Response ID ANON-MWX6-MJZR-N

Submitted to Melton Local Plan Update: Issues and Options Consultation
Submitted on 2024-01-05 13:13:50

Introduction

Definitions

About you

What is your name?

Name:
Lucy Flavin

What is your organisation? (if relevant)

Organisation:
Bottesford Parish Council

What is your Job Title/Role (if relevant)

Job title/role:
Clerk

What is your email address?

Email:
███████████████████

Are you making a submission on behalf of someone else?

Yes

If you are submitting on behalf of someone else, please provide details:

Name (on behalf of):

Organisation (on behalf of):
Bottesford Parish Council

About you (equalities questions)

Please provide the first 5 digits of your Postcode (for example LE13 1).

Enter the first 5 digits of your postcode:
████████

Gender: How do you identify?

████████████

If self-describe, please state :

Would you describe yourself as transgender?

████████████

What is your sexual orientation?

████████████

If other, please state:

What is your age?

████████████

Do you consider yourself to have a health problem or a disability which has lasted, or is expected to last at least 12 months?

If you selected other, please state:

What is your ethnic origin?

Please describe your ethnicity and race:

What is your religion?

Please state your religion:

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]:
Strongly 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:

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:
2

Question 3 - Ensure local housing meets the local communities current and future needs:
1

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:
3

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]:

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]:
Somewhat 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:

We support Option 3 of this Policy SS3. However as previous planning applications have shown there is a natural tension between:-

• Where possible the development does not result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land; and

• The development can be adequately drained and would does not increase the risk of flooding, in accordance with Policy EN11.

Would it be possible to clarify these sections a little in order to mitigate these tensions?

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:

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:

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:

We support option 2. We are concerned that current target minimum percentages are consistently not being enforced. None of the developments in Bottesford Parish seem to have hit the Value Area 2, 32% requirement for affordable housing? Can the above policy be amended to ensure this target is in fact met?

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:

We support whichever Option allows for economic development in farm locations outside the village envelopes in our parish.

Policy EC3. Existing Employment Sites

Policy EC3: Relevant context to respond to the questions below

Question 35: Looking at the options above, which option do you support?

Question 35 - Option 1: Delete the policy:

Question 35 - Option 2: Add specific class uses to policies:

Question 35 - Option 3: Adding Flexibility to the Policy:

Question 36: 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 parish council would only support the current policy would only support this proposal, if any alternative use for any specific site within the Parish is supported by the Parish Council on a case by case basis.

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:
Strongly disagree

Question 47 - Option 2: Clarify the policy to focus on socio-economic benefits:
Neither agree nor disagree

Question 47 - Option 3: Amend the Policy to define sustainable tourism:
Neither agree nor disagree

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:

"Moreover the Borough Council will resist planning applications which will have an adverse impact on tourism across the Borough, but with particular protection applied to valued attractions such as the Vale of Belvoir, Belvoir Castle and Burrough on the Hill Iron Age Fort, two of the most valued tourist attractions in the Borough."

The above paragraph (within the adopted policy) is particularly relevant to the concerns of the Parish and we therefore strongly support this commitment.

Definitions

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:
Strongly disagree

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:

There is an urgent need to redefine Green Spaces within the Parish in the light of rapid housing development proposals.

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:

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:
Strongly disagree

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

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 Borough Council should adopt clear and unambiguous flood resilience requirements in its policy for new developments, including the requirement that flood risk assessments take into account 1.flood risk on proposed sites, 2. flood risk created elsewhere by larger developments and 3. the cumulative impact of developments over time in areas that are prone to flooding and have experienced proportionately high levels of development over time. Such standards would provide greater certainty to both residents and developers. Risk tolerance is a matter for local communities and should not be left entirely National or Regional flood authorities. Therefore minimum flood risk resilience standards for new developments should be specified accordingly within the Policy and should address each of the 3 requirements specified above.

We are particularly alarmed that development proposals are being submitted with Flood Risk Assessments with resilience levels of 1% (1 in 100) and this threshold is being implicitly endorsed by the Local Flood Authorities and that cumulative impacts and impacts elsewhere (such as run off leading to fluvial risks along affected watercourses) are not being properly considered or are being ignored entirely. We draw attention to the National Infrastructure Commission's paper 'Water & Floods' notes that the 1% resilience level implies "more than 60% chance of flooding in the next 100 years". See https://nic.org.uk/studies-reports/reducing-the-risks-of-surface-water-flooding/surface-water-flooding-final-report/

We would point out that our recommendation has also been made by the National Infrastructure Commission's submission to the EFRA select committee as reported 2nd February 2021. The submission states: "The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and planning authorities should ensure that from 2019 all new development is resilient to flooding with an annual likelihood of 0.5 per cent for its lifetime and does not increase risk elsewhere". See https://committees.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/6834/html/

Proper policy standards addressing the above points are a high priority for the residents of Bottesford and for the Parish Council. We therefore recommend that Policy explicitly requires that new developments meet at least a 0.5% flood resilience standard and that flood risk assessments associated with developments explicitly address risks created elsewhere and take into account cumulative impacts of different developments over time.

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:
Strongly disagree

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:

Adopting this option into Policy would bring the Local Plan in line with the Bottesford Parish Design Code.

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:

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:

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

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).:

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

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

Question 77 - Connectedness: created new and weaves into existing networks:

Question 77 - Comprehensive: ensuring development is designed and delivered in a coordinated way, and avoiding piecemeal schemes:

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

Question 77 - Environmental sustainability and adapting to climate change:

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

Question 77 - Protecting and enhancing heritage assets:

Question 77 - Car parking:

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

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

Please, provide further context:

Question 78: Do you think there is a need for specific policy guidance about the use of design coding within the local plan?

Not Answered

Question 79: If you responded 'yes' to question 78, please provide reasons?

Please, provide further context: