

FOCUSED CHANGES RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED: Focused Change 13

Representor Name	Focused Change /Policy Ref	Summary of Representation	MBC Response
Michelle Galloway (obo Davidsons)	FC13	Support	Noted
Geoff Platts, Environment Agency	FC13	Sound.	Noted
Martin Lusty, WOTWTA NP group	FC13	We support this section	Noted
Gavin Simpson	FC13	Bring it up to date. Let residents in the south of Melton and Burton know what's going on. There is no information, and a development as big as that should not be allowed unless there is a guarantee of Government money being granted to finance the road to the east.	Any adverse impacts on the AoS or the scheduled ancient monument would be as part of the wider development of the area. The Council's evidence (technical note prepared by Cotswold Archaeology) indicates that the proposed southern Sustainable Neighbourhood land does not appear to have formed an important part of the setting of the Scheduled Ancient Monument and that separation is not a key aspect of the SAM.
Steve and Rachel Jackson	FC13.1	1. See all earlier responses on FCs, which apply here too. 2. No clarity within South Melton zone on exactly how houses to be built and where - layout, design, size and locations.	This level of detail is not available at present, but will be addressed by the masterplans which are required for the Sustainable Neighbourhoods
Mr R F Hoyland (CPRE Leicestershire)	FC13.1	Please see comments under FC2. CPRE consider that the amended development boundaries have been discreetly changed without adequate justification or transparency.	FC13 shows the proposed boundary amendment clearly. The opportunity to make representations on the focused changes has been publicised in accordance and in excess of regulatory requirements.
Michelle Galloway (obo Davidsons)	FC13.1	Support change to southern boundary of SSN.	Noted
Emilie Carr (Historic England)	FC13.1	The proposed extension of the southern boundary of the SSN would have an unacceptable impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) and previous advice has been disregarded.	The impact upon the Scheduled Ancient Monument has been independently assessed and it is considered that Historic England's assessment is based upon a misinterpretation of the evidence.
Gerald Digby	FC13.1	The proposed extension of the southern boundary of the SSN would have an unacceptable impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument and the Council has ignored the advice of Historic England. The proposed extension is an unacceptable incursion into the landscape and an Area of Separation.	The impact upon the Scheduled Ancient Monument has been independently assessed and it is considered that Historic England's assessment is based upon a misinterpretation of the evidence.
Michele Parker (Burton and Dalby PC)	FC13	Great Dalby should be re-designated as a Rural Settlement. Allocation GReA1 is not deliverable or developable and should be deleted from the plan.	The evidence does not support this proposal. The allocation is considered to be deliverable and developable.
Michele Parker (Burton and Dalby PC)	FC13.2	The safeguarding of a "Corridor of Investigation" should be deleted.	This proposal is essential to define and safeguard the route of the MMDR.
Emilie Carr (Historic England)	FC13.2	Historic England object to the 'corridor of interest' / 'corridor of investigation', due to the setting impact upon the significance of the Scheduled Monument of St Mary and St Lazarus Hospital. Seek removal of the section of the Col to the south of the southern SUE. The road should be incorporated within a Policy SS4 boundary that reverts to the Pre Submission draft version.	The purpose of the COI is to ensure that any proposed developments within the vicinity of the MMDR do not present a barrier to achieving its delivery, by ensuring that appropriate engagement takes place over this. Any adverse impacts on the AoS and on the scheduled ancient monument would be as part of the wider development of the area. The Council's evidence (technical note prepared by Cotswold Archaeology) indicates that the proposed southern SUE land does not appear to have formed an important part of the setting of the SAM and that separation is not a key aspect of the SAM.

Janet Simpson	FC13	<p>The southern SUE planning application should not be approved by the LPA until funding is in place for the Eastern Distributor Road.</p> <p>Also, Kirby Lane is not equipped to take the weight and capacity of a southern ring road in its current form.</p>	<p>Planning applications are ideally determined when all the information necessary is available. The Government has a 12 week target for LPAs to determine major planning applications such as these.</p> <p>An applicant can appeal against non determination, and the Council would risk an award of costs against if I did not determine on the grounds suggested.</p> <p>Re: Kirby Lane, interim and longer term options for the southern part of the MMDR will be considered as part of MMTS, and by the attachment of conditions to any planning applications granted.</p>
Elizabeth Taylor	FC13.2	<p>The growth proposed will have a severe effect on the roads within Melton Mowbray, because of lack of alternatives. This will greatly impact on its ability to grow without substantial investment in infrastructure. The Corridor of Interest should be deleted from the plan.</p>	<p>As part of the development of the Local Plan, evidence has been produced to identify major transport infrastructure required to support the plan (including the MMDR). The MMTS is being developed in parallel to consider wider transport measures within the town to support the plan and maximise opportunities created by the MMDR.</p> <p>The Corridor of Interest relates to Policy IN1 which is the first step towards securing the transport improvements necessary to address issues identified. The purpose of the COI is to ensure that any proposed developments within the vicinity of the MMDR do not present a barrier to achieving its delivery, by ensuring that appropriate engagement takes place over this.</p>