

Response ID ANON-13H4-7YE3-8

Submitted to **Melton Local Plan Pre-Submission Draft**
Submitted on **2016-12-14 13:48:08**

About you

1 What is your name?

Name:

dr brian kirkup

2 What is your email address?

Email:

[REDACTED]

3 Are you responding as an individual, consultee, stakeholder or other?

Resident

If Consultee, Stakeholder, or Other, please give details here. :

4 Address

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

5 Age

Please select your age:

[REDACTED]

Policy C1 (A) – Housing Allocations

1 CH5PC1(A)Q1: Do you consider that Policy C1 (A) is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

2 CH5PC1(A)Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

4) Consistant with National Policy

3 CH5PC1(A)Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy C1 (A) – Housing Allocations is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy C1 (A) – Housing Allocations or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

see below my comments around flood risk in flood section below. Basically I think the choice of Fris 2 over Fris 4 (reserve site) is unsound, as it is contrary to NPPF guidance 100-101 and the correct application of a sequential test, which should promote Fris 4 above Fris2 and make Fris 2 the reserve site.

4 CH5PC1(A)Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally

compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

see above

Policy EN11 – Minimising the Risk of Flooding

1 CH7PEN11Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN11 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH7PEN11Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH7PEN11Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN11 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EN11 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH7PEN11Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

I am writing in regard to Frisby on thr Wreake. You currently have Fris 4 as a reserve site and Fris 2, which is a site with numerous flood risks, as suitable for building. In your policy above you state that MBC will follow a sequential approach to planning giving priority to land in flood zone 1 (NPPF guidance sections 100-101)

Fris 2 site needs a sequential test performing by the council,(/www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-the-sequential-test-for-applicants) and the first part of that test is, avoidance, i.e. can the development be accommodated on a site with lower or no flood risk? Fris 4 fulfils these criteria, having no flood risk and is of adequate size, therefore Fris 2 fails the sequential test and Fris 4 should be preferred for development.

Fris 4 should be promoted and Fris 2 should become the reserve site.

It is also worth pointing out that the neighbourhood plans most recent village survey suggested Great lane, and Fris 4 as our preferred sites. Fris 2 came bottom as it did in our first village survey earlier in 2016.

Examination

1 EXQ1: Can your representation seeking a change be considered by written representations or do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

Written Representations

If you wish to speak at examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary::

2 EXQ2: Moreover please indicate if you wish to continue to be involved in the Local Plan (Please tick appropriate boxes).

If you wish to be notified at the address/e-mail provided when the Melton Local Plan is submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government, If you wish to be notified at the address/e-mail provided when the Inspector's Report is available to view, If you wish to be notified at the address/e-mail provided in Part A when the Melton Local Plan is adopted

Acknowledgement

1 I understand the above statement and agree I have complied with its requirements

I agree