

Agenda Item 4

Appendix 1 (b)

Chapter 4 policy SS5

Melton North

Consultation Responses

CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response
<p>The Nottingham Road to Scalford Road section of the site will deliver development within the first 5 years of the plan period (e.g. up to 2021).</p> <p>Please see enclosed report Section 3 paragraph 3.2 - 3.2 [Supporting Documents - No 49].</p>	<p>A delivery trajectory tailored to this part of the site is provided [Supporting documents- No. 49].</p> <p>The trajectory demonstrates that the Developers' site will be largely delivered within the first few years of the plan period. The trajectory assumes 2 sales outlets, with each achieving 3 sales per month.</p> <p>The Council's suggested trajectory fails to identify the disposal route for affordable housing. Whilst private units are disposed of two individuals, affordable housing is sold by a developer in blocks, as completed development parcels, typically through a S106 agreement to Registered Providers. This means that the affordable unit sales are achieved in parallel with private sales as development parcels come forward. This has the effect of increasing overall completions on the site.</p> <p>In view of the above, Policy SS5 needs to reflect the more realistic delivery trajectory identified above, recognising that the capacity of the NSN can be fulfilled within the plan period (e.g. up to 2,200 dwellings).</p> <p>In accordance with matters identified in paragraphs 3.31 to 3.56, the following further amendments to Policy SS5 are recommended:</p>	<p>Support for delivery of housing up to 2021 is welcomed. Housing trajectory The optimism is appreciated and welcomed but the authority feels more comfortable with the approach set out in the plan . No change is proposed to the figures. The commentary in the text (para 4.6.2) confirms the promoters' trajectories, which identifies that we understand they have a more optimistic approach. If these sites do come forward faster than allowed for in the plan it would be welcomed. The requests to add " subject to viability " and " where a need has been identified " (or similar words) to various parts of this policy are noted and understood. But it is considered that policies should be complied with ,unless there are exceptional reasons for not doing so. Those reasons could relate to viability or need,but it is not considered necessary to explicitly refer to them in every policy. en6 Not accepted as this would dilute the authority's ambitions for this policy.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• h1 should be re-worded to state: “Up to 2,200 houses with at least 1,700 to be delivered by 2036, 37% of which should be affordable, subject to viability”• Amend reference to C2 provision as follows: “Extra care housing/ Use Class C2 to meet an identified need within the Borough, where viable in accordance with Policies C2, C3 and C8”• c1 should be revised to: “A new two-form primary school (1.7 hectares) to be delivered alongside a local centre where possible and financial contributions towards secondary education to meet the identified need for school places”• c2 should be revised to: “An accessible local centre that will incorporate a mix of uses including small scale retail (up to 200 square metres), officebased employment and other community and healthcare facilities, subject to viability and where a need has been identified”	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• t1 should be revised to: “A comprehensive package of transport improvements informed by an appropriate transport assessment will be delivered subject to viability and phasing to be agreed with the Council. This will include...”• en6 should be revised to: “A development that complies with building regulations for energy efficiency and carbon emissions”• The second sentence of the first paragraph under the Masterplanning and delivery subheading should be amended to state: “In order to achieve a comprehensive approach, the masterplan should be prepared for the whole NSN. Sufficient indicative detail will be provided and agreed with the Council in respect of any land within the NSN falling outside the red line boundary of a planning application...” <p>The amendments are recommended in order to ensure that Policy SS5 is sound and that development can be</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>viably delivered</p> <p>for the NSN within the plan period.</p>	
<p>This will not preserve the rural ambience of the area.</p>	<p>Large scale developments are not wanted by residents</p>	<p>Accepted that large scale development is not welcomed by some local residents. The Plan seeks to deliver the housing, economic and infrastructure growth required and the Council consider the Sustainable Neighbourhoods the optimum approach for this.</p>
<p>These two policies allocate large scale strategic development (Sustainable Neighbourhoods), which include a high level of large infrastructure development for the Borough. 65% of all planned residential development, totalling 3,500 dwellings, during the plan period will be directed towards the 'Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area'. The principle of strategic growth in the Borough is supported, however this 'putting your eggs in one basket' approach is not supported as this will not deliver much needed homes in a timely fashion as directed by the NPPF. The Borough Council are already unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply, largely as a result of lack of strategic sites not delivering as anticipated, yet the Borough still wish to pursue this method of housing distribution.</p>	<p>Development should be more evenly distributed through the Borough with a variety of settlements accommodating development to meet local housing needs and support the requirements of the Borough. Appropriate housing delivery can be achieved across all settlement categories including 'Rural Settlements' where development is suitable and appropriate, which should not be restricted to such small scale delivery e.g 3 dwellings or less, when appropriate development, such as 10-15 units may be more appropriate in some settlements, whilst none is appropriate in others.</p>	<p>The distribution of housing follows the spatial strategy, which takes account of the ability of different settlements to accommodate development . The authority currently has a 5 year housing land supply.</p>

<p>The trajectory for the delivery of the housing within these development sites are seriously questioned. An assumption has been made that each of the sites will deliver 100 dwellings per year, based on two developers operating concurrently on each site (50 dwellings each). However Policy SS4 requires delivery of 2,000 dwellings, some 20ha of employment land for a mix of use classes, as well as provision of a new primary school, local centre (including parade of shops, A2-A5 use classes, small scale employment opportunities, and non-retail and community facilities), as well as a strategic road link connecting the A606 to the A607 to form the outer western relief road to Melton Mowbray, a number of new and enhanced bus services as well as important environmental objectives. Policy SS5 is similar in its requirement to deliver 1,500 dwellings, employment land, community facilities, a strategic road link connecting the A606 to Nottingham Road form the outer western relief road to Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>Both allocation requires comprehensive master plans preparing, as part of the requisite planning applications; incorporating all development elements into the masterplan i.e. employment,</p>		
---	--	--

<p>housing etc... It is likely that the preparation of such work is likely to take at least 12 months (including survey work), followed by the application itself, which, including the S106 legal agreement is likely to take a further 18 months. Upon receipt of outline planning permission, should it be granted, reserved matters applications will need to be prepared (a further 6-12 months) with determination a further 6 months minimum. This process therefore could take a minimum of 4 years (on each Sustainable Neighbourhood) before gaining detailed permission. That would led to at least 2021/22, when the Council have assumed delivery of 400 dwellings across the two Neighbourhoods. Neither site will have delivered any units by this stage. As set out above, large infrastructure will need to be in place as part of the allocations, relief roads, primary schools etc prior to residential development being delivered. Delivery of the required infrastructure takes a significant amount of time and money. It may even be that residential development is not delivered in the period 2021-2016 where</p> <p>the council assumes a further 1,000 units will be delivered.</p>		
---	--	--

<p>In their 1999 Local Plan, the Council allocated a 'New Village' (Policy NV1) to deliver approximately 1,200 new homes, employment land, retail, community facilities including a village hall, public open space, landscaping , highway infrastructure including the provision of the Melton Mowbray southern and western bypasses and links to it; the 'New Village' was never delivered.</p> <p>Unfortunately the Council have not learnt from the non-delivery of strategic sites, now seeking to allocate 65% of its requirements across just two large scale strategic sites. The need for large scale infrastructure to facilitate the planned strategic growth will cause delays, whilst small/medium scale sites in other settlements, including 'Rural Settlements', could come forward and deliver appropriate development with minimal delay since the level of infrastructure required will be far less.</p> <p>In addition to the above, we are concerned that the overall level of housing need (6,125 over the plan period; 245 per annum) is based on the 2014 SHMA, when the Leicester and Leicestershire wide Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) will be published</p>		
--	--	--

<p>for stakeholder consultation early in 2017 and is intended to supersede the SHMA. We support the desire to progress the Local Plan swiftly, but it is vital that it takes full account of the most up-to-date evidence on both housing and employment needs, which is not available at the time of this consultation. Clearly this will have an impact on many of the Local Plan policies. In the event the SHMA identifies a greater housing need there will need to be alternative options for delivering the additional requirement. Smaller scale sites will assist in delivering this whilst maintaining vitality in villages.</p> <p>The Council are currently unable to demonstrate a requisite five year supply of housing. By distributing residential development as proposed the delays of delivering the infrastructure required prior to delivering the much need new homes, will only seek to further exacerbate the housing delivery issue within the Borough.</p>		
--	--	--

<p>T1: A comprehensive package of transport improvements : 'A' suggests a link road from A606 to Melton Spinney. This alone without a link to the A607 Grantham road will only serve to increase traffic on Melton Spinney Road which is an unclassified road not designed to take the volume of traffic. The current junction onto the A607 is at times very busy and during busy periods at Twin Lakes Park on Spinney road traffic tails back several hundreds of meters.</p> <p>B: north/south connectivity can only be achieved after completion of a bypass to the east or west. This is required NOW to prevent severe congestion in Melton.</p> <p>E: Provision of new walking and cycle links as part of the proposed development:</p> <p>T2-B: Well-connected street patterns and walk able neighbourhoods providing high quality, safe and direct walking, cycling and public transport routes including links using the green infrastructure network; Both of the above points have impacts on the country park my views on this have been documented.</p>	<p>T1-A and B : Stop / Limit building until the correct road infrastructure is in place.</p> <p>T1-E and T2-B: Allocate additional space for these links outside the country park Northern boundary to maintain the ecology and open aspect.</p>	<p>The latest transport modelling evidence shows that the northern and southern distributor roads would provide some relief in their own right/as standalone measures. The eastern section will be delivered as funding becomes available, potential interim measures to provide traffic relief in the town will be considered as part of the wider transport strategy.</p>
<p>In the case of Melton Mowbray itself it's role as the primary urban centre is at</p>		<p>Noted</p>

<p>least not in dispute, nor can it be questioned that it contains the majority of employment opportunity. Unlike the rural areas it is also compact and dense enough to realistically improve internal transport infrastructure and encourage 'green' behaviours such as using public transport, walking and cycling to work or school. This is simply because the homes are likely to be closer to workplaces and facilities.</p>		
<p>page 42 paragraph 4.5.4</p> <p>Given that the Country Park can have no lighting since it is QE2 Field in Trust I find it difficult to see how the opening sentence can apply and perhaps more importantly on what evidence did MBC rely in making such a statement.. to make things worse the roads mentioned do not improve connectivity to the town centre they are just bits of roads from nowhere to nowhere hoping to grow into something more meaningful in several years time if the government of the day is willing to provide the relevant funds.</p> <p>page 43 map</p> <p>I assume the road is merely indicative but suspect it will sit on the northern extreme of the "SUE". It turns the country park into a town park. Presumably this</p>		<p>The relationship between the SUE and Melton Country Park is addressed by paragraph 4.5.7 and the Environment section of Policy SS5, including paras en3 A and en3 B . The need for and benefits of the transport infrastructure is explained in detail in Chapter 8 and supporting evidence</p>

<p>squeezing of park access and surrounding the park with houses is to maximise developer road contribution. Such blatant disregard for the park is not acceptable although consistent with the manner in which the park has been blighted by earlier council planning decisions particularly those off Scalford Road. The plan seems to suggest the wildlife corridor will be no more than the width of the disused railway line.</p> <p>Presumably no-one involved with preparing the plan knows anything about the regular traffic diversions through Melton entering via Thorpe Road when the A1 has problems in or around Grantham. Equally they cannot be aware of traffic issues on the same stretch of road caused by commuters to Mars at Waltham and they must be oblivious to the fact that Twin Lakes Park is the largest tourist destination in the town creating traffic congestion in the same locality. if they had been so aware then they would not have stopped the distributor road outside Twin Lakes and they would have realised that Melton Spinney Road could not cope with any extra traffic as it is in part little better than a country lane which also has the benefit of flooding if there is a slight amount of rain. The terms unsound,</p>		
--	--	--

<p>unsustainable, not fit for purpose all fit but the most apt description is unfortunately totally stupid</p> <p>page44 SS5 Housing</p> <p>This is not true. The developers will not fund the road and deliver 37% affordable housing. MBC knows that so why not be truthful. Not sure whether knowingly making false statements makes the document unsound but it should do so.</p> <p>In c2 who decides what is necessary and if everything is so uncertain why include anything in the document</p> <p>Transport t1 A</p> <p>In reality this is a road that goes from nowhere to nowhere across the top of a huge housing estate. All the roads it crosses will feel the added burden of congestion. Each part is to be developer funded so there will be gaps as the developments are phased making this "road" even more meaningless in the early years of the plan. Not sure what the wider agreed scheme is and assume that is just wishful thinking since there is no specific detail on that matter.</p> <p>t1 B</p>		
--	--	--

<p>This is a road that is not capable of being delivered by MBC nor indeed by Leicestershire County Council who are responsible for highways. Both these authorities want the road and have been given central government funding to create a business case. At best the consideration of funding the road will be heard in 2022. Work cannot start until later and given various infrastructure issues crossing road, rail and flood plain it is difficult to conceive any road being built and forming the north south link prior to the later stages of the plan period by which time most of the houses are planned to be built. How can this statement be made as there is no certainty of delivery and surely the local plan is meant to be evidence based and not just a list of hopes and aspirations.</p> <p>t1 D</p> <p>In recent times the local bus routes have been cut due to cost. The document accepts people work in Leicester which de facto is the location of local employment.. The buses to that city have also been reduced.</p> <p>t1 E</p>		
---	--	--

<p>As mentioned earlier the c</p> <p>Country Park cannot be lit so this statement is wrong unless like the road people are to walk and cycle from nowhere to nowhere</p> <p>t2 A</p> <p>So the buses have been cut and reduced making many areas in the north without any available bus. The services which were cut were running hourly but had little support presumably because of cost. The plan is to encourage the bus providers to increase the service to every 20 minutes. That should be even less profitable for them and no doubt the developer will be asked to pay which probably means even less affordable housing</p> <p>en1</p> <p>I suspect we are as residents excited by an improved town edge but may be even more so if the term were defined/clarified</p> <p>en8</p> <p>Contrary to MBC belief and apparent data I am sorry to say that Melton Spinney</p>		
---	--	--

<p>Road floods quite regularly and therefore according to this policy there should be no built development.</p> <p>4.5.8 The 1,000 dwellings are mentioned but I could not see any reference to the location</p>		
<p>Reiterated comments above and request a 500m buffer north and east of the country park</p>		<p>A 500m buffer is not realistic or necessary, nor is it justified in terms of the specification of its width in such a precise manner. It would prevent the development of a very large area of the Sustainable Neighbourhood, making the whole proposal and associated road undeliverable. The existing policies and the need for a master plan should address local concerns.</p> <p>It is proposed to adjust Policy SS5 Environment criteria as a 'focussed change' to specify the expectations for the protection zone in terms of an undeveloped area and reflection of landform.</p>

<p>I wish to object to the proposed local plan. In particular the previous inspector rejected the plan which allowed further development in the North I do not believe that the development without the completion of the Distributor Road is sustainable. The main grounds of my objection are increased traffic which will exacerbate as already difficult position; It is absolutely essential that the Distributor Road is completed before additional housing within the vicinity of Melton Spinney Road can be approved.</p> <p>Melton Borough Council has commissioned several reports from Independent experts which clearly indicate that the junction of Melton Spinney Road with Thorpe Road and the Thorpe Road traffic lights have at key times severe traffic problems.</p> <p>The proposal if accepted without Distributor Road would result in an unacceptable material impact to the safe and efficient operation of the highway network. Traffic generated by the developments are likely to result in severe impact on the A607 Norman Way/Thorpe End/B676 Saxby Road junction, with an associated knock-on impact on the wider highway network in Melton Mowbray Town Centre.</p>		<p>The plan (this policy and policy IN2) takes account of the need to ensure that road infrastructure and/or contributions towards it will be provided as a component of new development. It is not anticipated that the whole road will be provided in advance of associated housing.</p>
---	--	--

<p>In addition the environment around the country park will be damaged by allowing housing to be built on all sides of its boundaries. The plan allows for a 30% increase in the population but does not allow for additional medical resources.</p>		
<p>The NSN is to have at least 1,500 homes built between now and 2036. There are several points against the NSN and which make it unsustainable, unsound and unjustifiable:</p> <p>1. The sheer size of the development will put untold pressure on the already heavily congested roads in the north of the town. The north of town roads such as Thorpe Road, and Scalford Road are too narrow and with housing on both sides of the roads there is no room for carriage or pathway widening. There is certainly no room for cycle lanes.</p> <p>2. The Melton Country Park will be virtually shut off from the countryside and the pathetically</p>		<p>1. The need for and benefits of the transport infrastructure is explained in detail in Chapter 8 and supporting evidence.</p> <p>2&3. The relationship between the SUE and Melton Country Park is addressed by the Environment section of Policy SS5, including paras. en3 A and en3 B. The details of layout, including the provision of wildlife corridors and the protection of biodiversity sites, would be included in a master plan. It is proposed to adjust Policy SS5 Environment criteria as a 'focussed change' to specify the expectations for the protection zone in terms of an undeveloped area and reflection of landform.</p> <p>4 & 5. The precise route of the road has to be agreed. In accordance with paragraph 1 A it will be provided by the developers of the SUE.</p> <p>6. Agricultural land quality has been taken into account in the allocation of this SUE.</p> <p>7&8. In addition to response to 1 above it is</p>

<p>small strip of land suggested by MBC as the wildlife corridor for the Country Park is totally inadequate. The amount of housing planned to run alongside the Country Park will have a detrimental effect on the wildlife of the Country Park and could affect its status as a QE2</p> <p>Fields in Trust park. Indeed has QE2 Fields in Trust been consulted or even approached regarding the implications of the Local Plan to the Melton Country Park?</p> <p>3. Traversing the Country Park can only be done safely during daylight hours as there is no lighting in the Park (a stipulation of the QE2 Fields in Trust). During winter time the route could not be safely used by children going to or from school due to the short daylight hours. MBC thinks they can rely on the</p>		<p>noted that as part of the Melton Mowbray Distributor Road Options Appraisal Report work (2016), the northern distributor road was assessed as a standalone measure and was found to provide a material benefit to the town centre, albeit not to the extent of the MMDR in its entirety or to the level necessary to mitigate the impact of growth across the town as a whole.</p> <p>9. Noted . Additional development in sustainable locations should help to make the retention and provision of public transport more attractive to operators.</p> <p>10. The allocations in the Plan have been subject to sustainability and environmental assessment, including flooding and drainage . As individual applications are submitted they will need to be supported by flood risk assessments .Policy EN11 seeks to minimise the risks of flooding.</p>
--	--	--

<p>Country Park to provide enhanced connectivity to</p> <p>the town centre which shows either a deplorable lack of respect for the Park's QE2 Fields in</p> <p>Trust status, and its importance for local wildlife particularly in the more sensitive northern</p> <p>part of the Park, or a total inefficiency with regards to attempting to address the problem.</p> <p>4. A complete lack of understanding when it comes to link roads. A senior officer of MBC was</p> <p>heard to comment earlier this year that the proposed link between the Nottingham Road and</p> <p>Scalford Road would ensure that any development between the two roads would have a zero</p> <p>effect on the town. The suggestion being therefore that vehicles coming off the development</p> <p>will only want to travel between Nottingham Road and Scalford Road,</p>		
--	--	--

<p>having no desire to</p> <p>travel to the west, south or east of the town or even into the town itself. How can a comment</p> <p>like that be justified?</p> <p>5. There is no detail in the Draft Local Plan which is supposed to cover development up to</p> <p>2036, of how the so-called Distributor Road across the top of the Country Park is meant to be</p> <p>funded particularly as in order to avoid cutting off the Country Park, the section across the</p> <p>north of the Park will have to take the form of a bridge. This will be a costly affair and it is</p> <p>unlikely that developers will be prepared to fund that section (unless of course MBC decides</p> <p>to do a deal with the developers (unknown to the local residents) allowing them to build a</p> <p>LOT more homes than the 1,500</p>		
---	--	--

<p>mentioned in the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>6. The farmland across the north of the town is of a higher quality than the land crossing the south of the town.</p> <p>7. Most of the employment areas are to the south and west of the town with no direct connection with the north of the town except through the town itself. The largest percentage of people who work outside the borough work in Leicester and its surrounds. There is no direct connection with the south of the town except through the centre itself.</p> <p>8. Melton Spinney Road is a narrow country lane which has to cope with traffic. Twinlakes Park is a highly successful children's theme park and its entrance is on Melton Spinney Road. During school holidays in particular, the high volume of</p>		
--	--	--

<p>traffic</p> <p>attempting to leave the Park causes tailbacks from Thorpe End in the town all the way back</p> <p>up Melton Spinney Road. Thorpe Road, Melton Spinney Road and Thorpe Arnold Hill</p> <p>struggle to cope with the daily traffic going to and from Grantham. When the A1 is closed</p> <p>(as it frequently is), this can cause tailbacks up the Thorpe Road (A607 Grantham Road)</p> <p>from Thorpe End to a mile out of town near the golf course. The traffic is further</p> <p>exacerbated by the fact that Mars Petfoods has a major site just outside Waltham-on-the-</p> <p>Wolds and traffic at the beginning and end of the working day is very heavy. The fact that</p> <p>Twinlakes Park has opening hours of 10am to 6pm or 7pm sometimes, means that there are</p>		
---	--	--

<p>more than two 'peak periods' for Melton Spinney Road and Thorpe Road.</p> <p>9. The bus service into town for estates off Thorpe Road and Melton Spinney Road was discontinued by LCC in February 2016 due to lack of funding. The only bus service into</p> <p>the town is the Grantham to Loughborough hourly bus service which does not of course</p> <p>cover the estates. The roads are too narrow for cycle lanes and to walk from town to the</p> <p>current housing line of Thorpe Park on Melton Spinney Road is one mile. In fact for any</p> <p>new development in the north of the town, the walk from its edge into the town will be in</p> <p>excess of a mile.</p> <p>10. Insufficient regard (actually no regard) has been paid to the fact that during wet weather a</p> <p>stream forms in the fields opposite Twinlakes Park and on Melton Spinney</p>		
--	--	--

<p>Road. This stream takes a diagonal line down the field and enters a ditch next to 17 Melton Spinney</p> <p>Road and also crosses the road itself for several yards. It eventually finds its way to Thorpe</p> <p>Brook but in the meantime there is a lot of surface water and run off in the area after only</p> <p>about two hours of rain. MBC is in denial that there is a problem with flooding along Melton</p> <p>Spinney Road, Thorpe Road, the Tesco car park and Thorpe Road at the Thorpe End</p> <p>junction. Building yet more houses (600 plus for Melton Spinney Road) would just make the situation worse.</p>		
<p>Bottesford North may include Bottesford - and often doesn't seem to do so - but I note that despite suggesting we have over 400 homes forced upon us the Name Bottesford does not get ONE</p>		<p>Not relevant .Relates to Bottesford ,not Policy SS5</p>

<p>mention in this Sustainable Neighbourhood section. Why not?</p> <p>Where are these new facilities to be offered? When will they be built? Will they be built before the homes?</p> <p>Too many non-specific comments /unanswered questions here to be able to make a decision on whether this is a sound plan.</p>		
<p>Comments exactly as per SS4. This development must fund an equivalent by-pass segment.</p>		<p>See response to Policy SS4</p>
<p>SUSTAINABLE URBAN EXTENSION</p> <p>Policy SS5 – Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood Draft Policy SS5 seeks to deliver 1,500 homes as well as employment, community facilities, a link road and other transport improvements in an extension to the north of Melton.</p>	<p>As discussed above, we would encourage the Council to extend the proposed NSN and allocate a greater number of dwellings in this location.</p> <p>Land immediately to the east of the proposed NSN (to the east of Melton Spinney Road) is available, suitable for development and deliverable. The land extends to approximately 12 hectares (see enclosed Land Registry Plan and wider NSN Extension Plan for context). The site could accommodate approximately 360 dwellings based on a density of 30 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>It would appear logical to include this land, along with a wider land parcel to the east between Melton Spinney Road and the A607, in the NSN. This would provide an opportunity to extend the link road to meet the A607. It would also allow for an increase in housing numbers which would provide the Plan with greater flexibility.</p>	<p>In the longer term this is a reasonable suggestion ,which could be supported. However ,at present the additional dwellings which would be provided are not currently required in this location.</p>

<p>Strategic Assets</p> <p>22. The following comments are made by Strategic Property Services Asset Management Group in relation to the County Council's role as landowner.</p> <p>23. Leicestershire County Council's principal land interest in Melton Borough it would seek to promote through the consultation process would be the land at Sysonby Farm, Melton Mowbray – this site forms part of the Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood for which a separate detailed collaborative response will be submitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Council supports the proposed allocation of Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood which would include County Council owned land at Sysonby Farm. It notes that the site is capable of making a significant contribution to the infrastructure needs of the town. A flexible approach to master planning is requested to expedite delivery, and to note the scheme can deliver significantly higher numbers than the 1700 dwellings proposed in the plan period.		<p>Noted. There is currently no need for the SUE to provide more dwellings, but if future reviews indicate any significant shortfalls the situation will re-assessed.</p>
--	--	---

<p>Housing and Employment Growth</p> <p>4. Policy SS5 – North Melton Mowbray Sustainable Neighbourhood Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• T1 B – In order to use this paragraph and refer to it as part of the planning process it would be useful to clarify the meaning of this point. It may be possible to combine with point A “strategic road link connecting the A606 Nottingham Road to Melton Spinney Road forming part of the MMDR and facilitating the wider scheme”.• Point D Perhaps could read ‘Sustainable new and enhanced’• T2 A – We would suggest removing the reference 20 min frequency and replacing with suitable and regular. This will enable consideration to be given to providing appropriate services for shift workers, school and other commuter patterns as well as regular services to the town centre.• 4.5.4 – Suggested change to “Walking and cycling connectivity to the town		
---	--	--

<p>centre will be significantly improved. The development will also provide a new link road connecting the Scalford Road with the Nottingham Road. Supporting upgrades to Bartholomew’s Way and Welby Road and an onward link to the A6006 will be considered as part of the Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy and will likely be secured through development specific mitigation.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Master planning and delivery – should specifically include route of the distributor road. <p>Policy SS5 – Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood</p> <p>29. The proposed allocation of the Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood, including LCC owned land at Sysonby Farm, is strongly supported. Further, the site is deliverable and capable of making significant contribution to the infrastructure needs of the town. The key deliverables other than housing numbers are seen as desirable but should be brought forward in response to evidence base and/or commercial demand.</p>		
---	--	--

<p>30. It is essential to adopt a flexible approach to master planning of the Melton Mowbray NSN in order to expedite delivery. Within this process there is a need for landowners/ developers to commit to the location of uses and secure the line of the link road. Beyond that each should have the flexibility to bring forward development at a time appropriate to them within the context of the plan. In particular, the land between Nottingham Road and Scalford Road (partly in LCC ownership) has the ability to be brought forward , as a standalone site, at an early date to enable the 'pump priming' of infrastructure delivery. This approach would also support the delivery of housing numbers in the early years of the plan which appear dependant on the delivery of other sites within the Borough which currently appears to be lagging behind the required 245 per annum.</p> <p>31. Whilst the allocation is strongly supported attention is drawn to the ability of the overall allocation to deliver significantly higher numbers than the 1700 currently proposed. Accordingly, the 1700 should be considered as a minimum giving the opportunity to</p>		
---	--	--

<p>housebuilders to develop the site out at densities compatible with current market demand providing the potential to make up shortfalls elsewhere in the Borough.</p>		
<p>Growing Melton Mowbray through Large Scale Development Sites</p> <p>This notes that development required in Melton Mowbray will be focussed in two new large scale ‘sustainable neighbourhoods’ to the north and south of the town.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.3.4 states that ‘these developments will deliver new residential and business communities in the form of attractive and high quality new neighbourhoods and places supported by the infrastructure necessary to mitigate the impacts of growth.’</p> <p>However modelling should include identification of impacts on the wider highway network outside the Borough.</p> <p>The City Council notes that a new strategic link road will be provided to help deliver both the Melton Mowbray Sustainability Neighbourhoods which is expected to improve Melton Mowbray’s east/west connectivity through a link</p>	<p>modelling should include identification of impacts on the wider highway network outside the Borough.</p>	<p>It is not considered that the development would significantly impact on the Highways network within the City of Leicester owing to its relative scale, distance and likely dispersion of traffic.</p>

<p>road. By providing this new infrastructure, traffic movements from the new housing stock could gravitate towards Leicester (subject to robust transport modelling) as this may facilitate easier access to Leicester’s employment and other opportunities. Whilst this could reduce the traffic impacts in Melton Mowbray, there is the potential to create adverse impacts on the existing transport network in Leicester. These areas may include the A47, A607 and A46. Any adverse impact in this area may be accelerated from proposed large scale housing growth in Charnwood and Harborough. Mitigation measures for Leicester’s highway network may be required to support this new growth based on any strategic transport modelling findings.</p>		
<p>4.3 Growing Melton Mowbray through Large Scale Development Sites</p> <p>We support the principle of the two new large scale ‘sustainable neighbourhoods’. In addition to their intrinsic capacity to support the growth of economically and socially sustainable communities. They offer the opportunity to integrate development into the landscape and,</p>		<p>Support welcomed .</p>

<p>through recognition of and engagement with the historic environment, achieve sustainable and durable communities with a sense of place.</p> <p>4.4.3 Welcome confirmation that the SSN will respect the town's heritage and that of the surrounding hinterland as well as giving critical consideration to the separation of Burton Lazars and its nationally important scheduled monument (SM should be marked on Figure 7). The latter occupies a key and visibly prominent location at the south-east end of the SSN. Design and form of the development at this key pinch point will be critical to achieving a sustainable and successful development.</p>		
<p>Page 48 paragraph 4.7.4 sets out the approach in the event of significant shortfalls in housing are identified. Three potential areas for investigation are detailed. As indicated above, it is my view that a more robust and effective approach would be to include reference to the granting of planning permission for additional sites within or adjacent to the existing built up area of Melton Mowbray in addition to or as well as referring to the land west of Melton Mowbray which is in DAC use and therefore currently unavailable. Policy SS6 should be modified in line with the above</p>		<p>Not relevant to Policy SS5; relates to Policy SS6.</p>

suggestion.		
<p>We refer to previous comments, submissions and statements in this representation. If the allocation of Melton North is to continue it should be in addition to an allocation of Site MBC/049/13. The strategic road link mentioned under the heading Transport (A) will not deliver any material benefits to Melton town centre unlike other development connected with the EDR. Now the preferred route has been identified, it will be a very significant length of time before any material benefits can be produced and indeed this development will exacerbate the problems which already exist in Melton town centre. See our comments under Vision above.</p>		<p>The latest transport modelling evidence shows that the northern and southern distributor roads would provide some relief in their own right/as standalone measures. The eastern section will be delivered as funding becomes available, potential interim measures to provide traffic relief in the town will be considered as part of the wider transport strategy.</p>
<p>Again, improved transport links, a move towards different modes of transport. The villages north of Melton have a dwindling bus service, they do not have the room to encourage cycling, walking etc, they do not have the room to expand. This plan is all based in Melton and Melton's needs, it has scant consideration for the wider borough.</p>	<p>Re visit the Sustainability Appraisal - listen to information coming from the villages, build either in Melton and/or a new village near Melton.</p>	<p>The distribution of housing follows the spatial strategy, which takes account of the ability of different settlements to accommodate development . Other alternatives are addressed in Policy SS6.</p>

<p>4.5.4 says that "Walking and cycling connectivity to the town centre will be significantly improved."</p> <p>How, when the Country Park has no lighting and being a QE2 Field in Trust can have no lighting as it will significantly alter its status particularly in the more sensitive habitat sections of the Park? Also there is no room for creating cycle lanes in the town from any of the roads.</p> <p>There does not appear to be any sustainable justification for this statement.</p> <p>It is noted that the development will provide a link road connecting Scalford Road with Nottingham Road. That of course is only part of the planned northern Distributor Road so why is the balance of that road not mentioned? The only rational conclusion is that deals have already been done with the landowners (including Leicestershire County Council) for a contribution towards funding the road as part of planning approval. From a transparency perspective it would be helpful to know if that is the case, and to comprehend the balance of any deal proposed between the council and the developers/landowners. Within this</p>		<p>Melton North SSN is well located to provide sustainable links to the town centre. The sensitivity of Melton Country is recognised in Policy SS5 (en3A & en3B), which will ensure that any new infrastructure ,such as pedestrian and cycle routes ,have regard to the special characteristics of this area. Details of other links will come forwards through the proposed masterplanning .</p> <p>The context for the part of the road in the SN is described more comprehensively in Chapter 8 (Melton’s Economy)</p> <p>A ‘focussed change’ is recommended in that section relating to the alignment of the road and how it will connect, together with updated information and an approach to its funding. This change includes a ‘corridor of search’ that connects to the finishing point of the length of the Distributer road that crosses/serves the North Sustainable Neighbourhood.</p> <p>The evidence explains distributor road will alleviate traffic flows from the accident ‘blackspots’ even after taking into account the scale of the North Sustainable Neighbourhood.</p>
--	--	--

<p>context one needs to consider the slashing of the affordable home requirements in exchange for road development contributions in respect of planning consents already given by the council in the south. If this part of the link road is funded at the expense of the provision of affordable housing the Plan is unsound because it is contradictory and therefore not effective or indeed justified. If it is not so funded there is no apparent justification for the statement (isolating only that part of the road) and hence is unsound.</p> <p>4.5 Figure 8 Although the Distributor Road (DR) is "indicative" one has to assume it will be placed at the northern edge of future development in the north of the town. According to the map of the North Sustainable Neighbourhood (NSN) Concept, the proposed development will finish opposite Twinlakes Park (TP). If there is to be no development on the northern side of the DR then where is the link between Melton Spinney Road and the A607 Grantham Road to go - north or south of TP? All indicators point to there being no intention of linking Melton Spinney Road with the A607 Grantham Road. (See Appendix 4 Infrastructure Delivery Schedule which suggests the</p>		
--	--	--

<p>Eastern Distributor Road links to Thorpe Road and Melton Spinney Road). Instead all traffic will be expected to travel down Melton Spinney Road and join up with the A607 at the bottom of Thorpe Arnold Hill. The Plan contains many comments relating to improvements of existing roads/creation of roundabouts and junctions but makes no mention whatsoever of any improvement to Melton Spinney Road which is little better in parts than a country lane with no ability for two HGVs to pass each other. Even if the Eastern Distributor Road is eventually funded and built, the junction between Melton Spinney Road and Thorpe Road will be a potential accident black spot and create even more congestion on Melton Spinney Road with traffic flowing to and from the NSN and TP. If traffic is then expected to turn left out of Melton Spinney Road to travel uphill on the A607</p> <p>Grantham Road, this hill (called Thorpe Arnold Hill) will also become an accident black spot due to its narrowness and the sharp left hand blind bend at the top of the hill. This section of road struggles now to cope with the large amount of farm machinery and HGVs that have no alternative but to use this stretch of road. Surely to connect Melton Spinney Road</p>		
---	--	--

<p>with the A607 Grantham Road beyond Thorpe Arnold should be prioritised as to miss out this link would inevitably mean the northern section of the Distributor Road would just be a road to nowhere.</p> <p>The earliest possible delivery of the Eastern Distributor Road is sometime after 2022 and in the interim congestion and pollution levels will be beyond acceptable levels and the Plan fails to recognise this or allow for mitigation and is therefore unsound due to being not effective.</p> <p>There is clear indication that most of the northern edge of the Melton Country Park will be bordered by development which will turn the Country Park into a Town Park as the small corridor that has been left for wildlife is only the width of the disused railway line and its embankment which is not sufficient. It is also not clear how the Northern Distributor Road will cross the northern boundary of the Country Park which is the most sensitive part of the wildlife park. It is also not clear how this section of the Distributor Road will be funded as there will be no adjacent developer. The Inspector in his letter to the Council of 11th April 2013 explaining the</p>		
---	--	--

<p>inadequacy of the Core Strategy suggested that "the cutting off from the open countryside of the Country Park will also have an adverse effect on biodiversity". Since then the Country Park has acquired "QE2 Fields in Trust" status which arguably would be put in jeopardy by implementation of the Local Plan. There appears to be no evidence that the council has consulted with the QE2 Fields in Trust organisation with regards to the Local Plan and its effect on the Country Park.</p> <p>Policy SS5 - Transport</p> <p>t1 suggests a "comprehensive package of transport improvements informed by an appropriate transport assessment". That assessment details a road link between the A606 Nottingham Road</p> <p>to Melton Spinney Road and refers to "securing a route that allows north/south connectivity". The former is clearly a desire to build a road based on funding by developers, the latter does nothing</p> <p>more than identify where an appropriate connecting road could be built. This is insufficient since without connectivity</p>		
--	--	--

<p>traffic congestion is such that development of any magnitude becomes unsustainable as indicated in the Jacobs report (see comments on SS1 above). Without the north/south link, the proposed Northern Distributor Road finishing as it does on Melton Spinney Road does nothing to mitigate traffic flow within the town centre, exacerbates congestion and in reality is a road to nowhere.</p> <p>Additionally apparently there will be "New and enhanced bus services connecting the development with the town centreandnew walking and cycle links". There are currently no direct bus links to the employment areas from the north of the town, and although there is a limited bus service along parts of Scalford Road and Nottingham Road, these do not continue into the evenings nor do they operate on a Sunday. Leicestershire County Council (LCC) withdrew its funding for the Centrebus Service No.18 in February 2016. There is now no town bus service for residents living in the Thorpe Road and Melton Spinney Road area. Presumably LCC stopped this hourly service because it was too costly but the Local Plan suggests the service will become every 20 minutes and yet the Plan does not explain how</p>		
--	--	--

<p>this is to be funded and consequently the Plan is unsound since there is no justification.</p> <p>In addition the only safe area to cycle from the north of the town into the town centre is through the Country Park, but there is no lighting provided in the Country Park which severely impacts on the use of the Country Park as a cycle way or indeed a walk way after dark. As part of its QE2 Fields in Trust status the Country Park cannot have night time lighting.</p> <p>en8: One assumes that the document has a misprint and that "MSSN" should read "MNSN".</p> <p>Apparently there should be no built development in areas that are at higher risk of flooding, and yet Melton Spinney Road floods with great regularity when there is rain lasting longer than about 2 hours. On that basis en8 suggests there should be no development leading on to Melton Spinney Road which contradicts other sections of the Local Plan which is consequently unsound since it is not effective or indeed justified.</p>		
--	--	--

<p>4.5.8 There is mention of 723 dwellings without cross reference to any source document and similarly there is no indication as to how 3,980 has been derived. These numbers certainly do not appear in Appendix 1 dealing with site allocations. How can documents with contradictory numbers be sustainable? They are by definition unsound through lack of justification.</p> <p>4.6.2 On a similar theme to that mentioned in 4.5.8 above the numbers of dwellings being delivered during the Plan period reflected in table 8 do not add up to the number of dwellings again if the numbers do not work and are inconsistent it can only point to an inadequate,unjustified, ineffective, unsound Plan.</p>		
--	--	--

<p>This is a precise of one of the supporting documents - no online form has been submitted.</p> <p>The Consortium reaffirms its support for the North Sustainable Neighbourhood allocation. Notwithstanding this support the Consortium states that the identification of 1700 dwellings for the site of which 1500 are to be delivered before 2036 does not represent the true capacity of the site and cannot be reconciled with the evidence supporting its allocation. The consortium have submitted supporting documents which go into great detail about proposing an updated land use budget and in this budget it states that the quantum number of dwellings is 2,200 on some 71 hectares. The updated land use budget covers 12 land use components giving a total area for the NSN of 109.53hectares. These 12 components identified in the supporting document have informed the preparation of a revised illustrative Development Framework plan for the NSN (this is included in the supporting documents). The supporting documents provide evidence of delivering these land use components including an explanation of a proposed housing trajectory</p>	<p>In accordance with paragraphs 3.31 to 3.53 of the supporting document the following amendments are recommended to ensure that Policy SS5 is sound and that development can be viably delivered for the NSN within the plan period:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) SS5 h1 should be re-worded to state "up to 2,200 houses with at least 1,700 to be delivered by 2036, 37% of which should be affordable, subject to viability." 2) Amend reference to C2 provision to state "Extra care housing to meet an identified need within the Borough, where viable in accordance with Policies C2, C3 and C8." 3) c1 should be revised: " A new two-form primary school (1.7 hectares) to be delivered alongside a local centre where possible and financial contributions towards secondary education to meet the identified need for school places." 4) c2 should be revised: "An accessible local centre that will incorporate a mix of uses including small scale retail (up to 200 sq. mts), office based employment and other community and healthcare facilities, subject to viability and where need has been identified." 5) t1 should be revised: "A comprehensive package of transport improvements informed by an appropriate transport assessment will be delivered subject to viability and phasing to be agreed with the Council. This will include ..." 	<p>Support for delivery of housing up to 2021 is welcomed. Housing trajectory: The optimism is appreciated and welcomed but the authority feels more comfortable with the approach set out in the plan . No change is proposed to the figures. The commentary in the text (para 4.6.2) confirms the promoters' trajectories, which identifies that we understand they have a more optimistic approach. If these sites do come forward faster than allowed for in the plan it would be welcomed. The requests to add " subject to viability " and " where a need has been identified " (or similar words) to various parts of this policy are noted and understood. But it is considered that policies should be complied with, unless there are exceptional reasons for not doing so. Those reasons could relate to viability or need, but it is not considered necessary to explicitly refer to them in every policy. en6 Not accepted as this would dilute the authority's ambitions for this policy.</p>
--	--	--

<p>different to that of the Melton Local Plan. Evidence is also provided to suggest that the housing trajectory in the Melton Local Plan also fails to identify the disposal route for affordable housing and goes on to explain this point.</p> <p>The supporting documents include plans/maps and a full critique of SS5, including housing (different types/mixes), care homes, employment, community facilities, transport, energy efficiency, development phasing, financial contributions, masterplanning and development delivery.</p>	<p>6) en6 should be revised: "A development that complies with building regulations for energy efficiency and carbon emissions"</p> <p>7) The second sentence of the first paragraph under the Masterplanning and delivery sub-heading should be amended to state: "In order to achieve a comprehensive approach, the masterplan should be prepared for the whole NSN. Sufficient indicative detail will be provided and agreed with the Council in respect of any land within the NSN falling outside the red line boundary of a planning application..."</p>	
<p>Do not adversely affect areas of tranquility, including those benefiting from dark skies, unless proposals can be adequately mitigated through the use of buffering.</p> <p>Same comment as previous. Contradiction in terms when you are proposing to remove areas of tranquility by building housing, link roads and business infrastructure around existing homes.</p>		<p>Comments are an extract from Policy EN1 ,which is not directly applicable to the North SSN.</p>
<p>NHS centralisation issues as identified in Chapter 2.</p>	<p>NHS centralisation issues as identified in Chapter 2.</p>	<p>See response to Chapter 2.</p>

<p>Supported</p> <p>This also has all the advantages and is with the South scheme the most sustainable in the Borough. It ticks all the boxes opportunity for living and working in the same area public transport and walking and cycling routes. It also funds a great deal of the necessary infrastructure.</p>		<p>Support welcomed.</p>
<p>Supported</p> <p>This also clearly has all the advantages and is with the South scheme the most sustainable in the Borough. It ticks all the boxes opportunity for living and working in the same area public transport and walking and cycling routes. It also funds a great deal of the necessary infrastructure.</p>		<p>Support welcomed.</p>
<p>The construction of a section of the proposed outer distributor road cannot be justified on traffic grounds and does nothing to promote sustainable transport as set out in NPPF paragraph 182, 29 -41.</p>	<p>Funding should be directed at improvement to the town centre such as constructing an inner relief road to remove through traffic from the south of the centre.</p>	<p>The evidence supports the provision of a road as part of a package of transport improvements to alleviate the congestion in the town centre, facilitate economic and housing growth and improve connectivity to the town's radial routes.</p>
<p>We are particularly pleased to see references to the Playing Pitch Strategy and the emerging Built Sports Facilities Strategy</p>		<p>Support welcomed.</p>

<p>The Deregulation Act 2015 specifies that no additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings should be set in Local Plans other than the nationally described space standard, an optional requirement for water usage and optional requirements for adaptable / accessible dwellings. For energy performance the</p> <p>Council was only able to set and apply a Local Plan policy requiring an energy performance standard that exceeded the energy requirements of Building Regulations until commencement of amendments to the Planning and Energy Act 2008 in the Deregulation Act 2015 that date has now expired. So whilst the</p> <p>Council may still specify the proportion of energy generated from on-site renewables and / or low carbon energy sources it cannot set a local standard for energy efficiency above the current 2013 Building Regulations standard.</p> <p>Therefore references to policy requirements on energy efficiency and carbon emissions standards exceeding</p>		<p>See response to comments on Policy D1 (Chapter 9) .</p>
--	--	---

<p>existing Building Regulation requirements in Policies SS4, SS5 and C1 should be deleted.</p>		
<p>William Davis Ltd has acquired an interest in approximately 7.6 hectares of land within the NSN (east of Scalford Road) and will be looking to bring forward housing delivery as early as possible. We therefore support the Council's selection of this site as an appropriate and sustainable option for meeting the scale of required strategic growth in housing numbers and associated infrastructure. The site is well placed to secure new an improved transport connectivity and effective integration with the existing built form and green infrastructure on this northern area of the town.</p> <p>William Davis is one of the largest privately owned house builders in the midlands and we have been providing quality homes for the last 80 years. We have experience of bringing forward a number of large sustainable neighborhoods both alone and in consortium with other house builders and look forward to working with the Council in bringing forward this exciting development. We have very recent experience in working in partnership with Harborough District Council and other developers (Hallam Land Management,</p>		<p>Support welcomed</p>

<p>Davidsons, and Linden Homes) in preparing the Masterplan for the Harborough SDA (1,500 dwellings). Planning permission for this was secured in May 2016 and first reserved matters, for the first phase of 79 dwellings are about to be submitted.</p> <p>Policy SS5 provides a robust framework for future delivery of the NSN although William Davis has a couple of concerns regarding points of detail.</p> <p>Firstly the requirement at en6 that the development "exceeds building regulations for energy efficiency and carbon emission, where viable", is considered to be strictly contrary to Government Policy and therefore unsound. The Deregulation Act 2015 specifies that no additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings should be set in Local Plans other than the nationally described space standard, an optional requirement for water usage and optional requirements for adaptable / accessible dwellings. It cannot set a local standard for energy efficiency above the current 2013 Building Regulations</p>		
--	--	--

<p>standard. This requirement of Policy SS5 should therefore be deleted.</p> <p>Secondly, we consider that the reference to design codes exceeds what may be strictly necessary to ensure quality standards in design. In our experience a comprehensive Masterplan can be sufficient to ensure that high design quality is delivered without the need for design codes, which would automatically cause delay to the approval process. This is particularly the case where other policies in the Local Plan (such as that provided by Policy D1 in this Local Plan) provide a strong policy framework to support good design. In the NSN is to start to deliver homes in the period 2018-19, as assumed in the Council's trajectory, it is essential that unnecessary additional controls are avoided. The reference to Design Codes is therefore contrary to soundness tests as it will not be justified or effective.</p>		
View SS4	View SS4	
<p>The Pre Submission Draft Plan was considered by Council at a Special Meeting on the 20th October 2016. Late amendments to the plan were presented as an Erratum at the Council Meeting, and included changes to Policies SS4 and SS5 relating to the Melton North and</p>	<p>The Plan should be amended to make specific allocations of land to deliver the proposed southern and northern sustainable neighbourhoods to Melton Mowbray. The Council should work with the site promoters to agree the form and extent of the proposed allocations.</p>	<p>See response to this under Policy SS4 responses.</p>

<p>Melton South Sustainable Neighbourhoods to describe them as strategic development locations, to allow better opportunity for development of detailed composition following resolution of key issues.</p> <p>It is not clear whether the Pre-Submission Plan is proposing the allocation of strategic sites to the north and south of Melton. The NPPF advises that any additional development plan documents should only be used where clearly justified (para 153) -PPG confirms the Government’s preferred approach for each LPA to prepare a single Local Plan for its area (Paragraph 012, Reference ID: 12-012-20140306).</p> <p>It is considered that the appropriate approach for the Council is to prepare a single Local Plan including both strategic allocations and other allocations in the more sustainable settlements. To ensure soundness and enable adequate testing of impacts, the plan should include sufficient details to demonstrate the proposed sustainable neighbourhoods are capable of yielding the necessary development in accordance with Section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Given the key role the sustainable neighbourhoods play in delivering the strategy for the plan, it is important that these are included as</p>		
--	--	--

<p>specific allocations and shown on the Proposals Map. Before the plan is submitted to the Secretary of State, the Council should work with the promoters of the sustainable neighbourhood to agree the form and extent of the proposed allocations.</p>		
<p>Table 7 and Policy C1 – Housing Allocations Land to the East of Melton Spinney Road As discussed above, we would encourage the Council to extend the NSN to include land immediately to the east and to amend Policy C1 to allocate a greater number of dwellings in this location.</p>		<p>The site proposed is not required in order to satisfy need and would perform poorer as a replacement of exiting parts of the SN already identified.</p>

<p>The requirement for road infrastructure was based on a report from 2011 (Jacobs) estimating 2500 new houses. I understand we are now considering between 4000 and 5000 homes around Melton which only increases the immediate need for road infrastructure spending. The £2.8M from government for a feasibility study will not deliver conclusions for a 4/5 years after which there is no guarantees that capital for a relief road will be available. This situation could leave Melton with even more severe traffic problems than it currently has.</p> <p>4.5.4 Concerned that the Northern SUE virtually encircles the country park, and to achieve walking and cycling links to the Northern SUE would require new lit paths and access points, which would severely damage wildlife which mainly uses the quieter Northern end of the Park, but also damage the open aspect of the country park, and its link to open countryside.</p>	<p>1. Stop or limit building until the correct road infrastructure is in place.</p> <p>4.5.4 Walking and cycling into town: develop a buffer zone around the park to maintain open aspect to countryside and enable wildlife routes to open countryside. The old railway line currently shown on plans is not sufficient by a long way.</p>	<p>The evidence indicated that a strategic solution was required for a quantity of housing greater than 2500. The funding referred to is intended to develop a full business case for which it is anticipated will be complete in early 2018.</p> <p>New housing will need to be developed in step with provision of sections of the MMDR as it is the development that will be substantially funding large sections of the proposed road. The idea of a buffer zone around the park is included in Policy SS5en3B. Also the policy includes a commitment to consult key stakeholders on a masterplan for the SUE. Links from the development to the Country Park and safeguarding wildlife areas will be identified through the masterplanning process.</p> <p>It is proposed to adjust Policy SS5 Environment criteria as a 'focussed change' to specify the expectations for the protection zone in terms of an undeveloped area and reflection of landform.</p>
--	---	---