

Response ID ANON-13H4-7YW1-R

Submitted to **Melton Local Plan Pre-Submission Draft**
Submitted on **2016-12-16 19:54:42**

About you

1 What is your name?

Name:

Dr James Philip Clifford Harding

2 What is your email address?

Email:

[REDACTED]

3 Are you responding as an individual, consultee, stakeholder or other?

Resident

If Consultee, Stakeholder, or Other, please give details here. :

4 Address

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

5 Age

Please select your age:

[REDACTED]

Chapter 1: Introduction

1 CH1Q1: Do you consider that Chapter 1 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

No

2 CH1Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH1Q3: Please give details of why you consider Chapter 1 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Chapter 1 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

The proposed large increase in housing in Bottesford would overwhelm the village's (not 'town's') infrastructure with regard to traffic, parking, sewerage, schools, health facilities, shopping and leisure. As an ex employee of the Environment Agency I know that Bottesford is in a high flood risk area of the Trent plain totally unsuited to further disproportionate development which would put many more people at risk of flooding and increase the runoff that often causes the flash flooding such as has occurred in the village in the past. Bottesford parish is far away from the main centres of employment and a ludicrous choice for extra housing: there are several other more suitable brownfield sites well known to the planners far away in Melton Mowbray. Last but not least such irresponsible development will destroy the character of a beautiful Leicestershire village.

4 CH1Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make Chapter 1 legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make Chapter 1 legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Carry out sound and published investigations into the needs and impact on Bottesford relating to flood risk, traffic, parking, sewerage, schools, health facilities, shopping and leisure. Provide feedback to those Bottesford residents who have heard nothing from MBC in response to their comments on the earlier emerging options and draft plan.

Provide clear reasons why a totally disproportionate number of new houses has been proposed for Bottesford rather than other more suitable brownfield sites closer to employment and facilities in the borough.

Chapter 3: Vision and Strategic Priorities

1 CH3Q1: Do you consider that Chapter 3 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

2 CH3Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 2) Justified, 3) Effective, 4) Consistant with National Policy

3 CH3Q3: Please give details of why you consider Chapter 3 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Chapter 3 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

This extract from the above statement says it all!:

"The strong historic and landscape character of the Borough will be as apparent and cherished as ever, and new development will be notable for the success with which it has been reflective of that character and integrated into its setting".

The totally disproportionate proposal for large numbers of totally unnecessary new houses in Bottesford is totally at odds with this stated aim!

4 CH3Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make Chapter 3 legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make Chapter 3 legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Carry out sound and published investigations into the needs and impact on Bottesford relating to flood risk, traffic, parking, sewerage, schools, health facilities, shopping and leisure. Provide feedback to those Bottesford residents who have heard nothing from MBC in response to their comments on the earlier emerging options and draft plan.

Provide clear reasons why a totally disproportionate number of new houses has been proposed for Bottesford rather than other more suitable brownfield sites closer to employment and facilities in the borough.

Policy SS1 - Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development

1 CH4PSS1Q1: Do you consider that Policy SS1 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

No

2 CH4PSS1Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH4PSS1Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy SS1 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy SS1 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

The term 'sustainable' is frequently glibly applied and misunderstood. It is clearly not 'sustainable' to swamp a flood-prone rural village, lacking in all types of infrastructure and far away from amenities and employment, with unnecessary new housing that will destroy its character forever.

4 CH4PSS1Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Carry out sound and published investigations into the needs and impact on Bottesford relating to flood risk, traffic, parking, sewerage, schools, health facilities, shopping and leisure. Provide feedback to those Bottesford residents who have heard nothing from MBC in response to their comments on the earlier emerging options and draft plan.

Provide clear reasons why a totally disproportionate number of new houses has been proposed for Bottesford rather than other more suitable brownfield sites closer to employment and facilities in the borough.

Policy C1 (A) – Housing Allocations

1 CH5PC1(A)Q1: Do you consider that Policy C1 (A) is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH5PC1(A)Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH5PC1(A)Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy C1 (A) – Housing Allocations is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy C1 (A) – Housing Allocations or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

The proposed large increase in housing (427) in Bottesford would overwhelm the village's (not 'town's') infrastructure with regard to traffic, parking, sewerage, schools, health facilities, shopping and leisure. As an ex employee of the Environment Agency I know that Bottesford is in a high flood risk area of the Trent plain totally unsuited to further disproportionate development which would put many more people at risk of flooding and increase the runoff that often causes the flash flooding such as has occurred in the village in the past. Bottesford parish is far away from the main centres of employment and a ludicrous choice for extra housing: there are several other more suitable brownfield sites well known to the planners far away in Melton Mowbray. Last but not least such irresponsible development will destroy the character of a beautiful Leicestershire village.

4 CH5PC1(A)Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Carry out sound and published investigations into the needs and impact on Bottesford relating to flood risk, traffic, parking, sewerage, schools, health facilities, shopping and leisure. Provide feedback to those Bottesford residents who have heard nothing from MBC in response to their comments on the earlier emerging options and draft plan.

Provide clear reasons why a totally disproportionate number of new houses has been proposed for Bottesford rather than other more suitable brownfield sites closer to employment and facilities in the borough.

Examination

1 EXQ1: Can your representation seeking a change be considered by written representations or do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

Written Representations

If you wish to speak at examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary::

2 EXQ2: Moreover please indicate if you wish to continue to be involved in the Local Plan (Please tick appropriate boxes).

If you wish to be notified at the address/e-mail provided when the Melton Local Plan is submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government, If you wish to be notified at the address/e-mail provided when the Inspector's Report is available to view, If you wish to be notified at the address/e-mail provided in Part A when the Melton Local Plan is adopted, If you/your organisation wish to be included in future consultations on the Melton Local Plan

Acknowledgement

1 I understand the above statement and agree I have complied with its requirements

I agree