

To Whom it May Concern.

Please add us into the representations (to be submitted by 19th December) made by the Gaddesby Community group.

We re in total accord with their views and do not consider the Plan to be justified, effective or consistent with national policy.

General and further Comments:

1. It is a misnomer to consider Gaddesby a rural hub due to inefficient employment access and high speed broadband. We believe Gaddesby is better defined as a rural settlement. It is a dormitory or commuter village. It is not sustainable as a place of employment, education or traffic for the proposed 38% increase in housing without major changes to its infrastructure and spoliation of the rural and historic character of the village.

Since April 2015 (MLPSRR), Gaddesby has inexplicably changed its status from 'rural supporter' to 'rural hub', though it boasts only 2 of the 4 qualifying stipulations. Gaddesby does have a village hall and recently upgraded village school which will reach capacity in 4 years. The only other amenities are a pub and a church, inadequate to support employment. As noted, the town is only served by the 100 bus whose range and schedule are not flexible enough for practical commuting to most employment centres. Provision of fibre optic cable to each extant home is currently required for good service. BT, who now monopolize the service, should be required to put this in place before the copper wire service is further challenged through extending demand.

We feel the criteria for a hub should also include such facilities as a GP surgery, a Post office, food shop and newsagent, library, pub, petrol station.

2.-5: Housing Needs Survey vis. current permission, natural growth and percentages: As members of the Gaddesby Community group we believe the proposed GADD2 and GADD3 developments to be putting the cart before the horse until and unless the 2017 housing needs survey deems this village to require such extensive new build in addition to the 6 new infill houses and the 14 permitted dwellings for the yet unbuilt GADD1 site. The 38% increase would indisputably change the nature of the village.

6. Highways: Traffic augmentation has not been assessed by the plan. The village already suffers from a yearly palpable increase in traffic, heavy vehicles, speeding vehicles and difficulty in safe dropping off and collection of school children on Ashby Road as well as residential parking on Main Street. At peak times all access points to the A607 are dangerous and difficult. Encouraging further flow to and from the village will increase the danger of accidents and wasted time from better economic use. Better to increase residence in sites within safe walking or cycling distance to employment.

further comments;

re Chapter 7: Melton Borough's Environment-Protected and Enhanced: The Pre Submission Draft Plan neither respects the natural environment nor the built heritage, interfering with pasture, hedgerow, ridge and furrow, historic church long view, overburdening country lanes, possibly interfering with ecology of pond and stream, as well as increasing light, noise and traffic pollution as well as increased health and safety risk from traffic.

re Policy EN6 on Settlement character: 1.Harm would be done to the historic rural nature of the village with its grade 1 listed church view over the historic ridge and furrow fields were GADD 2 to be realized. Art Historian Nicholas Pevsner singled out this church as a crown jewel and it should be protected as such.2. GADD3 would harm open area that contributes positively to the character of the settlement at a village entry from open country along a rural lane.

re EN8 Climate change and Policy EN11, Minimizing risk of flooding: In view of the clayey land at the site for both GADD2 and 3, already rejected as unsuitable in the SHLAA assessment-MBC/-16/13, what new assessment and provision is in place for infrastructure to ensure the viability of theses developments and the safety of the existing buildings? Appendix 1 of the Local Plan calls for mitigation measures from flooding at GADD2. There is no provision for upgrading the current antiquated waste water and sewage system. Gaddesby Brook regularly overflows. Even with improved drainage for the proposed sites, what knock on effects would this have for current residential areas and would homes be insurable and the Council able to rehouse displaced residents in case of flooding?

re policy EN9 and EN 10 Ensuring Energy efficiency, low carbon development and energy from renewable resources. Proposing a 38% increase in housing for a commuter dormitory village is inefficient with regard to transport. Better to develop more accessible brown sites within Melton. Any new housing should be constructed with state of the art energy efficiency. There is no visual or auditory impact in tapping geothermal energy.

signed,

Peter Wheeler

Merrill Wheeler

