

FOCUSED CHANGES RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED: FC4 - Scalford

Representor Name	Focused Change /Policy Ref	Summary of Representation	MBC Response
Emilie Carr (Historic England)	SCAL1	The proposed allocation would harm the setting of a grade II* listed church and result in loss of historic earthworks on the site.	The harm has been assessed and is considered to be less than substantial.
Catherine Jennings	SCAL1	<p>Greenfield sites should not be considered windfall, windfall should only be within existing settlements as per NPPF. The second paragraph of Policy SS3 should be amended to: "Outside of those sites allocated through the local plan, planning permission will be granted for new development in the rural area within existing settlements, provided it is in keeping with the scale and character of the host settlement and where..."</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.16 The presence of a housing allocation shouldn't potentially restrict appropriate redevelopment / regeneration schemes within settlements.</p> <p>Scalford should not be a Service Centre, settlement population size should be the focus, not sustainability considerations.</p> <p>SCAL1 should be deleted from the Plan due to heritage impacts. If not deleted, the policy should be amended to favour design and character over housing numbers.</p>	<p>According to the glossary of the NPPF, windfall sites are sites which normally comprise previously developed sites which have unexpectedly become available. The NPPF does not state that these sites should be within settlements, or greenfield, only stating that they should not include residential gardens. Windfall sites on the edge of settlements would be subject to an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the character of the settlement. Therefore it is not considered necessary to restrict windfall developments to within existing settlements.</p> <p>The presence of a housing allocation will not restrict appropriate development / regeneration schemes within settlements as stated within policy SS3.</p> <p>The Focused Changes did not include any changes to the hierarchy of settlements and remain as set out in the pre submission draft, and justified by the adequate and proportionate evidence set out in the Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report 2016, and the Consideration of Settlement Roles and Relationships Report to MBC, September 2016.</p> <p>As stated, development of the allocation site is considered to have less than substantial impact on the conservation area, with the greatest impact determined as to the setting of Stoneleigh and the loss of views into the conservation area on the approach to the village from King Street, which could be mitigated by appropriate landscaping and layout as expressed in the site-specific Policy SCAL1. The housing numbers are an estimated capacity and will be subject to the policies as defined within SCAL1 related to design, materials and the impact upon heritage assets.</p>
Emilie Carr (Historic England)	SCAL1	SCAL1 – Object, the proposed site would harm the significance of the church and other heritage assets.	<p>Development upon the allocation site is considered to have less than substantial impact upon the Conservation Area. The greatest impact to the setting of Stoneleigh and the loss of views into the CA on the approach to the village from King Street. The loss could be mitigated by landscaping of the green space within the site in linear formation along the boundary edge to King Street to ensure sight lines towards the CA are not diminished. This has been incorporated into policy SCAL1, ensuring that the proposed scheme is sympathetic and limits its impact on the CA and setting of the listed building.</p> <p>The Council's Conservation Officer supports HE in each of these direct objections - there would need to be exceptional external circumstances for the Conservation Officer to offer contrary advice and in this case finds no reason to do so.</p>
Chris Hill (Scalford PC)	Scalford	<p>Scalford should be a Rural Hub, not a Service Centre.</p> <p>School is full, village is not sustainable. 18% increase to the village is not acceptable.</p> <p>Impact on heritage assets and unsympathetic development.</p>	<p>The Focused Changes did not include any changes to the hierarchy of settlements and remain as set out in the pre submission draft, and justified by the adequate and proportionate evidence set out in the Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report 2016, and the Consideration of Settlement Roles and Relationships Report to MBC, September 2016. Redesignation to a Rural Hub would not in any event alter the housing requirement assigned to Scalford because it is based on population size in both cases.</p> <p>According to the Local Education Authority, the school has capacity for 8 spaces (Jan 2017). Based on LEA forecasting, it is indicated that there will be 12 spaces remaining at the school by Jan 2021. Development in the village would be phased over the whole plan period, not within the first 5 years of the plan.</p>

<p>Catherine Jennings</p>	<p>SCAL1</p>	<p>Deletion from the Plan of site allocation and policy SCAL1 (Land south of Melton Road due to its impact on form and character of whole village which is Conservation Area. Policy SCAL1 identifies 23 dwellings on site as 'estimated capacity' while Policy C1(A) refers to it as capacity, which is more concerning as it might be taken as definitive capacity.</p> <p>If, however, SCAL1 is retained within the Plan, it is requested that Policy SCAL1 is strengthened by including additional text setting out that the final number of dwellings on site will be determined by detailed design, layout and conservation area related considerations.</p>	<p>The capacities within the site specific policies and C1(A) for that matter are only indicative and are in no way definitive to be taken as prescribing capacity for future applicants. No change needed.</p>
---------------------------	--------------	--	---