while ensuring that the policy meets with the guidance set out in paragraph 34 of the NPPF. However, sufficient flexibility should be incorporated which acknowledges that contributions from private developers to fund the MMDR will be the subject of negotiation during the planning application process with the County Council. This would recognise that not every development will be capable of contributing to the new road, particularly where this would make a scheme unviable or where other contributions are prioritised.

Definitions

Policy IN2. Transport, Accessibility and Parking

Policy IN2: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 70: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 70 - Option 1: Delete the policy:

Question 70 - Option 2: Amend policy wording to align with national and local guidance [preferred option]:

Question 71: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

Policy D1. Raising the Standard of Design

Policy D1: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 74: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 74 - Option 1: Delete the policy:

Strongly disagree

Question 74 - Option 2: Review and strengthen policy so it sets out strategic principles for high quality new development [preferred option]:

Somewhat agree

Question 75: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

Additional clarity on the expectations for design quality and criteria against which they will be assessed would be welcome in terms of certainty for applicants. However, there is a balance to be struck, as excessive criteria may become overburdening and inappropriate for a number of sites. Further consideration is needed about how this balance is best achieved. We would recommend the use of SPDs, Design Codes and reference to national guidance and design code / guide.

It would be advisable to include the right caveats in the policy wording to ensure flexibility and deliverability across all sites.

Question 76: Do you think the current design policy criteria covers all design issues adequately, that the current policy works well? Would you like to suggest any criteria to be added or removed from the policy?

Please, provide further context:

Reference to national guidance and design code / guide, as well as local design codes.

Question 77: How important do you think each of the following design considerations are for a new development?

Question 77 - Attractiveness: creating a pleasant environment to live and work:

Very important

Question 77 - Sensitive to context: responds well to its surroundings:

Very important

Question 77 - Distinctiveness: builds upon the unique characteristics of its surroundings and creates a sense of place in itself (design features such as scale, massing, materials, landscaping and architectural detailing):

Quite important

Question 77 - Neighbour amenity: does not adversely affect neighbours and nearby uses:

Quite important

Question 77 - Legible places: places that are easily understood by their users, particularly when moving around.:

Quite important

Question 77 - Connectedness: created new and weaves into existing networks:

Quite important

Question 77 - Comprehensive: ensuring development is designed and delivered in a coordinated way, and avoiding piecemeal schemes:

Neutral

Question 77 - Safe and attractive streets and spaces: create spaces and environment that feels safe and secure to be in.:

Very important

Question 77 - Environmental sustainability and adapting to climate change:

Very important

Question 77 - Mix of uses: the right range of uses and densities:

Quite important

Question 77 - Protecting and enhancing heritage assets:

Quite important

Question 77 - Car parking:

Neutral

Question 77 - Community consultation: opportunities for community to get involved and help shape development proposals:

Quite important

Question 77 - Other: please state below any other key design considerations not highlighted above:

Please, provide further context:

Question 78: Do you think there is a need for specific policy guidance about the use of design coding within the local plan?

Yes

Question 79: If you responded 'yes' to question 78, please provide reasons?

Please, provide further context:

NPPF paragraph 133 requires local authorities to prepare design guides or codes consistent with the principles set out in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code, and which reflect local character and design preferences.

Equalities Impact

Question 80: Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010?

No

Question 81: If you responded 'yes'/'unsure' to question 80, please provide your reasons and whether there is anything that you think could be done to mitigate any impacts identified

Please, provide further context:

N/A

Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

Please use the comment box below to provide any information you would like us to consider in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

Please, provide a reference to the section and your comments: