

Response ID ANON-MWX6-MJZ8-U

Submitted to Melton Local Plan Update: Issues and Options Consultation
Submitted on 2024-01-05 16:02:41

Introduction

Definitions

About you

What is your name?

Name:
Colin Love

What is your organisation? (if relevant)

Organisation:

What is your Job Title/Role (if relevant)

Job title/role:

What is your email address?

Email:
[REDACTED]

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):

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:

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

What is a 'competitive' rural economy? Competitive with what?

A GREEN rural economy should be identified within the criteria.

Promoting high quality and well designed development is a laudable objective - but meaningless unless pursued ruthlessly - against the weight of developers imposing identical computer designed standard box housing in village after village that takes away the historic diversity of village character. So maintaining a requirement for architectural diversity not only in but between rural communities must be a priority. Development should grace, not disgrace, the settings.

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:

1

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:

2

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

Question 3 - Other (please specify below):

Please, provide further context:

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:

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:

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:

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

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:

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:

It should only be permitted if there is a clear demand for local agricultural workers' accommodation.

If there is such a need demonstrated, the housing provision should be provided by the Local Authority who would then control the terms of the tenancy.

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:

As any such located new housing would inevitably require the use of car transport, it should only be permitted if it can be shown to be minimising potential adverse effects on climate change. For example any new development must have EV charging points and solar panels.

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:

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:

Given the past considerations about the division of housing allocations between Melton and the rural locations, there must be no change in this present Policy that might give rise to any additional (transferred) allocation to rural and thus less sustainable locations and further blight the rural characters .

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:

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

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:

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:

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

Question 14 - Option 3: Additional criteria:
Neither agree nor 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:

I am uncertain about much of this.

If there is, for example, a proven unmet housing need in Leicester, that housing need is in Leicester - not Melton.

Providing housing in Melton to meet Leicester's claimed requirements can only result in the substantial outcome of people being housed, quite unsustainably, well away from their place of work. If Melton was to accept such a proposal that would thus be quite contrary to the many of Melton's claims to be environment aware.

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:

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:

I can suggest that a substantial number of the issues raised with the present Policy C2 could have been anticipated from the very start. Planning Authorities have plenty of experience in confronting the arguments of developers to propose developments that do not readily comply with Local Plans. The problem is that Planning Authorities are seen as not to be robust enough in defending their own Local Plans. Crucial to this is the necessity to be able to overcome developers' claims as to 'economic viability'. Such claims are to be seen as passage-ways to maintaining high (20-25%) profit margins - margins well above those expected and experienced in other sectors of the economy. It is the Planning Authority that should have and maintain the control of what is built. Yet MBC has experienced, and relented to, developers claiming that they cannot fulfil 106 agreements because the claimed changes of 'economic climate' or other issues that would reduce the profit margins.

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:

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:

This amendment must be strongly supported. The building of houses that are truly 'fit for purpose' must be a priority of the Planning Authority. This is the very reasoning of the NDSS.

Again, as I have proposed above, many of these issues could have been anticipated when the Local Plan was first constructed. Although maybe curtailed by national legislation, too many times the language was 'softened' - as demonstrated by the use of 'supported' rather than 'required'.

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:

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 constant problem is the definition of 'affordable' and how this is interpreted by Planning Authorities and developers - each with very different objectives - Planning Authorities endorsing the social responsibility of assisting in the provision of housing to the less fortunate whilst developers first priority is to the shareholders with little or no concern about the provision of housing as a social responsibility. Hence the numerous cases when developers seek, and often succeed, in reducing or even eliminating the provision of affordable housing. The revision of text in this document must be strong enough to ensure that there is no slippage of the Planning Authority's intended social responsibility in housing provision.

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:

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:

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:

Question 24 - Option 2: Address increasing needs:

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

Strongly agree

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

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:

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:

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:

If a number of issues are to be taken out of this section and re-located to other parts it is vitally important that each re-location maintains the full force of each intent. For example, there is reference to High Quality Local Food Growing with a reference to garden plots. Just look at the garden sizes of the new developments!

Also when preparing the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan we included a reference to new gardens should meet the British Soil standard. This was in response to the Housebuilders' Federation advising us that they only expected that their members should provide gardens that are capable of growing grass - not to a standard for the 'more ambitious gardeners'!

How many new allotments have been made available within the new housing developments (or without) since the Melton Local Plan?

How many new estates has so-called long driveways with no pavements for pedestrian safety?

These Policy requirements should be central to all planning applications and permissions to ensure that Melton really is developing and providing Healthy Communities - otherwise it is just words..

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:

This depends on the design as well as the size of a development - see above re the long multi-residence drives with the absence of footpaths within estates. See the extensive absence of trees within many estates - beyond tokenism.

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:

Question 30 - Option 2: Amendments to reflect Use Class Order, new evidence and National Planning Policy Framework:

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

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:

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:

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:

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

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:

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:

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

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:

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:

Question 47 - Option 2: Clarify the policy to focus on socio-economic benefits:
Strongly agree

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

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:

It is noted that the present policy refers to protecting the Vale of Belvoir and Belvoir Castle.

This must surely reject any proposals for solar farms that are within these areas. Protecting means protecting, not diminishing, the attractiveness of the area for tourists..

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:

Question 49 - Option 2: Amend the policy:

Question 49 - Option 3: Split the policy:

Strongly 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:

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:

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:

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:

Question 53 - Option 2: Incorporate Green Belt criteria:

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:

I would recommend that one area is added to the Local Green Spaces identified in the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan.

1.The field between the Winterbeck and the Barratt's Wickett's estate Public Open Space (already designated as a LGS). This field is not just a field but carries a public footpath and other footways that are extensively used by residents, affording important views of Belvoir Castle, approaches to Easthorpe across the Area of Separation along with the north bank of the Winterbeck.

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:

Map and details to be submitted as requested to planningpolicy@melton.gov.uk

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:

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:

This is excellent in intent - but I always worry when I see that that developers' contributions are stated to be subject to viability considerations. If additional Open Space, Sport and Recreation are considered necessary then they are necessary not just desirable and subject to developers' seeking to ensure substantial (high) profit margins in the name of viability.
Thus far, I see no additional provision of allotments within Bottesford - despite a substantial increase in new housing.

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:

Question 58 - Option 2: Delete the policy, and make climate change a 'core thread' that runs throughout the entire plan:

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:

Again I see that in the introduction of the present policy there is reference to 'subject to considerations of viability'.
The issue of meeting global climate change targets is far too important to be subject to developers' interpretation of 'viability'. We are all at the stage where, if there are available means of mitigation then these must be incorporated in all new housing design and delivery. Developers must design new accounting models that incorporate these mandatory factors

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:

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

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

Option 2 is simply giving way to allow developers to continue (until when?) not meeting the excellent requirements as set out in the present Policy.

Once again the issue of the so called 'local development viability context' is seen as a legitimate reason for developers not complying with, omitting, the numerous criteria within the present Policy.

The fact is that appropriately responding to the urgent challenges of climate change is not something that can wait until 'developers negotiate land acquisition costs' to reflect (offset) the costs of higher building standards.

Having witnessed a substantial number of MBC Planning Committee meetings, I can say that I have seen very little evidence, if any, substantial and meaningful pressure on developers to fulfil the criteria within the current Policy. The outcome is that the Borough now has, and will continue to have, substantial new developments that are, in a planning objective sense (as expressed in this Policy) already non-compliant and obsolete.

Both developers and MBC somehow know what is required to combat climate change and then find reasons for not doing it!

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:

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

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

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:

The length of any Policy should not be a determining feature for consideration. The length of the Policy should be determined by the complexity of the issues covered by the Policy.

From personal experience, it is essential that there is very clear legal responsibility for the maintenance of all waterways. These include a dyke where the riparian owner has refused to clear it clear and LCC has declined to take on the cost of pursuing the issue in the courts.

The design of all new waterway systems must take account of climate change and the associated increased risk to health through incoming mosquitoes and similar.

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:

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:

See the reasoning within Q65 above.

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:

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

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:

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:

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:

This should not be understood as placing an extra burden on developers but placing an extra responsibility on developers. This extra responsibility, a responsibility in accordance with changing times, including climate change, will sit along side the other legal responsibilities that are currently incorporated in to building regulations. These may still be seen by developers as burdens that have to be incorporated in to their planning applications rather than accepted as their presently legally required social responsibility to build according to changing national standards. This Policy is simply updating, extending and enhancing these requirements. They should be required Conditions at the stage of any initial Planning Committee approval and not be subject to any later application for a Variation of Condition on the grounds of claimed 'viability'

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:

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:

Re the existing wording it should read development of fewer dwellings (not less)

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:

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:

The present Policy is set out with very clear and laudable objectives. Within my experience of watching many of the Planning Committee meetings, a major problem is that these objectives have not been established as central to many of the MBC planning consents for both large and small scale applications since the adoption of the Local Plan. This maybe because both officers and councillors have a lack of adequate professional design expertise and vision sufficient to propose and insist on higher standards of design. It may also be because, at the present time, there is a far from sound legal basis on which the Planning Authority can insist on many aspects of design as set out in the Policy, Further limitations of the ability of the Planning Authority to insist on design objectives as expressed in the Policy are developers presenting arguments based on economic 'viability' to attain high profit margins and the constant risk of developers both threatening and actually going to the costly Appeal procedures.

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:

As expressed above, I consider the design objectives as currently expressed in the Policy are excellent. However I am dismayed at the picture of semi detached houses, brick wall and fencing on the top left hand side of this consultation document. Surely this cannot be meant to be a representation of all that is 'good' according to the current Design Policy. What is seen are the developers all too common love of 'little boxes' constructed to a totally unimaginative design using brickwork that only requires unskilled 'straight liners' - brick layers only able to lay bricks in straight lines. This is just one example of de-skilling the construction and design processes that can be seen across the country and will have to be rejected if good design is really to be at the centre of future developments.

I notice also that the houses seem to be built on sloping ground and wonder what scope there is for well designed rear gardens including the quality of the soil left by the developer. I could go on.

In his 1989 book A Vision of Britain (then) Prince Charles expressed great concern about the current poor developments inappropriate to their settings that can be witnessed being built across the country. He makes the pertinent point that 'It is seldom enough to disguise them by planting' - an observation that must be noted by planning authorities when developers make proposals that their designs will be 'screened' - so as not to be seen! Ian Nairn made a similar point when stating that buildings must grace not disgrace the landscape and that views are a two way experience.

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:

Very important

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

Very 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):

Neutral

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

Very important

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

Very 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:

Quite important

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

Very important

Question 77 - Environmental sustainability and adapting to climate change:

Very important

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

Quite important

Question 77 - Protecting and enhancing heritage assets:

Very important

Question 77 - Car parking:

Very important

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

Very important

Question 77 - Other: please state below any other key design considerations not highlighted above:

Please, provide further context:

Sensitive to context. What does this mean? If it refers, for example, to a context of existing well designed developments that makes sense. But what if the present context is clearly unattractive on any range of criteria? How would a new development be expected to be sensitive to that context? Can the concept of 'harmony' be built in somewhere?

Distinctiveness. Refer to above comment - I am thinking of a recent planning application for a bungalow that was rejected at the planning application stage on a number of design criteria but went to appeal and the inspector granted the appeal on the grounds that the existing bungalows were of a similar standard. That is to say, the existing poor designs justified a further bad design.

This Policy must overcome such decisions. We can and must do better than this to and ensure high quality design legacies.

Piecemeal schemes. These can be good - depending on location, design and connectiveness.

Safe environments. The present 'acceptability' in planning terms of extensive multi-dwelling private driveways without pavements is an example of an obvious risk to pedestrians

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:

Very simply, anything that provides Policy grounds for helping to establish legally binding planning considerations for good design must be implemented.

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:

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: