

FOCUSED CHANGES RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED: Focused Change 4

Representor Name	Focused Change /Policy Ref	Summary of Representation	MBC Response
Lilian Coulson, obo Mr & Mrs N J Spick	FC4.1	Supports BOT1	Noted
Nicholas Houghton	FC4.1	Hose - fully support the new HOS2 and the removal of the old HOS2 & 3. Open meeting held at the Village Hall where approaching 80% of those present voted in favour of the New HOS2.	Support for HOS2 noted.
Dr J. Warwick	FC4.1	Questions accuracy of some site specific information on FRIS 2 and FRIS 3.	The housing site assessment was carried out on a consistent basis for the whole of the Borough, using trusted sources of information. This approach is considered proportionate and fit for purpose. The use of unverified local information could have introduced bias.
Chris Gamble	FC4	Object to inclusion of Water Lane and land to the south within this plan. The NP with one site only reflects the community wishes and should be taken into account. Questions the legality of doing otherwise.	The sites in the MLP reflect the best options based on a robust and proportionate evidence base which informed the site assessment process. IN accordance with Government guidance, Little weight can be afforded to the Frisby NP until at least an Inspector's Report has been received. If this happens, before the close of Local Plan Examination Hearings, the Council will consider suggesting modifications to its plan to align.
Shout 4 Residents	FC4	What is mitigation, ie back up plans for housing.	Policy SS6 and associated reasoned justification set out the triggers for local plan review. Non delivery or significant delay in bringing forward the sustainable neighbourhoods would trigger a review.
Sue Green HBF	FC4/SS6	It is critical that the Council's assumptions about the deliverability of individual sites are correct and realistic to provide sufficient headroom and flexibility in both the overall HLS and 5 YHLS throughout the plan period. Suggest lead in times for SUEs may be overambitious due to master planning requirement, and suggest the trajectory should be revisited to ensure it has the support of the builders in the SUEs, otherwise it looks ambitious. There should be more reserve sites in Melton Mowbray where housing delivery delays are most likely to occur, and the policy restriction on the release of reserve sites by location is also likely to reduce its effectiveness. Appropriate monitoring triggers are needed to ensure the reserve sites policy and/or local plan review can be operable if SUE delivery is delayed or reduced. The council should provide Sedgefield as well as Liverpool calculations of 5YHLS, and justify its use of the latter, and points out the continuing hoes shortage that could arise. Suggest Sedgefield is achievable from identified supply. It is noted that the Council continues to recoup shortfalls over the plan period (Liverpool) rather than within the first five years (Sedgefield). The Council should provide both calculations.	The deliverability assumptions are in most cases based on the information provided by the land promoter or developer and only put back or reduced, if appropriate. The trajectories for the northern and southern SUEs were provided by the developers and adjusted to take account of overall market activity that the town could sustain at any one time. The plan (e.g. SS3) and NPPF both allow for windfall sites to come forward as well as identified sites within the plan period. Significant and persistent shortfalls of new housing delivery from the forecast trajectory will give rise to consideration of a plan review (Policy SS6 refers). Published evidence justifies the Council's use of the Liverpool approach. It is unrealistic to forecast the levels of housing delivery that applying the Sedgefield approach would produce for early years of the plan after adoption.

Steve and Rachel Jackson	FC4.1 (5.4.6)	<p>It is stated that "Policies may be required in some locations that allow sites to progress only once infrastructure issues have been resolved, and sites may have critical design and layout requirements that need to be addressed for them to be regarded as 'suitable'"The consequence of this caveat is that [for South Melton at least] , approval for the development of 2000 houses could be green lighted without:</p> <p>a) any prior agreement or clarity or commitment reached on what infrastructure must be in place to alleviate the adverse consequences of such a development, including but not limited to substantial work traffic impacts.</p> <p>b) clarity on the final critical design and layout requirements of a site.</p> <p>Any changes comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior agreement/clarity on precise infrastructure to be implemented 2. Prior agreement/clarity on the final critical design and layout requirements of a site 	<p>Noted. Policy SS4 (Melton South Sustainable Neighbourhood), and Policy SS5 (Melton North Sustainable Neighbourhood) both seek to ensure that a comprehensive masterplan is prepared and agreed in advance of, or as part of a planning application for each of the Sustainable Neighbourhood (SN) sites. This would include phasing and delivery plans for both of the SN sites. Both policies SS4 and SS5 seek to ensure that relevant and required infrastructure to support the housing, such as employment, community facilities, transport and environmental protection and enhancement are delivered in a timely manner as part of the phasing of the sites. This would be secured by way of a combination of planning conditions and developer contributions (S106 agreements)</p>
Adam Murray	FC 4.1 - C1(A)	Allocation of additional site Main Street/Chapel Lane	This site falls below the size threshold for allocation, therefore would be an application under Policy SS3, Windfall. No change.
David Haston (obo Mr Chandler)	FC4	<p>I am just looking through the scores for the sites in Long Clawson (page 196 of the Service Centres update document 30 May 2017) and am trying to work out how the ++, +, 0, - and -- impacts for each topic translate into the numerical scores given on page 196, but I am having some difficulties.</p> <p>I had assumed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ++ would equal 2 points + would equal 1 point 0 would equal 0 points - would equal -1 point -- would equal -2 points. <p>However, when I apply that to LONG4, the score for that site equates to 18 points rather than the 22 points awarded to it in the table on page 196. Have I missed something or is this a numerical error in the table?</p>	Noted ,but consider that ther authority's evidence is robust and proportionate .
Martin Herbert (obo Hill Family) Brown & Co (Martin Herbert)	FC4.1, C1(a) and C1(b)	Repeat draft plan submission request that part of Spreckleys Farm be allocated or identified as a reserve site, as more preferable to other sites in less sustainable village locations in those lists.	The response to this was given in response to the PSD representation.
Martin Herbert (obo Hill Family) Brown & Co (Martin Herbert)	FC4.2, site allocations	Reiterates points made in representation on FC1.2, SS2.	See response to FC1.2, SS2.

Lilian Coulson, obo Mr & Mrs N J Spick	FC4.1	Land adjacent to 8 Easthorpe Road, Bottesford should be included in plan - the EA updated flood risk modelling to be carried out in Autumn/Winter 2017/18 should be brought to attention of LP Inspector, as existing is historic and out of date	The site has been assessed using the information currently available and is subject to flood risk. It is appreciated this is dynamic but it is not agreed the Plan should be postponed to await the arrival of new evidence. The housing site assessments underpinning Focused Change 4 were based on the most up to date information and data that was available on a comparable basis across the whole of the Borough at the time, for a relevant range of sustainability, suitability and achievability factors. The Council consider this to be adequate and proportionate evidence, as per NPPF para. 158.
Colin Love (Professor)	FC4	Housing sites - No evidence Bottesford 'requires' the 322 houses on the 4 sites identified	The reference to requirement relates to the dispersal method devised for the Plan (the 'proportionate approach'). Bottesford accounts for around 7% of the Borough's population and therefore its anticipated growth (though this is considered conservative because Bottesford population structure is much younger than other areas) but at 324 has been allocated only 5.2% of the intended growth. Bottesford is second only to Melton in terms of sustainability in terms for services, transport links etc and as such a strong argument exists that it should attract growth, rather than be 'subsidised' by other locations. HEDNA identifies that 280 dpa are required in order to meet affordable housing requirements (Table 40) but in view of low delivery since 2011 this is calculated to be closer to 325 dpa. This increase as suggested is approx 32% higher than the 245 dpa that the plan proposes, and if applied to Bottesford individually would create a requirement of 430 approx.
Savills on behalf of Worthearly Ltd	FC1.2 (SS2), FC4.1	SUPPORT FC1.2 (SS2) - support FC4.1 - support & suggest site can come forward for housing earlier than plan anticipates.	Support and timing of availability suggested noted.
Sharon Wiggins (Leicestershire County Council)	FC4	Policy C1 – Housing allocations: Primary provision: Development in Primary and Secondary Rural Centres will require S106 contributions to meet the cost of expanding the existing schools within the villages named. Noted that the allocations for some villages, in particular Long Clawson, Harby, Frisby, and Waltham have increased. Expansion of schools in village locations is problematic and costly, the schools in these locations occupy very constrained sites with limited potential for expansion. If this is not achievable, LCC may also seek an additional contribution to cover transport transitional costs for pupils to nearby schools with places, until new accommodation is available in the locality. This may in part be mitigated if trigger points for S106 contributions are made early in each development. Secondary provision: Rural developments will either fall within the catchment area of the Melton town secondary schools, and would be considered as part of the Secondary options outlined above, or within the catchment area of the Bottesford Belvoir High school, which based on current forecast pupil numbers is capable of expansion to accommodate the additional pupils from development in these areas. FC4.2 Local Plan Appendix One – Sites allocations and policies: This document contains information on school current and forecast numbers which was correct as at March 2017. This information has changed with the addition of up-dated pupil forecasts and births data; however the conclusion referred to in the document with regards to school places have not fundamentally changed.	Schemes have been developed by the LEA for the expansion of Long Clawson, Somerby and Waltham PS 's to the scale provided for by the site allocations in the Plan. In the case of Frisby all 3 allocated sites are the subject of Planning Applications and in the case of all 3 the LEA has advised that the school will need to be expanded and has defined costs for this. In the case of Harby, all sites have planning permission with contributions in place in accordance with LEA requests, in full, except HAR4 for which a contribution has been requested and will be secured if PP is granted. Noted – where applicable this is included in site specific policies in FC4 (Appendix 1) and is a material consideration in the planning application process if circumstances change. An update will be welcome and the comment expressed is noted.
John Rust		Assessments not unpinned by local knowledge.	The housing site assessment was carried out on a consistent basis for the whole of the Borough, using trusted sources of information. This approach is considered proportionate and fit for purpose. The use of unverified local information could have introduced bias.

K. Lynne Camplejohn		Need a clearer link between table and figure of value areas.	The policies and proposals of the plan are to be read as a whole. The clarity sought can be achieved by looking at the value areas figure concurrently with Policy C1(A)
---------------------	--	--	--