

FOCUSED CHANGES RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED: Focused Change 5

Representor Name	Focused Change/Policy Ref	Summary of Representation	MBC Response
Shout 4 Residents	FC5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan seems to have expanded further more to the south, why? Is the number of houses being built, determined by the Government, MBC or the developers? There must be a timescale for the start of the building of the houses, do we know when these are likely to start? Social Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The originally proposed southern boundary of the SSN followed the uneven line of existing field boundaries . This was considered to impractical and it is now proposed that the boundary should be extended to achieve a satisfactory road alignment and to ensure sufficient quantum of development to support necessary transport infrastructure. National planning policy requires the Council to boost significantly the supply of housing, and to co-operate with other local authorities in the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area to meet the housing needs of the HMA as a whole. Up to date evidence informs the proposed housing requirement. Policy SS6 allows for review of the plan should identified needs change. Housing development is scheduled to start in 2018
Sue Green HBF	FC5	Support change to ‘encouragement’ for M4(2) and M4(3) standards rather than a ‘requirement’. The Council should only be seeking to determine house sizes based on evidence using the criteria set out in the NPPG.	Support noted for change to encouragement rather than requirement for M4 (2) and M4 (3). In reference to the deletion of house sizes in policy C2 (FC5), the Council sets out it’s reasons for the justification of table 9 and this policy in the associated text.
Michelle Galloway (obo Davidsons)	FC5	No comments	Support noted
Adam Murray	FC5	Support change related to Housing Mix and promoted sites can deliver as per the amended policy.	Support noted.
Michelle Galloway (obo Davidsons)	FC5	Support	Support noted
Dr J Warwick	FC5	technical standards for access should be 'required' rather than 'encouraged'.	The building regulations this representation refers to cannot be made a requirement as it would not be viable for every residential development. Instead, these regulations will be dealt with on a site by site basis. The evidence for this is in the Revised Local Plan and CIL Viability Study (May 2017)
Martin Lusty	FC5	In support	Support noted.
Carl Powell	Section 5.5 and 5.6	Requirements have not been objectively assessed and the best up-to-date relevant evidence has not been used. That best evidence is in HEDNA 2017.	The Towards a Housing Requirement for Melton Borough (Jan, 2017) document, prepared by GL Hearn (the same consultants who prepared the HEDNA (Jan, 2017) recommend 245dpa. Thus, the reason for the Melton BC Housing Needs Study (2016) being used for the Housing Mix policy as this was based on the demographic change likely with a housing delivery of 245dpa.
Mrs Debbie Adams	FC5	Not enough emphasis on the building of bungalows for the older generation who wish to downsize	5.5.3 and 5.5.6 of the reasoned justification supporting C2 Housing Mix policy addresses the points made in this representation.
Colin Love (Professor)	5.5.7, Policy C2, Appendix 5 5.62	‘Required’ to replace ‘encouraged’. Greater regard needs to be given to the HEDNA report in determining the housing mix policy.	The Revised Local Plan and CIL Viability Study, May 2017 report states that technical work produced by EC Harris in 2014 revealed the impact of these standards presented a cost uplift on standard build costs and could be argued as deterring investment where such schemes are marginal. The TAHR report, Jan 2017 evidences the 245dpa. The MBC HNS, Aug 2016 has been used as the evidence for the Housing Mix policy as it is based on the demographic change likely for a delivery of 245dpa, whereas, the HEDNA, Jan 2017 housing mix is based on a smaller amount of housing delivery.
Laurence Holmes (on behalf of Richborough Estates and Leicester County Council)	Policy C2 / Table 9	Support a flexible housing mix approach and compliance with National Space Standards and Building Regs 2015 requirements rather than encouragement	Policy C2 on housing mix states “we will seek to manage the delivery of a mix of house types and sizes to balance the current housing offer, having regard to market conditions, housing needs and economic viability”. Policy C3 is an aspirational policy. Any residential properties built to National Space Standards would be achieved through the development management process, in relation to design.

Laurence Holmes (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey, William Davis, Barwood, Leicestershire County Council, Richborough Estates)	FC 5 / Policy C2 / Table 9	Support a flexible housing mix approach and compliance with National Space Standards and Building Regs 2015 requirements rather than encouragement.	Policy C2 on housing mix states “we will seek to manage the delivery of a mix of house types and sizes to balance the current housing offer, having regard to market conditions, housing needs and economic viability”. Policy C3 is an aspirational policy. Any residential properties built to National Space Standards would be achieved through the development management process, in relation to design.
Laurence Holmes (obo NMLC) (ANON-7VBY-7HER-X)	FC5, C3	Support	Noted
Daniel Warwick (ANON-7VBY-7HW5-K)	FC5	Adjust housing mix so that larger houses (4/5+ bedrooms) are minimised.	The housing mix does minimise the development of 4+ bedroom properties. The emphasis is on 2 and 3 bedroom properties for both market and affordable housing (as shown on table 9 of the Local Plan). Policy C2 states "residential developments which include bungalows will be particularly supported".
CPRE Mr Hoyland	FC5	Why housing mix data from HEDNA has been ignored, esp. for elderly and disabled ?	As per 5.5.7 of the reasoned justification for policy C2 on housing mix (FC5): “The 2016 Melton Borough Council Housing Needs Study (HNS), rather than the more recent 2017 Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA), is used as evidence for the optimum housing mix (see Table 9) because it is based on the demographic change likely to be associated with the delivery of 245 dwellings per annum”. The HEDNA estimates the population change for people with mobility problems and reason that this is cited in 5.6.2, whereas 5.5.7 refers to the demographic change likely to be associated with delivery to formulate table 9 on housing size mix.
Ronald Thew	FC5	There is a need for bungalows to facilitate downsizing.	The policy and reasoned justification already states this.
Laurence Holmes (obo Richborough Estates & LCC) (ANON-7VBY-7HEF-J)	FC5	Policy C2 – Housing Mix: The Developers support a flexible approach to the range of tenures, types and sizes of dwellings to be provided within the site, which should have regard to identified market conditions and viability. Policy C3 – Optional Building Regulations: The Consortium support the need for high quality housing that complies with National Space Standards and requirements within the Building Regulations 2015. The policy should relate to detailed stages, rather than outline.	Noted. Housing Mix is often a matter presented at both outline and detailed stages and is necessary because it can be a matter of principal in many circumstances.
RHB Ranns for Croxton Kerrial and Branston Parish Council	FC5	There is no justification for the use of HNS data, when HEDNA is more up to date, and it relates to wards, not specific parishes or settlements. The HNS related to a rural hierarchy of settlements that has been superseded. A pdf file was uploaded.	This is the appropriate approach as it aligns to the scale of development which is envisaged in the Plan which will influence the mix of homes needed.