

FOCUSED CHANGES RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED: Focused Change 12

Representor Name	Focused Change/Policy Ref	Summary of Representation	MBC Response
Elizabeth Crowther (LHH PC)	FC12	<p>Seek a new policy to specifically cover infrastructure requirements for rural communities, SS7, like Policy SS2 (assumed to mean IN2) which describes developer contributing positively to key infrastructure within the town.</p> <p>The new Policy SS7 Sustainable Rural Communities –Infrastructure- would detail the basic infrastructure elements required to maintain sustainable Service Centres and Rural Hubs where developer positive support is expected. This list should come from Neighbourhood Plan work, Parish Council and community feedback as well as statutory bodies.</p>	<p>Policy IN2 (i) specifically refers to contributions being sought for local infrastructure identified in the IDP or neighbourhood plan to deal with impacts of new development . Policy C9: Healthy Communities also provides the basis for the Council to seek contributions towards health facilities.</p>
Sue Green HBF	IN2, FC12	<p>Refers to C&W Viability Study evidence. The Council will have to balance affordable housing provision and securing funding for infrastructure. The Council is reminded that if the Local Plan is to be compliant with NPPF development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that viability is threatened (para 173 & 174). Therefore the HBF object to the word “minimum” in Policy C4 it is recommended that the word “minimum” is deleted.</p>	<p>These comments are dealt with in response to FC6.</p>
John Rust		<p>Whilst proportionate investment in infrastructure is planned for Melton to help it accommodate new development, the same is not true of the villages. Traffic impact on rural roads not considered.</p>	<p>Decisions about infrastructure investment are based on impacts rather than being related directly to the number of houses planned. Contributions from developers must be necessary and proportionate to the impact the development has on local services and infrastructure. Contributions will be invested where evidence shows that it is necessary to support development. The Local Plan process focuses on larger scale infrastructure required to support the cumulative impacts of development proposed through the plan. Following the adoption of the plan, the planning process will provide a means to secure necessary infrastructure relating to more local developments. A response to traffic impact on rural roads was given in response to comments at Pre Submission draft stage.</p>
Peter Wilkinson, Landmark Planning obo Mrs S Noble	new IN3	<p>The policy should be reworded along similar lines to Policy C4, to note that regard will be had to market conditions and economic viability, amongst other things, in applying the requirement, as per the approach suggested in the C&W viability evidence.</p>	<p>CIL is non negotiable once set. Negotiations on other developer contributions and viability will occur through the development management stage and secured through s106, and are already governed by national legislation.</p>
Brian Hodder		<p>Lack of co-ordinated infrastructure and strategic approach, especially for traffic flow and air pollution,e.g. around Melton Spinney Road where 3 new sites will access onto the road. Persuading occupants of new homes not to use cars won't work.</p>	<p>The local plan is where development and infrastructure is co-ordinated. The provision of the MMMDR is being co-ordinated with new housing development, schools, shops and employment areas. Policy IN1 and IN2 encourage the provision of infrastructure to encourage travel by sustainable means, but does not assume no useage of cars by new residents.</p>