Response ID ANON-MWX6-MJZY-V

Submitted to Melton Local Plan Update: Issues and Options Consultation
Submitted on 2024-01-04 15:55:55

Introduction

Definitions

About you

What is your name?

Name:
Tim Smith

What is your organisation? (if relevant)

Organisation:
Leicestershire County Council

What is your Job Title/Role (if relevant)

Job title/role:
Strategic Planning Manager

What is your email address?

Email:
███████████████

Are you making a submission on behalf of someone else?

No

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

Name (on behalf of):

Organisation (on behalf of):

About you (equalities questions)

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

Enter the first 5 digits of your postcode:

Gender: How do you identify?

███████████

If self-describe, please state :

Would you describe yourself as transgender?

███████████

What is your sexual orientation?

███████████

If other, please state:

What is your age?

███████████

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

███████████

If you selected other, please state:

What is your ethnic origin?

Please describe your ethnicity and race:

What is your religion?

██████████

Please state your religion:

Vision and objectives

Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

Question 1 - Option 1: No change:
Strongly disagree

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

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

Please, provide further context:

A review of the Visions and Objectives is strongly supported to take account of the changing context since adoption of the plan. The approach and suggested key issues in Option 2 are broadly supported but should be made sufficiently robust to cover all key objective areas, including the importance of climate change, health, housing and transport connectivity. Option 2 would also allow the Education Infrastructure required to support the community to ensure it is appropriate for the scale of development.

We would welcome a review of the Melton Roof Tariff for Education Infrastructure to ensure it still meets the needs of the funding required to provide additional pupil places.

In simplifying the vision and objectives, care needs to be taken not to undermine the importance of environmental considerations which need to be considered with priority when redeveloping the vision and supporting objectives. It must not be considered as an afterthought. In the proposed seven key issues, the reference to reuse and recycling of waste has been lost, so assurance would need to be provided within the local plan that all the environmental objectives as stated in the existing vision are not lost and overlooked.

The bullet point, 'Promoting high quality and well-designed development that helps to create healthy, sustainable, and safe communities' is the only time health is referenced in the key aims. Health is set within the context of new developments. However, is there an opportunity to add 'health' into the first bullet point 'Improving facilities for all of the community and providing the new infrastructure needed to support our growing population' then becomes 'Improving facilities for all of the community and providing the new infrastructure needed to support our growing population that supports the health and wellbeing of our residents across the life course'. Is there an opportunity to recognise the health and wellbeing in existing residents in one of the other key aims without it being in the context of new developments and also highlights the need in Melton given Melton has an ageing population?

The strengthening of the need to tackle the causes and effects of climate change within the vision/objectives, plus making this more of a priority, is supported. Additionally, it is good to see that enhancing and minimising harm to nature is also included. To be successful these objectives should be embedded throughout the local plan and within other objectives.

Minerals safeguarding is important in the assessment and allocation of any sites. Waste site safeguarding is also important in the consideration of sites and the vision, so as not to prejudice the waste hierarchy, which is the responsibility of all local authorities, not merely the County Council. Whilst we are aware this section is not yet allocating sites, perhaps protecting and safeguarding finite resources as well as 'reuses and recycles resources' is appropriate? The use of waste as a resource could be mentioned.

It is also an NPPF requirement (para 210 e) for the district to identify and safeguard mineral related infrastructure (existing, planned and potential storage, handling and transport sites for minerals) where it is not located on an active mineral site. PPG for Minerals at para 006 (Reference ID: 27-006-20140306, Revision date: 06 03 2014) indicates that in two tier authority areas, responsibility for safeguarding facilities for the above will rest largely with the district planning authority except where such facilities would be located at quarries.

The County Council welcomes the repeated positive reference to the heritage and historic character of the Borough, from the Vision statement, through strategic and environmental objectives, to many of the individual policies. Both individual heritage assets and the wider historic environment offer significant contribution to the distinctiveness and sense of place the borough, support its communities and economy, as well as promoting the town and surrounding borough as a tourist destination.

Whilst the current document does not explicitly address Policy EN13 (Heritage Assets) of the current Local Plan, reference to heritage is made throughout the document, reflecting the embedded nature of the resource. In light of the passage of the Levelling Up Act, consideration might be given to reflecting

some of the changes brought in by the Act. In that context, LuRA introduces to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (TCPA) a new duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing specified heritage assets for plan-making and decision-taking. There is also a more general expansion to the duty of decision-takers when it comes to heritage assets from the desirability of preserving to a wider objective to preserve or enhance. There is also a new enforcement power in the creation of an option to serve temporary stop notices for listed buildings. On a separate note it also introduces a statutory duty on the County Council to maintain an Historic Environment Record for the authority area.

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

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

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

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

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

Question 3 - Enhancing Melton Mowbray's town centre:

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

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

Question 3 - Other (please specify below):
1

Please, provide further context:

It is considered that all of these objectives seem to be logical, sensible and in many ways intertwined. Provision of new infrastructure, ensuring local housing need and enhancing Melton Mowbray is crucial for example, albeit within wider context and a 'golden-thread' which should run throughout the plan reflecting the addressing the causes of climate change, promoting healthy, sustainable and safe communities and enhancing nature and minimising harm to the environment.

It is suggested that some alterations are made to the objectives to strengthen them (see * for additional text). These include:

- Improving facilities for all of the community and providing the new infrastructure needed to support *economic growth and* our growing population
- Addressing the causes and effects of climate change *and encouraging the development of renewable energy*
- Ensure local housing meets the local communities current and future needs
- Supporting a diverse, competitive and innovative [delete 'rural'] economy *in Melton Mowbray and rural areas*

Policy SS1. Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development

Policy SS1: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

Question 4 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

Question 4 - Option 2: Amend the policy [preferred option]:
Strongly agree

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

Please, provide further context:

It is considered that that a policy reflecting the presumption in favour of sustainable development should remain in the plan to clearly evidence the commitment to it. The policy helps to underpin the plan and decision-making processes, in compliance with the guidance set out in the NPPF.

Policy SS3. Sustainable Communities (unallocated sites)

Policy SS3: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

Question 6 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

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

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

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

Please, provide further context:

Sustainability has to underpin all types of development as the fundamental consideration and so Option 3 to review the policy to enhance wider sustainability is preferred. This option would help considerations around wider local sustainability issues and the wider social/economic and environmental factors crucial in shaping developments that improve the health and wellbeing of the community. Smaller developments can make it harder to provide Education Infrastructure solutions at existing school sites.

The review of the policy should:

- Include clarity on what 'sustainable' means when used in different contexts – e.g. environmental sustainability and delivering on climate change and nature objectives.
- Reference the need that development helps to make a place more sustainable in terms of minimising the need for external travel by car.
- Reference health and wellbeing within the policy wording.
- Be reviewed in a way that allows it to be incorporated within policies D3 and C5 but allows for the needs of the ageing population etc.
- Consider Minerals safeguarding and waste safeguarding.

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

Please, provide further context:

In the interest of minimising infrastructure challenges (including transport impacts of growth), it is considered that new homes in Melton's smallest and least sustainable settlements should be limited to only where there is a clearly identified and evidenced local need (and where options to provide elsewhere are not), which may include some or all of the following:

- Supporting rural business
- Maintaining community links
- Meeting the needs of all within the existing community including a mix of homes for families already living in the settlements
- Taking advantage of existing under-utilised infrastructure provision and/or when the developments are at their most environmentally sustainable (i.e design is low in carbon (i.e. heat pumps), generates renewable energy where appropriate and its development enhances local biodiversity where appropriate.

Minerals safeguarding and waste safeguarding would need to be important considerations in any justification.

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

Please, provide further context:

Yes. It is considered that there should be criteria to require these homes to be built to the highest sustainability standards in order to meet net zero and tackle climate change (as should be the case for all new development, regardless of type or location).

The criteria within the policy should include, at a minimum, that design of homes should maximise energy efficiency and carbon reduction in their design and ongoing running/maintenance. For example, through insulation, the use of low carbon materials, maximising air source and/or ground source heat pumps, maximising appropriate local renewable energy generation and storage and provide electric vehicle charging access to promote zero-carbon travel. Additional consideration could be provided for where appropriate heat networks or community energy installations could be included within plans to maximise benefit to the local community. Developments must also consider appropriate action on climate adaptation in regards to flooding and also overheating/heatwaves.

Broadband to the property should also be considered to enable people to work from home increasing sustainability by reducing the need to travel to work.

Policy SS4. South Melton Mowbray Sustainable Neighbourhoods

Policy SS4: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

Question 10 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

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

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

Please, provide further context:

The County Council would not support deletion of the Policy and strongly suggests the policy is retained and updated.

We would seek to work with Melton Borough Council in order to see whether and how this policy needs to be amended with regard to the Southern Melton Mowbray Distributor Road in the light of the latest Housing Infrastructure Fund position, including as necessary safeguarding of its route (i.e. to replace the current broader area identified in the Local Plan).

The Policy would make the delivery of Education Infrastructure more achievable from both a financial perspective and viable education delivery. The South Masterplan provided sites for two primary schools, 1 x 210 1 x 420 places, and a 650 place secondary school. This will need to reviewed depending on any modifications to the Local Plan and updated to ensure previous proposals are still fit for purpose.

The review of the policy should also:

- Consider how the development should be designed to maximise carbon reduction and nature enhancement, whilst minimising the impacts of climate impacts.
- Reflect the future waste arisings further to the proposed 2000 dwellings and the subsequent need for LCC and Melton Borough Council to work effectively together to manage the future need for additional waste infrastructure at the appropriate time.
- Reflect healthcare needs.
- Reflect education with the planned 2,000 dwellings in the generating 170 childcare places. There is also no mention of Early Years, which needs to be recognised.
- Consider Minerals safeguarding and waste safeguarding.

Policy SS5. Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood

Policy SS5: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

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

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

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

Please, provide further context:

As per Policy SS4, the County Council would not support deletion of the Policy and strongly suggests the policy is retained and updated.

We would seek to work with Melton Borough Council in order to see whether and how this policy needs to be amended to continue to make provision for the completion of the MMDR NE and ongoing developer contributions towards it.

The Policy would make the delivery of Education Infrastructure more achievable from both a financial perspective and viable education delivery. The North Masterplan provides two primary sites, 1 x 210 and 1 x 420, this will need to reviewed depending on any modifications to the Local Plan and updated to ensure previous proposals are still fit for purpose.

The review of the policy should also:

- Consider how the development should be designed to maximise carbon reduction and nature enhancement, whilst minimising the impacts of climate impacts.
- Reflect the future waste arisings further to the proposed 1700 dwellings and the subsequent need for LCC and Melton Borough Council to work effectively together to manage the future need for additional waste infrastructure at the appropriate time.
- Reflect healthcare needs.
- Reflect education with the planned 1,700 dwellings in the generating 145 childcare places. There is also no mention of Early Years, which needs to be recognised.
- Consider Minerals safeguarding and waste safeguarding.

Policy SS6. Alternative Development Strategies and Local Plan Review

Policy SS6: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

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

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

Question 14 - Option 3: Additional criteria:
Somewhat disagree

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

Please, provide further context:

It is considered a policy on this subject should be retained, but be clear and concise and in line with the Vision of the Plan.

Climate action should be embedded wherever possible and thus could be included as an additional criteria to strengthen the Local Plan and climate change/nature objectives.

Option 2 may also tie in with the Government's intention for Local Plans to be more locally focused. Whilst it is appreciated that this plan is being prepared under the current system, it may 'future proof' the plan. Option 2 would also facilitate a more reflective and relevant local plan for the Melton Mowbray area.

If the option chosen proposes to introduce new or additional criteria, we would need to think carefully about any criteria relating to an utter and entire failure to deliver the southern MMDR (as opposed to a delayed delivery and/or alternative approach to provision). In such circumstances from a transport perspective, we would be cautious about that triggering a 'search' for an alternative Plan spatial strategy (as opposed to a recast of the Southern Sustainable Neighbourhood Policy), given the Local Highway Authority's previously expressed view that focusing growth on Melton Mowbray is preferable to a more dispersed pattern of growth.

Clarity over the Leicester City's unmet need would be helpful as this will further guide the strategic plan for Education Infrastructure requirements and the number of pupil places required.

Definitions

Policy C2. Housing Mix

Policy C2: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

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

Question 16 - Option 2: Amend the policy [preferred option]:
Strongly agree

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

Please, provide further context:

The County Council consider that although it will make the policy longer, amendments would ensure the policy is strengthened. It is agreed that housing mix should be based on latest evidence, with consideration made to make some distinction between different communities, e.g. those in Melton Mowbray town centre and the rural areas.

Minerals and waste safeguarding should be considered as part of the assessment of any sites.

Policy C3. National Space Standard and Smaller Dwellings

Policy C3: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

Question 18 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

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

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

Please, provide further context:

It is agreed that this policy should be updated to reflect a requirement for Nationally Described Space Standards to be met for all dwellings, and to promote quality affordable housing.

Definitions

Policy C4. Affordable Housing Provision

Policy C4: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

Question 20 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

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

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

Please, provide further context:

The approach to Option 2 is agreed, with evidence showing internal housing space is linked to health outcomes, opportunities for children to play and study. Insufficient space is linked to poor health impacts on mental wellbeing.

Specific comments from the County Council as a landowner - The policy should be updated as proposed but should contain the exception proviso in relation to viability in order not to act as a constraint on housing delivery. Given the level of affordable housing required to meet the needs of the Borough, consideration should be given to increasing the overall numbers to help deliver affordable housing needs. The policy should also consider delivery of 100% affordable housing sites and the need for market housing to support rural exception sites where grant funding is insufficient to support delivery.

Definitions

Policy C7. Rural Services

Policy C7: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

Question 22 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

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

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

Please, provide further context:

A retention and reworking of Policy C7 is supported to provide more clarity. The policy should enable the protection, retention or enhancement of existing community services and facilities or that lead to the provision of additional assets in the interests of making a place more sustainable in terms of minimising the need for external travel by car. The policy should also reflect issues that are important to health and wellbeing outcomes including community cohesion and opportunities for social connectivity.

Specific comments from the County Council as a landowner - The rationale behind the policy is sound. However, it could be reworded in a way that permits limited development to support a local school, for example, rather than concentrating on the conditions for its redevelopment. The policy should also be repositioned within the chapter to follow Self Build policy.

Policy C8. Self Build and Custom Build Housing

Policy C8: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

Question 24 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Somewhat disagree

Question 24 - Option 2: Address increasing needs:
Somewhat disagree

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

Question 24 - Option 4: Adding the two optional local eligibility tests:
Somewhat disagree

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

Please, provide further context:

The local plan should encourage exemplar sustainable housing options, which option 3 could enable. This will require thinking about what would incentivise self-builders to choose to build low carbon & environmentally designs. However, if done correctly the non-self build properties should maximise where possible their designs to be low carbon and environmentally friendly – meaning in theory, this option isn't needed as all houses should be sustainable and low in carbon, including their ongoing running/maintenance.

Minerals and waste safeguarding should be considered as part of the assessment of any sites.

Policy C9. Healthy Communities

Policy C9: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

Question 26 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

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

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

Please, provide further context:

Strengthening the Plan to make health and wellbeing a key thread running through it would be welcomed and supported and is the preferred option. The policy needs to promote Healthy and Safe Communities and comply with NPPF guidance and include the key elements by reference to the policies detailed elsewhere in the plan.

Delivery of active travel infrastructure and measures can contribute significantly to improving the health of our communities and we would be keen to discuss how a reviewed Plan might help in terms of being able to cite it in future bids to Government for funding for active travel infrastructure and measures.

Revising this policy will ensure the inclusion of the Health Impact Assessments expectations and threshold criteria agreed upon locally ensuring a clearer process for all.

In regards to the wording of the first bullet point in option 2 'Refocus and reduce the policy to only cover health issues not better dealt with elsewhere in the plan (such as within climate change, transport, design, developer contribution, open and green space policies) to reduce replication and improve clarity within the plan', we agree with referencing health throughout and its links to all the other relevant policies but would still like to see those wider determinant themes (transport, green space etc) still included within the health section also to reiterate how crucial those aspects are in shaping health outcomes.

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

Yes

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

Please, provide further context:

Health impact assessments are a crucial tool in identifying the potential positive or negative impacts of developments on local populations and help to assess the potential risk or benefits to health, ensuring that informed proactive measures can be taken to mitigate negative effects and maximise the health benefits. Health Impact assessments are associated with improving health outcomes and reduce inequalities.

Following a meeting with district planning reps in October 2023 (including a representative of Melton Borough Council), the Office for Health Inequalities and Disparities (OHID) and the TCPA, there was initial agreement on an approach where some development sites identified in the adopted Development plan would require a Health Impact Assessment, and these will be identified and agreed by the Borough Council and the Leicestershire Public Health team early in the adoption process based on size and/or local health data.

The draft Leicestershire HIA scoping tool/criteria (to be applied to planning applications for sites not identified within the plan) is currently being considered. This will identify thresholds for HIA completion based on a list of agreed criteria around numerical thresholds and local health need. The Public Health team would very much like to work with the Borough to develop and embed these criteria when approved.

It is also considered that all development should be future ready and adapted to the inevitable increase and magnitude of climate impacts – therefore recommend that the threshold is kept low to ensure climate adaptation and reduction in health impacts is maximised.

Policy EC1. Employment Growth in Melton Mowbray

Policy EC1: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

Question 30 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

Question 30 - Option 2: Amendments to reflect Use Class Order, new evidence and National Planning Policy Framework:
Neither agree nor disagree

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

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

Please, provide further context:

It is agreed that Option 1 (deletion of the policy) is not feasible. It is felt that Option 3 would provide the best opportunity for developing more bespoke criteria which could, say, for example, in transport terms be related to passenger transport provision and delivery of elements of the emerging Melton Mowbray Local Cycle and Walking Infrastructure Plan.

It is considered that there could be a general employment policy covering need and spatial distribution. In the same way that there are individual policies for major housing sites the same should apply to major employment allocations.

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

Please, provide further context:

It should be noted that Minerals and waste safeguarding should be considered as part of the assessment of any sites.

Definitions

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

Policy EC2: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

Question 33 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

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

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

Please, provide further context:

It is agreed that a Policy covering this matter should be retained, including developing criteria relating to highways and transport matters.

The policy can provide an opportunity for embedding climate change action and additionally, rural employment opportunities should align to Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland's Local Nature Recovery Strategy which is currently under development and led by Leicestershire County Council

(james.obrien@leics.gov.uk).

Given the current limited supply of EV charging points, it is considered that if an employment site is adjacent to an existing settlement, there could be an exploration as to whether these points could be utilised by residents in the evenings/weekends when not being used by people working there.

Minerals and waste safeguarding should be considered as part of the assessment of any sites.

This policy and any proposed should be reviewed in light of any changes to the National Planning Policy Framework.

Policy EC3. Existing Employment Sites

Policy EC3: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 35: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 35 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

Question 35 - Option 2: Add specific class uses to policies:
Somewhat disagree

Question 35 - Option 3: Adding Flexibility to the Policy:
Somewhat agree

Question 36: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

A policy covering this matter should be retained.

Adding flexibility to the policy is to an extent helpful, however in addition to the 'disadvantages' of that approach already cited in the Issues and Options document, a further one is if it were to result in development that was of a more intensive traffic generation in a location that was 'unsuitable' (e.g. because of highway capacity or safety issues, or geographic location (poor transport connectivity).

Minerals and waste safeguarding should be considered as part of the assessment of any sites. This is perhaps especially an issue in relation to waste sites where there is the potential for them to be redeveloped for more profitable uses. Safeguarding could also be an issue where the redevelopment puts a more sensitive use in close proximity to an extant waste or mineral site.

Based on a review of the current sites, a distinction could be made between key employment sites, secondary sites and sites of little future economic value with appropriate protection for each level.

Definitions

Policy EC4. Other Employment and Mixed-use Proposals

Policy EC4: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 37: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 37 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Somewhat disagree

Question 37 - Option 2: Wording amendments and define Mixed-use Development:
Neither agree nor disagree

Question 37 - Option 3: Split the Policy:
Somewhat agree

Question 38: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

It is considered that a policy covering this matter should be retained and continue to contain at least a criteria related to accessibility by active and sustainable modes of transport. Minerals and waste safeguarding should also be considered as part of the assessment of any sites.

It is however, felt the policy provisions are potentially capable of being delivered in other chapters of the plan – Home working in the Housing Chapter for example

Town Centre and Retail Evidence

Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 39: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 39 - Option 1: Focus on Melton Mowbray Town Centre:
Somewhat agree

Question 39 - Option 2: Carry out a full Town Centre and Retail Study including needs assessments:
Neither agree nor disagree

Question 40: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this section

Please, provide further context:

A review of the evidence focusing on Melton Mowbray Town Centre is generally supported given the existing Melton Retail Study is dated 2015.

Definitions

Policy EC5. Melton Mowbray Town Centre

Policy EC5: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 41: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 41 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

Question 41 - Option 2: Update and incorporate elements of the Town Centre Vision [preferred option]:
Strongly agree

Question 42: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

Given the importance of an attractive, well-functioning Town Centre in terms of minimising the need for external travel to other places (especially by car), we would wish to see a policy retained in the Plan.

From a Public Health perspective this could benefit from linking to a strong policy around hot food takeaways. A focus on density and health considerations linked to population health, as adopted in other areas nationally would also be welcomed.

Definitions

Policy EC6. Primary Shopping Frontages

Policy EC6: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 43: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 43 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

Question 43 - Option 2: Amend the policy [preferred option]:
Strongly agree

Question 44: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

An updated approach reflecting latest evidence is supported.

Definitions

Policy EC7. Retail Development in the Borough

Policy EC7: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 45: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 45 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

Question 45 - Option 2: Amend the policy [preferred option]:
Strongly agree

Question 46: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

The approach to amending the policy to reflect new evidence and guidance and when retail impact assessments are required, is supported.

Definitions

Policy EC8. Sustainable Tourism

Policy EC8: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 47: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 47 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

Question 47 - Option 2: Clarify the policy to focus on socio-economic benefits:
Somewhat disagree

Question 47 - Option 3: Amend the Policy to define sustainable tourism:
Strongly agree

Question 48: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

Option 3 is the preference in order to include a definition of sustainable tourism and breaking this down into the individual factors to help combat climate change and enhance nature.

An additional recommendation would be to include that tourism developments are adapted to future climate change impacts, including flooding and heat waves. Where new developments/opportunities do not consider nature and mitigate against climate change, these should not be prioritised for social and economic gain.

The policy should include criteria relating to accessibility by active and sustainable modes of transport.

Definitions

Policy EN2. Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Policy EN2: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

Question 49 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

Question 49 - Option 2: Amend the policy:
Somewhat agree

Question 49 - Option 3: Split the policy:
Somewhat agree

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

Please, provide further context:

The suggested additions for nature and biodiversity, including the acknowledgement that these areas are closely linked to climate change mitigation and adaptation would be very welcome. Both options 2 and 3 would be welcomed but there is a preference for Option 3 to enable more focused aspects of biodiversity and geodiversity.

Sites afforded statutory protection should be acknowledged as such and be afforded that level of protection.

The policy should reflect the statutory requirements for BNG and incorporates requirements arising from the LNRS. Development supporting BNG initiatives should be encouraged.

Definitions

Policy EN3. The Melton Green Infrastructure Network

Policy EN3: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 51: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 51 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

Question 51 - Option 2: Amend the policy [preferred option]:
Strongly agree

Question 52: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

It is considered that a policy covering this matter should be retained but updated, and continue to contain a criteria related to enhancement of public rights of way and permitted routes and possibly also how this aligns to the delivery of the emerging Melton Mowbray Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan/Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy.

Policy EN5. Local Green Spaces

Policy EN5: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 53: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 53 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

Question 53 - Option 2: Incorporate Green Belt criteria:
Somewhat agree

Question 53 - Option 3: Designate additional Local Green Spaces:
Strongly agree

Question 54: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

The County Council is supportive of a revised policy and would welcome designation of additional Local Green Spaces where deemed appropriate. The assessment of any new spaces should closely link with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and work towards enhancing local native biodiversity – they could also increase opportunities for community involvement in nature.

In addition, Local Green Spaces can be identified in the context of the importance to the community and in respecting the setting of important buildings. They can be protected via design principles but should strictly adhere to NPPF guidance in particular in respect of the need not to be an extensive tract of land.

Question 55: If you wish to propose a new area for Local Green Space, please send a map and supporting information to planningpolicy@melton.gov.uk and add a note in this section

Please, provide further context:

N/A

Policy EN7. Open Space, Sport and Recreation

Policy EN7: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

Question 56 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

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

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

Please, provide further context:

Option 2 would ensure the consideration of new evidence and ensure provisions suitable for all ages and groups. The policy should set out minimum standards required and consider measures to address any current shortfalls.

Public Health would be happy to support with information and evidence for this if useful.

Policy EN8. Climate Change

Policy EN8: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

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

Question 58 - Option 2: Delete the policy, and make climate change a 'core thread' that runs throughout the entire plan:
Neither agree nor disagree

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

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

Please, provide further context:

As with sustainability, climate change is a fundamental global and national consideration and as such it is considered that it should be a thread that runs through the entire plan.

The update to policy EN8 to is also supported to strengthen and promote sustainable and low carbon developments.

Resource efficiency and the circular economy are also important in ensuring reduction in climate change impacts.

Policy EN9. Ensuring Energy Efficiency and Low Carbon Development

Policy EN9: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

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

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

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

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

Please, provide further context:

It is considered that a form of Policy in this regard is retained and there is agreement with the need for at least Option 2.

With Option 2, a considered review of the policy into more specific policies would better enable an approach more fitting to the context of an existing local plan and facilitate consideration of the local context making it more relevant and focussed to the local plan area.

Option 3 would make the 'policy more robust and specific, to ensure all new development meets the highest standards' - If this waits for the new local plan, consideration must be given to the impact of all developments that wouldn't consider this between now and the new local plan, and the impact this has on the environment – especially as these developments will likely have a lifetime beyond 2050. Therefore, developments that are allowed but didn't meet the highest standards, will exacerbate difficulties in meeting net zero across Melton.

Reference to cycle parking provision should be retained in Plan policy and EV charging provision covered appropriately so as not to overlap with Building Regulations.

It should also be noted that resource efficiency and the circular economy are also important in ensuring reduction in climate change impacts.

Policy EN10. Energy Generation from Renewable and Low Carbon Sources

Policy EN10: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

Question 62 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

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

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

Please, provide further context:

LCC would consider the removal of the policy to be detrimental as it would weaken the borough's ability to align with and contribute toward climate change law and national policies including net zero, the priority of which is stronger than ever. Removing the policy would reduce the flexibility with which Melton LPA could consider infrastructure development designed to generate energy from renewable and low carbon sources.

The County Council sees numerous opportunities where this policy can be strengthened.

From the perspective of the Local Highway Authority, there should be further consideration of access for construction, maintenance and de-commissioning. It might also be appropriate to include reference to 'repowering'/upgrading specifically, e.g. to cover off where a number of smaller wind turbines are replaced with larger ones (and whether the larger turbine components could be safely transported to the site).

Consideration should be given to including community energy opportunities within the policy, to further strengthen community benefits and opportunities for local green growth. It is also recommended that the policy aims to maximises prioritisation for local renewable energy generation & storage where appropriate and simplifies the processes for new developments to include this within plans.

For renewables such as biomass – considerations should be given to how this is sourced for the development, to ensure the fuel is truly renewable, limits its wider impact to the environment and where possible comes from local sources, to limit wider emissions (e.g. transportation).

This policy could also include the consideration of heat networks for new developments to maximise opportunities to reduce carbon emissions.

The policy also has an opportunity to positively encourage the generation of renewable energy both from commercial schemes and roof-top sources. To secure this the policy needs to be a strategic policy not subject to being overridden in NDPs and set out the primary areas for commercial production based on best evidence.

Policy EN11. Minimising the Risk of Flooding

Policy EN11: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

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

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

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

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

Please, provide further context:

It would not be considered appropriate to delete this policy, given locally relevant criteria.

Climate impacts are projected to become more frequent and severe, even if carbon emissions stopped today – therefore, this policy needs to ensure it encourages new developments to adapt to climate impacts where possible/appropriate. In addition, climate adaptation should be built into other appropriate policies. Consideration should be given to where the local plan may lose its influence over being able to ensure appropriate adaptation measures are put in place. If it is found that there is a risk of developments not applying appropriate adaptation measures, option 2 should be prioritised, even if the policy remains long. Poor adaptation to climate change will cost more in the long run due to damages than if appropriate measures are considered at development stage.

Consideration should be made as to whether a specific policy is needed to help address heatwaves and overheating in new developments, as this would be the other main impact experienced with future climate change.

Definitions

Policy EN12. Sustainable Drainage Systems

Policy EN12: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

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

Question 66 - Option 2: Incorporate additional requirements:
Strongly agree

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

Please, provide further context:

The proposed revisions appear to represent best practice.

Policy IN1. Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy

Policy IN1: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

Question 68 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

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

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

Please, provide further context:

Ensuring Policy IN1 reflects the latest position for delivering transport infrastructure in and around Melton Mowbray is considered a necessity.

Definitions

Policy IN2. Transport, Accessibility and Parking

Policy IN2: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

Question 70 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

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

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

Please, provide further context:

The need for developments to consider and implement sustainable transport infrastructure, good and accessible design and sufficient parking outweighs the extra burden and complexity for developers.

Policy IN4. Broadband

Policy IN4: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 72: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 72 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

Question 72 - Option 2: Amend policy [preferred option]:
Strongly agree

Question 73: Please use the comment box below to explain your response or provide any additional information you would like us to consider in our review of this policy

Please, provide further context:

A review of this Policy is supported to take account of changes in the NPPF and to reflect the importance of broadband provision across Melton Borough. The suggestion to delete the reference to 'Fibre to the Cabinet' is agreed.

Definitions

Policy D1. Raising the Standard of Design

Policy D1: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

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

Question 74 - Option 1: Delete the policy:
Strongly disagree

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

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

Please, provide further context:

We would welcome criteria around new developments that specifically aims to improve health and wellbeing outcomes after the construction phase - for example, places that enable active travel, and connectivity of place to reduce isolation by design that encourages social interactions.

Making the policy a strategic policy will elevate its importance and place a greater responsibility on developers to adhere to its requirements ensuring a consistent standard in development proposals. Having the key strategic design considerations clearly laid out in the plan would also remove uncertainty around requirements and ensure design expectations were clear.

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

Please, provide further context:

Regards current criteria 'e' regarding the sustainable management of waste, this could be strengthened by making it clear that the need for appropriate space provision needs to be both for individual dwellings as well as communal residential buildings. This also needs to be designed and incorporated where possible with residents needs in mind e.g. the additional ability to house a compost bin and food waste caddy for example not just a rubbish and recycling bin.

The Policy could also consider use of SuDS are part of the design of a scheme.

See also response to Q75.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Question 77 - Environmental sustainability and adapting to climate change:
Very important

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

Question 77 - Protecting and enhancing heritage assets:
Quite important

Question 77 - Car parking:
Quite important

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

Question 77 - Other: please state below any other key deign considerations not highlighted above:
Quite important

Please, provide further context:

All of these design considerations are important, particularly connectedness and comprehension of development. Detailed community involvement needs to be considered in the context of all sections of the community (especially younger age groups).

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

Yes

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

Please, provide further context:

On balance, yes, in so far as allocations that are to be subject to design coding should be identified within the context of the site policy. Furthermore, having specific policy guidance would ensure and facilitate a consistent approach to design standards and would remove the risk of any deviation from what would be required.

Equalities Impact

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

No

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

Please, provide further context:

N/A

Appendix A. Summary of the conclusions of the Local Plan Review

Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

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

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

No comments at this time.