

FOCUSED CHANGES RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED: Focused Change 11

APPENDIX 1 (k)

Representor Name	Focused Change /Policy Ref	Summary of Representation	MBC Response
Charles Skelton	FC11/13	Tenants of farms at Thorpe Arnold. Concerned about severance and other catastrophic impacts of the proposed distributor road.	The County Council has indicated that the design of road will take account of the need to maintain access, avoid severance and take account of needs of the farm business as far as possible. Details of the recommended route option and design for the eastern and northern sections of the MMDR are undergoing consultation at the time of writing, and responses can be made at www.leicestershire.gov.uk/mmdr . There will also be further opportunities to comment on the details of any proposed scheme at planning application stage.
Melanie Steadman	FC11 - Long Clawson transport	Refers to a 2016 "Community Speed Watch Scheme" whose results indicated traffic volumes twice that of England and the East Midlands Region for rural minor roads and slightly higher than that of England and the East Midlands urban roads, and to the nature of the road. MBC should consider the cumulative effects of development within the village and increased use of existing facilities, e.g. doctors. This effect is considered a severe highways problem, as per NPPF. Refers also to a recent High Court challenge from Cheltenham, and cite from Mr Justice Holgate's conclusions "Development proposals are likely to be acceptable if they can be accommodated within the existing capacity of the section (link or junction) of the strategic road network, or they do not increase demand for use of a section that is already operating at over-capacity levels". The Speed Watch results evidence that over-capacity already exists in our road system. Comment also on inadequacy of pavements, and its effect on quality of life. Refer to evidence base and SA undertaken on behalf of local residents that is in MBCs possession.	Development in Long Clawson and the associated traffic impacts will be assessed through the planning process as applications are submitted, at which point any necessary mitigation will be identified. At this stage there is nothing to suggest that there are any transport issues which it will not be possible to overcome through this process
Natural England	FC11 & IN1	Highlight that the MMDR will have an impact on the River Eye SSSI and that there are statutory obligations to safeguard wildlife that any detailed proposals will have to reflect. Seek engagement with authorities regarding the scheme.	The comments have been passed to the County Council who have advised that the recommended route option takes account of the River Eye SSSI. The County Council have also indicated that they are already in engagement with Natural England about this.

<p>Shout 4 Residents</p>	<p>FC11</p>	<p>FC11 – Melton Transport Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is the southern relief road starting from Burton Road to Leicester Road, if no permission has been given from the land owners? • If no permission has been given how will the road be delivered, Kirby lane is already a rat run and it has been said that Kirby Lane will become part of the southern relief road. • The priority of the building – houses or road first? • The timing of the road is crucial. Shouldn't there be more clarity on this, before decisions are made? • There appear to be 3 processes – local plan/eastern link plan/houses – 17 years for the eastern link road, this is a long time for Melton to cope with the number of houses and no relief road (this was more of a comment than an actual question) • Can it be confirmed where the relief roads will start & finish for the each area (North, South & East) • Plans identify gaps in the development of the road, why are they not joined up??? • Who's land is it going to cross and has permission been given to cross it? • What happens should the builders 'go bust'? • Has the proposal for a sports development on Burton Road and additional houses, been taken in to consideration with the local plan? Ask a range of questions about the MMTS, covering implementation in the absence of landowner permission, what will happen to Kirby Lane, timing compared to housing development, and seek clarity about sections and timing. Also ask if the sports village has been taken into account, and what happens if builders don't complete. 	<p>LCC or MBC can use Compulsory Purchase powers to acquire the land for the road. The alignment of the Southern Section of the Distributor Road will be determined through the master planning process for the southern sustainable neighbourhood – it is not known yet if this will be along Kirby Lane or not. Whilst it would be preferable to get the road put in before the houses, the southern MMDR will be implemented as sections of the SSN come forward. Through the development management process the county council will ensure that the traffic impacts of development are satisfactorily mitigated through interim arrangements until the MMDR in its entirety is completed.</p> <p>The County Council is pursuing Government Local Majors route funding for the Eastern and Northern sections of the MMDR . If this is successful, work will start in 2020, and be completed well before 2036.</p> <p>If builders go bust, the Council could implement the scheme and then recoup costs from whatever builder takes over the scheme. The Sports Village has been taken into consideration.</p> <p>The Corridor of Investigation (FC13) shows the broad extent of the proposed Distributor Road, from Leicester Road to Nottingham Road, going east of the town, with no gaps. Non willing landowners could be subject to compulsory purchase, as outlined in Policy IN1. The role of Kirby Lane will be established in the masterplanning of the Southern sustainable neighbourhood. The road is expected to be delivered with developer contributions and Government funding. It will be spent as soon as processes allow after agreement/receipt, but some housing is likely before all sections of the road are complete. For plans covering 15+ years, it is normal for not all the details to be known at an early stage. The sports village has been factored into the transport modelling for the road.</p>
<p>Michelle Galloway (obo Davidsons) Pegasus (Guy Longley),</p>	<p>FC11</p>	<p>Support for the proposed focussed change introducing the 'corridor of investigation' for the route of the MMDR. Recognition that to will be a key to unlocking the growth required in Melton Mowbray.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
<p>Michele Parker (Burton and Dalby PC)</p>	<p>FC11 IN1</p>	<p>Comments on the unsuitability of corridor of Investigation/Interest for the MMDR and the adverse impact of it and associated housing development on a scheduled ancient monument (SAM) and on the area of separation.</p>	<p>The purpose of the COI is to ensure that any proposed developments within the vicinity of the MMDR do not present a barrier to achieving its delivery, by ensuring that appropriate engagement takes place over this.</p> <p>Any adverse impacts on the AoS or the scheduled ancient monument would be as part of the wider development of the area. The Council's evidence (technical note prepared by Cotswold Archaeology) indicates that the proposed southern SUE land does not appear to have formed an important part of the setting of the SAM and that separation is not a key aspect of the SAM.</p>

Debbie Adams (part 1)	FC11, FC12, FC2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure inadequate now for 26,000, let alone population from a further 4,000 homes, and there is no guarantee that the required infrastructure to support increase would be provided. No certainty of Government or developer funding for another 2 years, therefore how can SSNs that depend on it be viable and the plan found sound in advance of funding certainty? would prefer current congestion and no housing, rather than 4000 new homes as possible new road. • No certainty that road would be built to an appropriate design, e.g. for farm machinery and HGVs. • inadequate provision for alternatives (bus, walking, cycling), and that standards for new development are not being applied to existing areas, e.g. bus stops within 400m homes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions to the MMDR will be a condition of any planning permission granted for new development dependent on it. The viability study underpinning the Local Plan indicates the SSNs will be viable, and with a 25 year time period, it is normal for a local plan to set out proposals for things for which all the details are not yet certain. • The broad design standards for the MMDR are set out in Focused Change 11, and the road would also be required to meet DfT Design Manual for Roads and Bridges standards. • When the northern and eastern sections of the MMDR are complete, this will have a significant traffic benefit for the town as a whole, allowing appropriate routes and transport choices for travel within and around the town. To support this aim, additional measures to improve walking, cycling and public transport connectivity within the town are currently being investigated and will be included as appropriate within the Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy. Developer contributions have to be fairly and reasonably related to the development and cannot be used to address existing issues unless this is the case, but some improvements necessary for development are nonetheless likely to benefit the town as a whole, e.g. providing increased bus frequency or penetration of services.
Debbie Adams (part 2)	FC11, FC12, FC2	<p>How is MMDR going to cross the MCP/Who pays? The route should be finalised now.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are limited opportunities for sustainable transport in Melton. • Can the construction time be limited to 5 years? • LCC has a conflict of interest, as part landowner and local highway authority. • Safety issues mean access should only be on one side of the MMDR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Northern part of the MMDR (A606 Nottingham Road to Melton Spinney Road) will be included in the business case for DfT funding that is currently being prepared by the County Council. If the business case does not result in further funding being awarded towards the scheme by the DfT, it would be provided as part of the overall masterplanning of the northern SUE, by the developers of that area. Details of the proposed route of the MMDR are undergoing consultation at the time of writing. Responses to the consultation can be made at www.leicestershire.gov.uk/mmdr, and will be used to further assess the recommended route and make revisions to this as necessary. A final recommended route will then be presented to Leicestershire County Council's Cabinet for consideration. Once a recommended route has been determined by LCC's Cabinet, this will in turn enable the route corridor to be further refined and more detailed design to be undertaken. There will further opportunity to comment on the detailed design of the distributor road when a planning application for the road is submitted. • In order to deliver transport infrastructure of the scale and nature of the MMDR, it is necessary to adopt a flexible approach to achieving this due to uncertainties about when public (including central Government) and/or developer funding will become available, as well as to allow sufficient lead in times to complete necessary processes. As such, it is not feasible to set a limit on the build period to 5 years. • Melton Borough Council determined development locations through the Local Plan process. Subsequent to this, the LHA has worked with MBC to identify the infrastructure required to support the proposed distribution of growth, which has resulted in the MMDR being identified as necessary infrastructure. The LHA has provided advice to MBC independent of any considerations in terms of land ownership. All landowners are being consulted and would be expected to make an appropriate contribution towards the scheme. • Safety considerations concerning access to the MMDR (including from adjacent developments) are being considered as part of the planning and design process for the road.
Susan Love	FC11, IN1	<p>Money would be better spent on public transport rather than roads.</p>	<p>The transport strategy is based on evidence about what is required to support the growth ambitions for Melton Mowbray. In this context, major new highway infrastructure was found to be a necessary component of the transport measures required to address existing and future traffic and transport issues, leading to the identification of the MMDR as the central element of the strategy. However, the MMDR is only part of the solution and other measures within the town, including public transport (as well as walking and cycling) options are also being considered and will form part of the overall transport strategy.</p>

Anthony Maher	FC11	8.3.3/8.3.4 – Need to give more priority to generating more jobs in the Borough in line with housing growth, and investing in public transport if reducing need to travel is to be achieved. 8.3.19 Obtain government funds for the distributor road before any further development takes place.	The section referred to is within the transport section of the plan. The objectives of the plan overall elsewhere prioritise economic growth. The timing of delivery of sections of the road will be dependent on when funding is available, but the County Council and MBC are working to secure it as soon as possible, though developer contributions and Government funding.
Anthony Maher	FC11, SS5	Will not reduce car use. The MMDR should be funded and implemented before any housing is built. There is conflict between the use of Melton Country park as a commuter route and its recreation and biodiversity role. Also QE2 Fields Trust status does not allow lighting.	The planning process will be used to identify and secure anything that is deemed necessary to make specific development proposals which are in addition to measures set out in policy SS5 or the Local Plan as a whole. We would ideally like to see the distributor road constructed in its entirety ahead of housing delivery. However, in order to deliver transport infrastructure of the scale and nature of the MMDR, it is necessary to adopt a flexible approach to achieving this due to uncertainties about when public (including central Government) and/or developer funding will become available. This may mean having to accept that the scheme will be delivered in phases aligned to housing delivery. Should the MMDR ultimately be delivered through a phased approach, any necessary interim measures would be secured through the planning process.
Melton North Action Group	FC11, SS4	SS4 - Infrastructure should be provided at the same time as development, otherwise the Sustainable Neighbourhood is 'unsustainable'. Quotes from a CLG Committee report of session that says "It is important that infrastructure provision takes place at the same time as housing development, or the development will be unsustainable" followed by a recommendation to Government. MLP should not be advanced until funding for road secured.	We would ideally like to see the distributor road constructed in its entirety ahead of housing delivery and are actively exploring opportunities to achieve this. However, in order to deliver transport infrastructure of the scale and nature of the MMDR, it is necessary to adopt a flexible approach to achieving this due to uncertainties about when public (including central Government) and/or developer funding will become available. This may mean having to accept that the scheme will be delivered in phases aligned to housing delivery. Should the MMDR ultimately be delivered through a phased approach, any necessary interim measures would be secured through the planning process. On the same basis, it is not feasible to set a limit on the build period to 5 years.. Certainty of funding is generally not a soundness issues for investment that extends beyond the first 5 years after a plan is adopted. It is accepted that there will be some uncertainty in plans that are for at least 15 years ahead.

<p>Melton North Action Group</p>	<p>FC11, SS5</p>	<p>It's not clear where funding for the Melton County Park section down to Grantham Road will come from. No committed funding for mitigation of 'demonstrably sufficient magnitude' to accommodate uplifted housing numbers since Jacobs study. Is enough money being put aside to fund public transport links to town, station and surgery? Also not enough highway space to improve cycling and walking. Melton CP Greenway does not take account of Trust status that prevents lighting, that it is only useable in daylight, and that it could adversely affect wildlife. LCC have a conflict of interest as both landowner and local highway authority. Suggest a loan to cover MCP section of MMDR, to be repaid as devts come forward. There should be a 5 year maximum construction period for the road. Development should only be on one side of the proposed MMDR for safety reasons. Spell out what is meant by "some development" as mentioned in 8.3.19. Corridor of interest clause is too vague</p>	<p>This section will either be Government funded or from contributions from the developers across the whole of the northern SSN, as indicated in the policy and the IDP. The mitigation alluded to is the package of measures that will be proposed through the Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy, which includes the MMDR. The Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy will set out what is needed in terms of overall transport provision within the town. Necessary public transport links will be secured through the planning process. The MMTS will investigate opportunities to improve walking and cycling infrastructure within the town, including new opportunities created by the delivery of the delivery of the MMDR. Specific walking and cycling improvements will also be secured through the planning process where this is necessary to support development. Melton Borough Council determined development locations through the Local Plan process. Subsequent to this, the LHA has worked with MBC to identify the infrastructure required to support the proposed distribution of growth, which has resulted in the MMDR being identified as necessary infrastructure. The LHA has provided advice to MBC independent of any considerations in terms of land ownership. All landowners are being consulted and would be expected to make an appropriate contribution towards the scheme. The County Council and Borough Council are being proactive in seeking appropriate funding sources, including Government funding, and contributions from developers through the planning process and in future, through CIL. Safety considerations concerning access to the MMDR (including from adjacent developments) are being considered as part of the planning and design process for the road. The development referred to would be any planning applications whose traffic impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated in advance of completion of the full MMDR. Planning permissions will only be granted where satisfactory mitigations for traffic impact can be achieved, including through a phased approach. The Corridor of Interest relates to Policy IN1 and is the first step towards securing the transport improvements necessary to address issues identified. its purpose is to ensure that any proposed developments within the vicinity of the MMDR do not present a barrier to achieving its delivery, by ensuring that appropriate engagement takes place over this.</p>
<p>Adrian Vincent</p>	<p>Section 8.3.13 - 8.3.17</p>	<p>In general support the plan to route the Distributor Road to the East of Town. However, the change to the East has been made quite recently and has not been adequately consulted upon, the route is inadequately undefined, and even the preferred corridor will not be known until late in 2017. Not enough detail to know whether villages of Thorpe Arnold and Burton Lazars and other residential areas will have adverse effects from 60mph sections.</p>	<p>Reference to proposals for an Eastern section to the MMDR were included in the pre Submission Draft Local Plan in November 2016, and the Council agreed the prioritisation of a preferred route and business case for the development of the eastern section of an outer relief road at its meeting on 20th July 2016. Details of the recommended route option and design for the eastern and northern sections of the MMDR are undergoing consultation at the time of writing, and responses can be made at www.leicestershire.gov.uk/mmdr. There will also be further opportunities to comment on the details of any proposed scheme at planning application stage, and the impact on Burton Lazars will be considered as part of these processes.</p>
<p>Derek Fraser</p>	<p>FC11</p>	<p>Queries realism about proposed bus useage given reduced services and useage now. Also car parking in town needs sorting before new houses are built. Melton doesn't have good public transport links. Needs a significant increase in car parking in the town, possibly a multi storey car park.</p>	<p>Comments noted. More housing is likely to increase the demand for services and support service levels. Providing more car parking can encourage people to make more journeys by car where there are sustainable travel alternatives. The Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy will look at a range of transport meassurs to address th transport issues of the town.</p>

Derek Fraser	FC11, FC10, ID	The relief road should come before housing is built. The funding is uncertain from developers due to other planning requirements, and from Government, so there is a risk that the roads will never be built, resulting in vastly increased congestion.	We would ideally like to see the distributor road constructed in its entirety ahead of housing delivery and are actively exploring opportunities to achieve this. However, in order to deliver transport infrastructure of the scale and nature of the MMDR, it is necessary to adopt a flexible approach to achieving this due to uncertainties about when public (including central Government) and/or developer funding will become available. This may mean having to accept that the scheme will be delivered in phases aligned to housing delivery. Should the MMDR ultimately be delivered through a phased approach, any necessary interim measures would be secured through the planning process. Contributions to the MMDR will be a condition of any planning permission granted for new development dependent on it. The viability study underpinning the Local Plan indicates the SSNs will be viable taking account of all developer contributions that will be needed.
Martin Lusty, WOTWTA NP Group	FC11.	This section fails to acknowledge the recently announced government strategy in respect of electric vehicles. There is a need for charging points throughout the Borough and the infrastructure to support them.	The Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy will be developed in accordance with current Government guidance and will be reviewed at appropriate points thereafter to ensure it remains consistent with the latest legislation and guidance including to reflect technological advances.
Maurice Bell		Provides detailed comments on engineering, highway safety and design aspects of the proposed distributor road and provides potential solutions to the issues identified, including for the areas in the town centre where traffic flows would be reduced. These comments supplement representations made at Pre Submission Draft stage.	Comments noted and have been passed on to the County Council for their consideration. They will be considered in developing the Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy.
Yvonne Rowe	FC13/FC11	Relief road should by pass Burton Lazars, to avoid putting more traffic on the route through Burton Lazars. The Corridor of Interest threatens coalescence of Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars, and encroaches onto an Area of Separation that should be protected.	The matters here are considered in the material presented as part of the ongoing MMDR recommended route option consultation. See www.leicestershire.gov.uk/mmdr . The purpose of the COI is to ensure that any proposed developments within the vicinity of the MMDR do not present a barrier to achieving its delivery, by ensuring that appropriate engagement takes place over this.
Leicester City	FC11, 12	The changes appear not to have addressed the issues raised in Pre-Submission Local Plan representation regarding acknowledging any potential strategic transport impacts outside Melton Borough. Cite what they consider to be the possible traffic impacts on the existing transport network for routes coming into the city, including the A47, A607 and A46. As such, mitigation measures for Leicester’s highway network may be required, to be established through strategic transport modelling. The draft Local Plan also does not acknowledge existing strategic infrastructure, such as Birstall Park and Ride, that could be utilised to help to address any increase in people travelling into the city by car.	A response to the PSD representation was provided in the published schedules at www.meltonplan.co.uk . The focused changes have not altered the Liocal highway authority's (previously stated) view on the wider transport impacts of the Melton Local Plan. The Plan seeks to respond to existing levels of out migration by providing employment and housing opportunities within the local area with a view to reducing out commuting.
Adam Murray obo Lomas Family	FC11	MMDR Corridor of interest passes through land holding, and implementation of road will cause severance of the farm holding, adversely impact the family’s homes and their business at Eye Kettleby Lakes. Consider it highly unlikely that any employment land use will generate sufficient value to fund the road.	The text of FC11 indicate that the COI is not a set route; that will be determined through further consultation associated with at least at planning application stage. The specific impacts cannot be understood until a detailed line and design is in place. The viability study carried out to support the local plan indicates that the southern SUE proposal as a whole has sufficient value in it to deliver the road as a whole.

David Adams		<p>Who will fund the section of MMDR north of the Melton Country Park? Road should be built before the houses. Suggests that funding from Government unlikely to be forthcoming as economic benefits are greater elsewhere, even in Leicestershire. The swap of road contributions from affordable housing is a subsidy to the developer; if the road was dropped, this money wouldn't be thrown away. The developments proposed are unsustainable without the ring road, and the ring road will not bring any benefits to the town. Concerned about impacts if road does not materialise.</p>	<p>The section north of the country park will either be Government funded or from contributions from the developers across the whole of the northern SSN. The timing of delivery of sections of the road will be dependent on when funding is available. Evidence to date shows that the MMDR scheme is capable of achieving high value for money as defined by central government guidance. This places the scheme in a strong position to receive future government funding. There is only a limited amount of value from development that can be captured for planning purposes, so an appropriate compromise on competing planning objectives had to be met in the use of such funds, between the road, CIL and affordable housing. Contributions towards the road are not thrown away – they are vital to the overall delivery of the MMDR. The sustainability of the Northern SUE and Southern SUE proposals are considered in their entirety, including schools, roads, etc. provision. The package overall is sustainable. The MMDR scheme will provide various benefits to the town including expansion of key growth locations, opportunity to improve active travel within the town, reducing journey times, improving air quality, and reducing noise and vibration levels.</p>
Emilie Carr (Historic England)	FC11	<p>Historic England object to the 'corridor of interest' / 'corridor of investigation', due to the setting impact upon the significance of the Scheduled Monument of St Mary and St Lazarus Hospital. Seek removal of the section of the CoI to the south of the southern SUE. The road should be incorporated within a Policy SS4 boundary that reverts to the Pre Submission draft version.</p>	<p>The purpose of the COI is to ensure that any proposed developments within the vicinity of the MMDR do not present a barrier to achieving its delivery, by ensuring that appropriate engagement takes place over this. Any adverse impacts on the AoS and on the scheduled ancient monument would be as part of the wider development of the area. The Council's evidence (technical note prepared by Cotswold Archaeology) indicates that the proposed southern SUE land does not appear to have formed an important part of the setting of the SAM and that separation is not a key aspect of the SAM.</p>
Ray Ranns	FC11/IN2	<p>Criteria (1) to (5) cannot generally be achieved in the villages. It is in conflict with the spatial strategy that requires 35% of new developemt to be in villages.</p>	<p>The local plan are to be read as a whole. Policy SS2 sets out the overall spatial strategy. Policy IN2 is to identify the transport considerations for development that is appropriate according to other policies in the plan, including the spatial strategy. The criteria fo Policy IN2 apply after the spatial hierarchy policy (Policy SS2) has been applied.</p>
Anthony Rivero, Network Rail	8.3.16	<p>Suggests a change to reflect consideration of the impact of the MMDR on the railway line, along the lines of:"impact on Existing and future residents, the Melton to Peterborough railway line and on the environment and ecology along the route".</p>	<p>This suggested change could be put forward as a minor modification. Note that LCC are currently engaging with Network Rail as part of the MMDR scheme development process.</p>
Laurence Holmes (obo LCC and Richborough Estates) , ANON-7VBY-7HEF-J	FC11/IN1	<p>The supporting wording for Policy IN1 should reflect the need to align the Melton Mowbray Distributor Road route with the northern boundary of the allocation site, therefore ensuring the maximum capacity of the site can be reached. Also, there is a need for flexibility in the wording of Policy IN2 to ensure that this road can be delivered in sections, as necessary due to the need for separate planning permissions within the NSN.</p>	<p>The County Council are currently carrying out a consultation on the preferred alignment of the Northern and Eastern sections of the Distributor Road. The final alignment of the raod will need to reflect the outcome of that consultation. The County Council hopes to be successful in its bid for funding this section of the MMDR. Otherwise, the assesment of whether sections of the road can be brought forward in stages will take place through the development management process and will be dependent on appropriate alternative mitigation of traffic impact in the interim.</p>
Laurence Holmes (obo NMLC) (ANON-7VBY-7HER-X)	Policy IN1 and IN2	<p>Alignment of MMDR should reflect the northern SSN boundary. Reiterate that there should be flexibility in wording to allow flexibility of Northern MMDR to be delivered in sections. It will be important to align junction design and delivery with access arrangements required to facilitate development with the NSN.</p>	<p>Alignment of MMDR is the subject of current recommended route consultation by LCC. This point was addressed in response to Pre Submission draft representation. The Plan has not made this prescriptive and considered it would be premature to do so until full investigation of the ability to do so have been completed, as there may be practical reasons why , in parts, it is not possible. These will be explored by the design work currently underway. This should be read in conjunction with FC 11 which identifies the 'corridor of investigation' for the route of the MMDR, also recognising it cannot yet be prescriptive.</p>
Colin Love (Professor)	FC11	<p>MMDR - Needs to be a strong environmental case for it, not economic.</p>	<p>The MMDR is to address environmental issues of localised congestion and air pollution as well as to support and facilitate economic growth and new housing.</p>