

# Response ID ANON-13H4-7YDC-Q

Submitted to **Melton Local Plan Pre-Submission Draft**  
Submitted on **2016-12-17 13:43:30**

## About you

### 1 What is your name?

Name:

Anthony Paphiti

### 2 What is your email address?

Email:

[REDACTED]

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

Resident, Community Group

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

### 4 Address

[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::

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

Yes

### 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?

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. :

There is what appears to be disconnects with

1. the visions for the future (satellite, industrial, historic/tourism) and
2. the transport facilities needed to cope with any significant growth flowing from 1.

**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:**

This is answered in other comments made

## **Chapter 2 - Melton Borough Today – A Portrait**

**1 CH2Q1: Do you consider that Chapter 2 is?**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::**

Yes

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

Yes

**2 CH2Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?**

**3 CH2Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy Chapter 2 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 2 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

**Please insert text here. :**

The question in each section of this Consultation asking for agreement whether a policy is "legally sound" is not one a layman can answer - that is for a planning lawyer to assess. Laymen are not competent to do so.

It would be disingenuous to rely on answers to this question by ordinary consultees as any form of endorsement of the legality of the policy in question.

**4 CH2Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make Chapter 2 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 2 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:**

Obtain independent advice from a planning lawyer, rather than request agreement from lay consultees who are not in a position to assess legal compliance.

## **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::**

No

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

No

**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

**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. :**

I make no comment on legal compliance, as this is the remit of an independent planning lawyer. Lay persons answering this consultation are not competent to make this assessment unless they work in the area of planning and are conversant with planning law.

My comments throughout this consultation do display a degree of dismay although, in principle, it is felt that the plan is headed in the right direction - but it has made some unfortunate detours through the metaphorical long grass.

While this Chapter is described as a "vision" it is difficult to perceive it as such, as it is confused between several "visions". The question I would ask is, how do you see a future Melton Mowbray, as (1) a satellite town with little industry; (2) a satellite town with more industry; (3) an historic market town that preserves its innate character as melded to the surrounding countryside?

For example, how can "vision 3" be consonant with the proposals for massive housing expansion, adding up to 12,000 more people? This cannot be done unless you create a town within a town. This is what the Germans call the Altstadt ie the old town, which is a way of preserving character and history with development going on around it. But, even if that is a possibility, I do not see it discussed anywhere in the MLP.

MLP envisages "6,125 homes and some 51 hectares of employment land between 2011 and 2036 in Melton Borough. " That equates to a minimum increase of 12,250 people, calculated at an average of 2 per household. If one factors in children, the number grows further, placing additional pressures on roads/transport, schools and medical services. According to the Leicester and Leicestershire Partnership, ([https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2016/10/11/Melton\\_eastern\\_distributor\\_road.pdf](https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2016/10/11/Melton_eastern_distributor_road.pdf)) Melton "Borough covers 48,138 hectares and has a population of 50,400" as at the ONS Census 2011.

MLP does the opposite to "Strengthens and enhances Melton Mowbray's role as a historic market town", by providing a nightmare scenario which turns Melton into a sort of satellite city for Leicester/Nottingham, totally stifling its uniqueness and character and changing that character irreparably. Instead of focusing on how Melton can develop its current tourism, which has so much potential, it is majoring on a mix between industrial development and a dormitory town. One thing is clear, that with an additional minimum of 12,000 people, will be the need to provide local jobs. The knock-on effects of which are glossed over.

The internal road infrastructure will not be solved by constructing a ring road - something that has been debated since 1969.

Rail and bus links are not conducive to the expansion planned. Try and get a train back in the evening after about 9pm - is there even a rail link to Nottingham? The rail station would probably need expanding, to carry greater numbers (from the current 2/3 carriage trains). As for bus services, these are being reduced in frequency, especially to outlying villages. As there will be more demand from increased inhabitants, this will place even greater strain on these already strained services which have been scaled back as cost saving measures take hold. As I see it, services are shrinking, not expanding, including the constant threat of closure and under-use of St Mary's hospital.

The concomitant social issues arising from large scale housing expansion have been avoided altogether. There is no discussion on plans for policing a much larger, population intensive area, inhabited by people moving in from cities and other diverse communities to what is/was a small market town. This is such a major concern that it sits as "the elephant in the room". The duty of care requires there to be thorough inquiry, reporting and discussion on this issue, as it has a serious potential impact upon the community. At present, one hardly ever sees a policeman (ie a Police Constable) on duty in the town.

Building more houses does not Retain "the character of the countryside whilst supporting land-based industries and tourism opportunities". Houses need land. Around Melton that land is rural farming land which complements the countryside. The proposal for industrial scale expansion of Melton's housing will damage the character of the countryside.

The provision stating "Provides the necessary infrastructure to support economic and population growth" caters for manufactured rather than natural growth. Housing is being expanded on the huge scale proposed to meet a government target and is not being driven by local demand.

**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:**

Many of the statements are not even aspirations but, rather, platitudes that for the reasons given, simply do not compute with the proposals in the Local Plan.

There needs to be a proper connection between housing growth and demand, in turn linked to concrete evidence of availability of employment opportunities. In those cases where the employment opportunities will be external to the town (ie Leicester/Nottingham) there must be a clearly articulated plan, rather than anodyne aspirational statements, to show how transport concerns will be addressed in a time frame commensurate with town expansion.

## **Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – The Spatial Strategy**

**1 CH4Q1: Do you consider that Chapter 4 is?**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::**

No

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

No

**2 CH4Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?**

2) Justified

**3 CH4Q3: Please give details of why you consider Chapter 4 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 4 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

**Please insert text here. :**

In relation to the duty to cooperate, you have defined this as a "requirement for local planning authorities to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities and other public bodies across local boundaries on strategic priorities, such as development requirements which cannot wholly be met within one local authority area."

What the policy makes clear is that it is "The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2014" which "identifies Melton Borough as forming part of the Leicester & Leicestershire Housing Market Area." It is that assessment ie not a local one (ie Melton), which "identifies an Objectively Assessed Need for the equivalent of 245 new dwellings each year for the Borough of Melton between 2011 and 2036".

This exposes the fact that housing expansion is in response to government targets rather than need/demand and, importantly, that Melton is allocated a share of housing which it must meet. It seems that other policies about transport and industry are being made to fit around this requirement.

For the Ward of Gaddesby, over the 10 year period 2004 – 2014 population has grown by only 68, that is, under 7 people per year, across all villages in the Ward (see Figure 2.5).

In contrast, the MLP states (§4.2.21), " Together these 5 villages, Asfordby, Hose, Scalford, Stathern and Great Dalby, have a shortfall of 162 houses which need to be identified in other locations." Where the "shortfall" comes from is unclear. However, the Local Plan is proposing building 72 houses in Great Dalby alone, thereby increasing its current population of 544 by about 288 (on an average of 3/household). This is in a population which has hardly grown since 1851, when it had 479 inhabitants!

In the statistical analysis for Gaddesby, Figure A5.1: Population by Broad Age Group (2014), it shows a reduced population in the 16-64 year age group. It is hoped that affordable housing will keep young people in the villages.

**4 CH4Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make Chapter 4 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 4 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:**

Meet local expectations about town and housing expansion, rather than follow external diktats from LCC about what is good for the Borough. Stop creating an expansion which will then have to be filled by importing people into the borough from urban areas, when there isn't the transport, medical, educational, or employment infrastructure there to support them. These proposals do not address need. They address policy.

## **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::**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::**

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

**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?**

**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. :**

**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:**

## **Policy SS4 – South Melton Mowbray Sustainable Neighbourhood (Strategic Development Location)**

**1 CH4SS4Q1: Do you consider that Policy SS4 is?**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::**

No

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

**2 CH4SS4Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?**

2) Justified

**3 CH4SS4Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy SS4 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 SS4 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

**Please insert text here. :**

The proposal ignores an earlier assessment and consultation relating to the construction of a ring road – the Options A,B,C and D - with commensurate in-fill housing, which was provided by an expert consulting company (this was about 10 years ago). Option C was a planned road through Melton South - this corresponds to "Option 1" on the Melton Mowbray Eastern Distributor Road (Current Status and Progression of the Scheme). The MLP appears to be rejecting that consultation which, I believe, was approved by the MMBC. If these facts are correct, what is the legal basis for doing so?

Affordable Homes, "subject to viability", is vague and needs clearer definition. What is the vision for the Melton of the future - a satellite town for Leicester/Nottingham; an industrial hub for (undefined) industry; or an historic Market town with huge tourist potential, provided the character of our town centre and surrounding countryside are preserved?

There is an inconsistency in allocation of areas of separation and no logical explanation why there is no such designation for the village of Great Dalby, to protect its character and amenity, bearing in mind the growing industrialisation of the Melton Airfield combined with the planned expansion of Melton Mowbray South to provide 2,000 homes.

**4 CH4SS4Q4: 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:**

Articulate a clear vision for what the future Melton Mowbray will look like: a satellite town for Leicester/Nottingham; an industrial hub for (undefined) industry; or an historic Market town with huge tourist potential, provided the character of our town centre and surrounding countryside are preserved.

Notwithstanding the legal concern expressed over compliance/rejection of an earlier approved scheme, there should be a designation of an area of separation that lies from the northern boundary of the Melton airfield to the southern boundary with Melton Mowbray (Kirby Lane/Eye Kettleby Lane), so that everything south of that boundary comprises an area of separation for the village of Great Dalby, protecting in tandem the historical site of the Thor Missile site on the Melton Airfield.

## **Policy SS6 – Alternative Development Strategies and Local Plan Review**

**1 CH4SS6Q1: Do you consider that Policy SS6 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 CH4SS6Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?**

**3 CH4SS6Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy SS6 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 SS6 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

**Please insert text here. :**

**4 CH4SS6Q4: 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:**

## 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::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

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

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?

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. :

It is a random allocation of housing to villages, with no explanation of how each case is justified.

In the example of Great Dalby, where 67 new homes have been proposed, potentially almost doubling the current village population, it is not explained how this responds to any actual demand; where the land is coming from (bearing in mind it is farming land which surrounds the village); what impact this will have on an already increasingly busy A6047 which runs through the village; what proportion of this will be set aside for young people living in the village to be able to buy an affordable home and live here when they marry. Will they be given a priority or will it be left to market forces?

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:

See my comments elsewhere on whether a policy is "legally sound"

## Policy C2 – Housing Mix

1 CH5PC2Q1: Do you consider that Policy C2 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 CH5PC2Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH5PC2Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy C2 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 C2 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH5PC2Q4: 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:

## Policy C4 – Affordable Housing Provision

1 CH5PC4Q1: Do you consider that Policy C4 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::**

No

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

**2 CH5PC4Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?**

2) Justified

**3 CH5PC4Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy C4 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 C4 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

**Please insert text here. :**

The Strategic objective is to "Help provide a stock of housing accommodation that meets the needs of the community, including the need for affordable housing".

The Housing Needs Study , commenting on Policy SS4, states: "h1: 2,000 homes (of which 1,700 will be delivered before 2036), 37% of which should be affordable, subject to viability;"

Net Affordable Housing Need "analysis shows a need for 95 dwellings per annum to be provided – a total of 2,371 over the 25-year period (2011-36)."

However, there is no clear detail of this analysis. The statistics obfuscate rather than clarify. The assessment of affordable housing need seems to be linked to the use of a demographic projection linking to dwelling growth of 6,125 over the 2011-36 period and applying a percentage figure to the calculation. However, in §25, on page 4, it is stated that the "emerging Local Plan is proposing a policy for 37% of additional housing to be affordable". In other words, these two documents present a somewhat circular argument as a form of basis to justify the selection of the figure of 37% as affordable housing.

For the Ward of Gaddesby, over the 10 year period 2004 – 2014 population has grown by only 68, that is, under 7 people per year, across all villages in the Ward (see Figure 2.5). In contrast, the MLP states (§4.2.21), " Together these 5 villages, Asfordby, Hose, Scaford, Stathern and Great Dalby, have a shortfall of 162 houses which need to be identified in other locations." Where the "shortfall" comes from is unclear. However, the Local Plan is proposing building 72 houses in Great Dalby alone, thereby increasing its current population of just over 288 (on an average of 3/household). This is in a population which has hardly grown since 18451, when it had 479 inhabitants!

These housing projections do not seem to correlate with each other.

**4 CH5PC4Q4: 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:**

Each village should be consulted, through its Parish Council, for an assessment of future housing development. Expansion of the villages would therefore be consonant with the wishes of all concerned in the affected community - this approach epitomises localism, rather than having quotas imposed from outside on what appears to be a random basis.

## **Policy C7 – Rural Services**

**1 CH5PC7Q1: Do you consider that Policy C7 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 CH5PC7Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?**

**3 CH5PC7Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy C7 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 C7 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

**Please insert text here. :**

**4 CH5PC7Q4: 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:

## **Chapter 6: Melton's Economy – Strong and Competitive**

**1 CH6Q1: Do you consider that Chapter 6 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 CH6Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?**

**3 CH6Q3: Please give details of why you consider Chapter 6 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 6 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

**Please insert text here. :**

**4 CH6Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make Chapter 6 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 6 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:

## **Policy EC1 – Employment Growth In Melton Mowbray**

**1 CH6PEC1Q1: Do you consider that Policy EC1 is?**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::**

Yes

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

**2 CH6PEC1Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?**

**3 CH6PEC1Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EC1 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 EC1 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

**Please insert text here. :**

These appear to be suitable sites, but my concerns relate to the following:

What types of business have "actually" expressed an interest in moving to the locality?

When would they be ready to do so?

What sort of employment vacancies would they offer?

How many jobs would be created?

Would those vacancies be filled by local employees or are the skill-sets required likely to attract people from outside the borough - in which case, what possible advantage is it to the Borough?

Would those businesses enhance or detract from Melton as an Historic Market Town?

How will road networks be enhanced to cater for increased traffic volumes?

When would it be intended these works be undertaken?

How long is it anticipated they would be likely to last?

Will the number of new houses to be built be enough to meet, or in excess of, demand created by these new jobs?

In 3.2. Strategic Issues, Objectives and Priorities for Melton Borough, it is said at §3.2.1 that there is an insufficient available local workforce as "local employers experience difficulties recruiting into relatively \*low skilled and low paid positions\*, affecting their efficiency and competitiveness". [My emphasis]. Is that the vision for Melton's expansion: low-skilled and low-paid jobs? Hence there is a need to elaborate on the type of industry it is intended to attract. Of course, aspiration is one thing, concrete commitment is quite another. Has an



**4 CH6PEC1Q4: 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:**

Para 4 insinuates that employment will be local, as "access to the sites will be possible by bike and public transport."

So, this intimates that the type of businesses that would be likely to establish themselves there are already known, yet this is not explained in the MLP.

It would be helpful to have more detail, along the lines set out above. It will then be clearer as to whether the plan is indeed sound and well-informed. Without that information, the provisions you set out relating to employment prospects are merely speculative.

How does the creation of jobs correlate with the number of homes it is proposed to build? Will there be at least 6000 local jobs for the "6000 or so new houses" to be built by 2036? What type of jobs will they be - the low-skilled, low-paid jobs referred to in §3.2.1 of the MLP?

## **Policy EC2 – Employment Growth in the Rural Area (Outside Melton Mowbray)**

**1 CH6PEC2Q1: Do you consider that Policy EC2 is?**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::**

Yes

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

**2 CH6PEC2Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?**

**3 CH6PEC2Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EC2 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 EC2 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

Please insert text here. :

**4 CH6PEC2Q4: 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:**

"Small-scale tourism proposals" understate the potential for tourism. With an imminent Brexit and a cheaper pound against the Euro, there are excellent opportunities to enhance tourism in the entire Borough. We need a detailed and coordinated tourist strategy that looks beyond our national borders. But, developing our tourism potential could be seriously harmed by over development of the town, which changes its character beyond recognition - and beyond its current (and, if further developed, future) attractiveness as a tourist resort.

## **Policy EC3 – Existing Employment Sites**

**1 CH6PEC3Q1: Do you consider that Policy EC3 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 CH6PEC3Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?**

**3 CH6PEC3Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EC3 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 EC3 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

Please insert text here. :

**4 CH6PEC3Q4: 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:**

### **Policy EC5 - Melton Mowbray Town Centre**

**1 CH6PEC5Q1: Do you consider that Policy EC5 is?**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::**

No

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

No

**2 CH6PEC5Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?**

3) Effective

**3 CH6PEC5Q3: 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 the Melton Local Plan or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

**Please insert text here. :**

Legal compliance should be commented upon by a Planning Legal expert. Lay persons are not qualified to make that assessment and their views on this question are of no consequence.

The attraction of new businesses to the town is to be welcomed, but there has to be a balance in the type of businesses and their locations. For example, Nottingham Street has far too many eating establishments and, in one case, with the same type of restaurant on each side of the road. That has built in a direct competition and is not conducive to helping businesses thrive - which is what the MBC should be doing.

There should be more discernment over the businesses being granted planning permission and, importantly, where they are located.

The town used to have a variety of shops, now there is a preponderance of restaurants, hairdressers, card shops and charity shops.

Consistency in shop frontage is good - one can see the effects of this policy in eg Stamford.

I am not sure how it is said the "duty to cooperate" is relevant here. This is about Melton, not any other town or borough.

**4 CH6PEC5Q4: 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:**

Stricter control over business approval, ensuring diversity in business types along a street/road and avoiding placing businesses in direct competition with each other - this has the potential to deliver the very opposite effect: business failure.

Attract larger department stores into the town, by ensuring suitable sites where there is good parking - Marks and Spencer's location was poor, as ingress/egress was very difficult, especially if turning right on exit.

### **Policy EC6 – Primary Shopping Frontages**

**1 CH6PEC6Q1: Do you consider that Policy EC6 is?**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::**

Yes

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

2 CH6PEC6Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH6PEC6Q3: 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 the Melton Local Plan or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH6PEC6Q4: 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:

## Policy EC8 – Sustainable Tourism

1 CH6PEC8Q1: Do you consider that Policy EC8 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

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

2 CH6PEC8Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH6PEC8Q4: Please give details of why you consider Policy EC8 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 EC8 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

Legal compliance is for an independent Planning Lawyer to comment on. Lay persons are not qualified to make this assessment.

Tourism is vitally important to the town and environs and is something we should capitalise on and promote overseas. We have lots to see here: beautiful countryside, local heritage sites (which you list), Belvoir Castle, country parks - all with easy cycling distance. We do need to enhance cycle paths, to make them traffic free and safe - this can be done through a combination of options, from new build to closing low use lanes and re-routing traffic or making access purely on the basis of eg residents only, improving and using canal towpaths. These options have worked very successfully on the continent.

The benefits to local businesses will be significant - hotels/guest houses, pubs, restaurants, shops. It will also open the door to more meaningful international town exchanges/twinning as a mechanism of boosting our tourist industry.

4 CH6PEC8Q4: 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:

## Policy EN1 – Landscape

1 CH7PEN1Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN1 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 CH7PEN1Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH7PEN1Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN1 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 EN1 or its compliance

with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

**4 CH7PEN1Q4: 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:

## **Policy EN4 – Areas of separation**

**1 CH7PEN4Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN4 is?**

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

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

**2 CH7PEN4Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?**

**3 CH7PEN4Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN4 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 EN4 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

Please insert text here. :

This is my second attempt to make an entry here - the first having not been saved, for some reason.

It would have been helpful to have referred to "Melton Borough Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study".

Great Dalby has been omitted from the list of list of villages yet, in order to preserve its inherent character, its location within the High Leicestershire Hills, and to protect the historically significant Thor Missile site on the Melton Airfield, an area of separation should be established for the village, with its boundary at the northern point of the Melton airfield as it abuts the southern boundary of the town.

At §3.8 of the quoted Study, Great Dalby Area of Separation was assessed, as proposed through the Local Plan Consultation. However, the plan dismissed this area of separation on the curious basis that "Development of the northern edge of Great Dalby could be controlled through character and design policies". This is inconsistent and arbitrary when one considers the case of adjacent villages where an AOS has been approved.

**4 CH7PEN4Q4: 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:

To implement the suggestion above for an Area of Separation, with the suggested boundaries, to protect the village of Great Dalby and the Historically significant Thor Missile site located on the Melton Airfield.

To justify the disparity in approach in respect of eg Burton Lazars and Great Dalby.

## **EN8 – Climate Change**

**1 CH7PEN8Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN8 is?**

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

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

**2 CH7PEN8Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?**

**3 CH7PEN8Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN8 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 EN8 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

**Please insert text here. :**

This is generally supported, but with reservations concerning the policy for renewable energy and allocation of sites for development. I have made further comment in the section on EN10

**4 CH7PEN8Q4: 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:

## **Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Sources**

**1 CH7PEN10Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN10 is?**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::**

No

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

**2 CH7PEN10Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?**

2) Justified, 4) Consistant with National Policy

**3 CH7PEN10Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN10 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 EN10 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

**Please insert text here. :**

The move toward a sensible renewable policy is to be welcomed and the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 has been helpful as a first step.

Unfortunately, what the M&RLSS does not do is explain how it arrives at its conclusions in relation to sensitivity to turbine heights, thereby placing them in their respective categories. The process seems arbitrary. Table 2.1, for example, is re-cycling "Data supplied by the Councils (dated 1st August 2014)" as an authority for the propositions it sets out in its table of turbine heights, without any empirical analysis. The effect of this process, designed to "inform policy", is to give it a level of credibility which is unjustified and is, to some degree, disingenuous, as it is a circular movement of data.

The same comments apply to the landscape sensitivity assessments. In other words, actual evidence is lacking. Where are the expert opinions from landscape experts etc that support the classifications, especially of Landmarks and Views identified by Borough Councillors (Appendix 5 to M&RLSS)? From the correspondence at Annex 4, there are subjective assessments submitted by Parish Councils, but no mention of how these are then translated into the conclusions of the M&RLSS. This is important as the M&RLSS is being used as the basis to "inform" the MLP. There is mention (16th August 2013 – an interestingly worded letter) of Halcrow and Bayou Blue Environment being appointed to produce guidance on renewable "wind energy", but it is not clear that their actual findings were ever subjected to public scrutiny and there is no explanation as to what they said or what the council accepted or rejected – and how it did so. Instead, they appear to be "wrapped up" in the M&RLSS which is then adopted by the Council to inform the MLP – all a bit self serving.

That Study " has been used to inform policy on renewable energy such that it complies with the ministerial statement issued in June 2015 by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Paragraph: 033 Reference ID: 5-033-150618)" - this alludes to one aspect of the MLP which has been misunderstood.

Furthermore, the designation of areas is not something that the Council "has" to do. The Minister's statement makes no such requirement. The Minister said, "When determining planning applications for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, local planning authorities should only grant planning permission if: the development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a local or neighbourhood plan". The Government has also made it very clear that Councils are "not required" to allocate suitable areas for wind energy development in their local plans. James Wharton MP, the former Planning Minister, has said, "The new planning tests announced in the June 2015 written statement reflect our view that in future wind turbines should only get the go-ahead when local people have said they want them, and where. I can confirm that the statement does not require local planning authorities to identify suitable areas for wind energy development in their local plans."

The Council has chosen to designate areas and, by so doing, has provided a magnet to potential developers to direct their applications to these areas.

The MLP does not recognize that the Council, as a public authority, has a duty of care towards the community, which extends to protecting health as well as heritage, amenity and environment. Since 18 June 2015 it has been government policy that affected local communities should have the final say on whether to approve wind farms in their areas. However, what amounts to an "affected community" is not defined nor the degree of adverse impact necessary to amount to

"affected". Therefore, the operation of consultation in relation to any development is such that it entitles those living some distance from a proposed development to exercise a view on a matter in respect of which they will experience little adverse effect (but an effect, all the same) and thereby gives their views an unjustified and unfair equivalence to those who are directly affected.

**4 CH7PEN10Q4: 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:**

Remove the proposal to designate areas for renewable energy.

Re-visit the designation of turbine heights. These are arbitrary groupings. For example, to state that a turbine of height 50m, in clusters of 4 or 5, is wholly damaging to the landscape and visual impact.

The M&RLSS is merely advisory and does not have to be slavishly followed. It should be applied commensurate with the sensitivities of the local landscape, heritage and population. The approval of turbines above 35m should require exceptional justification.

The presumption should be in favour of solar over wind power, as the former is less obtrusive and damaging to the landscape and bird-life, has no known ill-health effects, can be more easily blended into the landscape by using non-reflective glass, is likely to meet with fewer objections from residents in the vicinity of its location - quite a contrast to turbines, which can be seen from mile away.

## **Policy EN13 – Heritage Assets**

**1 CH7PEN13Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN13 is?**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::**

Yes

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

**2 CH7PEN13Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?**

**3 CH7PEN13Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN13 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 EN13 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

**Please insert text here. :**

This is an important policy, as we must protect our valuable heritage assets. It is important to recognise that we do not own these assets. Rather, we are custodians of them for future generations. This is why the siting of any development which may damage them or detract from an aesthetic appreciation of them in their historical setting is vitally important.

**4 CH7PEN13Q4: 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:**

## **Policy IN1 –Transport & Strategic Transport Infrastructure**

**1 CH8PIN1Q1: Do you consider that Policy IN1 is?**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::**

No

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

**2 CH8PIN1Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?**

2) Justified, 3) Effective

**3 CH8PIN1Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy IN1 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 IN1 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

**Please insert text here. :**

While in general terms a ring road would be a positive development, neither the Melton Local Plan nor the 2016 Melton Mowbray Distributor Road Option Assessment Report makes any express reference to the earlier report discussed in Cabinet on 8 April 2008 (MELTON LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED OPTIONS REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE) which looked at 4 options for Melton Mowbray bypass location and stated, "An analysis of the traffic patterns indicates that the most effective initial solution would be an A607 (west) to A607 (east) northern bypass with the second most effective being an A606 (south) to A606 (north) western bypass." This was "Option C" of the 4 options. Instead, Option A has been chosen in the MLP.

It is "believed" that option C was the result of a recommendation in a study commissioned by the MBC and residents were invited to comment with their preferences. In other words, it is believed there was a public vote to support Option C and, when an attempt was made to change it, it was pointed out that this was not possible in view of the steps the Council had taken.

When was that proposal (Option C) reversed?

Under what authority was that proposal reversed?

What were the reasons for changing the option?

Traffic flow in the town is hampered by the poor synchronisation of traffic lights. For example, along Leicester Road/Warwick Road, there are pedestrian controlled lights outside Boyes. On a Tuesday, when traffic flows are particularly intense, the operation of these lights disrupts any smoothness in traffic flow there might otherwise be, and causes vehicles to be trapped on the yellow box-junction at Leicester Street. At peak times, the pedestrian lights should be synchronised with the main traffic lights.

In other areas, the absence of any form of traffic flow control raises a potential for accidents. For example, it is a miracle that nobody has been injured or killed at the junction with the MMBC offices and Burton Street. Turning right, from that junction, is seriously dangerous at peak times, with traffic trapped at the junction by intense traffic flow along the main road, taking chances to escape by pulling out in front of traversing vehicles. While traffic lights may not be the appropriate answer, other measures, such as a traffic island, should be considered. This option also has the benefit of being low cost and low maintenance. The scheme works well along Leicester Road/Lake Terrace.

**4 CH8PIN1Q4: 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:**

As before

### **IN3: Broadband**

**1 CH8PIN3Q1: Do you consider that Policy IN3 is?**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::**

Yes

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

**2 CH8PIN3Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?**

**3 CH8PIN3Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy IN3 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 IN3 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

**Please insert text here. :**

This is an excellent proposal - if it is deliverable outside the Melton urban area.

An internet service delivering a minimum of 5Mb would be welcomed in the villages - on occasions I have had 0.4!

**4 CH8PIN3Q4: 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:

Extend this to the villages - and providing a service to existing dwellings (ie speed to cabinet and cabinet to home)

## Policies Maps

1 PMQ1: Do you consider that the Policies Maps are?

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 PMQ2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 PMQ3: Please give details of why you consider that the Policy Maps are not legally compliant or unsound or fail 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 Policy Maps or their compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 PMQ4: 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:

5 PMQ5: Please indicate which Policy Maps you response relates to.

If multiple please indicate on separate lines for each. :

## 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