

## Chapter 5, Policy C1(b)

| Name        | Representor Number | CH5PC1(B)Q3: Response   | CH5PC1(B)Q4: Suggested Changes | MBC Response   | Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes |
|-------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|---|
| A.Thomas    | 304                | If I do not agree with the imposition of 141 houses then how can I agree to another 40?   |                                | Comment noted.   | None.                                       |
| Carl Powell | 231                | <p>This is better than the policy on primary allocated sights because of the lines:</p> <p>'Where proposals on reserve sites are submitted, assessment will be carried out taking into account the following:</p> <p>Evidence of the extent of community support;<br/>The wider public benefits arising from the development;'</p> <p>I cannot see why 'evidence of community support' should be irrelevant to a primary site but not a reserve site.</p>   | none                           | This criterion would apply wherein there was community support to deliver the scheme, even if the rest of the allocations had been brought forward/could be brought forward. If there was no community support and other allocations had delivered, then the site should not be brought forward in line with the policy. | None.                                       |
| Colin Love  | 173                | <p>The Melton Plan policy clearly states that building should avoid areas subject to flooding. This must be understood as not only referring to specific SHLAA and other potential sites but also the general area in which these sites are located.</p> <p>The house allocation for the Borough should not prioritise simply on the basis of 'proportionality' to the identified Rural Service Centre but prioritise on the recognised flood risk.</p> <p>It has been shown elsewhere in this response that Bottesford Parish is a High Risk area for flooding. The 2001 flood not only affected individual properties but also the centres of Bottesford and Easthorpe and also parts of the Muston road network. This made access to the schools, retail</p> |                                | Comment noted.   | None.                                       |

|             |     |  |  |                |       |
|-------------|-----|--|--|----------------|-------|
|             |     | <p>facilities and industrial units precarious and, indeed, impossible.</p> <p>The Melton Plan should look first at the total number of sites identified for potential development within the Borough, including those currently designated Reserve sites, and allocate the housing according to those at LEAST risk of flooding. Thus, for example, according to available evidence, Waltham is not designated as liable to flooding - but has a reserve site of 168 houses. In contrast, Bottesford with an acknowledged High Flood Risk across the parish area has the largest allocation of houses.</p> <p>This makes no long-term planning sense - especially in an era of progressive climate change when it is forecast that the risk of flooding will increase,.</p> <p>Additionally, using at least some of the presently designated Reserve sites that are closer to Melton than Bottesford would make a greater contribution to the core of Melton's plan for economic development within the town (Chapter 6) because those residents would be much more likely to identify with, and occupy, the employment opportunities within the town.</p> |  |                |       |
| Diane Orson | 214 | <p>Some of the reserve sites are better than some of the current sites put forward</p> <p>The views of the local people in the communities should be taken into account and a suitable</p>   |  | Comment noted. | None. |

|  |     |   |  |  |       |
|--|-----|---|--|--|-------|
|  |     | compromise found between the council and the locals community on the use and numbers in reserved sites  |  |  |       |
| Hazelton Homes   | 396 | Given the Borough's recent history of persistent under-delivery of housing sites, we would suggest that it would be beneficial for the Local Plan to identify more reserve housing sites in order to improve the robustness of the plan. Furthermore, allocating additional reserve sites would also allow for flexibility within the plan if there are any delays in delivering any allocated housing sites. | we consider it necessary for the draft Local Plan to identify additional reserve sites for inclusion in Policy C1 (B): Reserve Sites.  | Comment noted.   | None. |
| LCC (Highways, Education, Early Years, Waste, Property Assets, LLFA, Libraries & Culture, LRERC) | 405 | 55. Query the need to identify 'reserve sites', citing that currently unknown opportunity sites, such as previously used employment sites could come forward for redevelopment which may form a more sustainable location than a 'reserve site'.  | Policy C1(B) – Reserve Sites<br><br>34. Whilst the proposal to consider the allocation appears consistent with the provisions of the NPPG, the policy contrains the delivery of additional windfalls that may deliver more appropriate development. In addition, in the application of this Policy consideration of the potential to increase the level and speed of housing delivery within the Sustainable Neighbourhoods should also be taken into account and the benefits of increasing numbers in the delivery of community infrastructure weighed against the constraints identified in respect of the reserved sites proposed. | Reserve sites exist to ensure development and delivery of the spatial strategy. These sites can only be brought forward if it is demonstrable that a site in the same settlement cannot be brought forward. If there is failure to deliver Borough wide, this would be seen as a fundamental failing of the plan which could trigger review. | None. |
| Lesley Walker  | 322 | We in the village have repeatedly informed MBC that large scale development in Somerby is not required or sustainable for the village. This has been bourne out by the 10 months one application has been still undecided (Oakham Road)   | We in the village have argued with MBC that the role of Somerby as a settlement that can sustain large scale development is flawed as MBC economic development team  | Please refer to policy SS2 for commentary on spatial hierachy and settlement roles.  | None. |

|                |     |   |   |   |       |
|----------------|-----|---|---|---|-------|
|                |     |   | have no data to support this roll and any data would be generic and not specific to Somerby.                    |   |       |
| Lilian Coulson | 55  | <p>Policy C1(B) is considered sound in that the principle of reserve sites is supported, but is found unsound in that the statement regarding settlement assessment and capacity is incorrect and unfounded. The policy states that there are no Reserve Sites available in Bottesford. Together with the under provision of allocated sites in policy C1(A) to meet the distribution set out in policy SS2, the lack of Reserve Sites here in many of the settlements where there are suitable sites available is particularly frustrating and perpetuates the unsoundness and lack of consistency of application of the stated objective and underlying policy of the Plan (ie policy SS2).</p> <p>As stated in the representation regarding C1(A), my client's land adjacent to 8 Easthorpe Road, Bottesford, has previously been proposed to the Council as a housing allocation and would be developable and deliverable at an early date. It is sustainably located and could deliver real planning benefits for the Service Centre, including vital linkages to the heart of the town centre as well as much needed homes. Furthermore, the allocation of this additional site would provide choice and assist in meeting local housing needs, especially as it is immediately available for development. So whilst it should be allocated in the short-term, as a fallback it should be allocated as a Reserve Sites which would have the additional benefit of providing a buffer should one of the allocated sites not come forward within the timescale anticipated and thus allow the Plan's housing needs to be met.</p> | My client's land at Bottesford should be allocated as Reserve Site (if not as an allocation) as outlined above. | Where sites were assessed as suitable and there was a surplus of sites, reserve sites were selected. In some settlements, there was no surplus of available sites thus no reserves. | None. |
| Nick Walker    | 321 | I have repeatedly brought to the Council's  | In order to safeguard the farm  | Please refer to policy SS2 for  | None. |

|   |     |   |   |   |       |
|---|-----|---|---|---|-------|
|   |     | attention that Somerby's role as a settlement is not legal, we do not fit the criteria as we have no employment opportunities as confirmed by the MBC Economic Development Team. They have no data.   | land and sustainability of farming in Somerby, I have asked for the conservation officer to increase the conservation area around Somerby. To date, no response or reply has been made. | commentary on spatial hierachy and settlement roles.  |       |
| Peter Bailey  | 8   | NHS centralisation issues as identified in Chapter 2.   | NHS centralisation issues as identified in Chapter 2.   | Comment noted.  | None. |
| Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group                   | 429 | <p>Policy C1 (B): Reserve Sites</p> <p>There are over 540 houses potentially identified on reserve sites including 240 at Melton Mowbray. Sites for Large numbers of potential dwellings are being sat on while some locations are 'overwhelmed'. The 162 dwellings, re- allocated due to lack of sites in some villages, could be located on the Melton Mowbray reserve site with far less impact than in the rural areas. This would also increase the funds to support the Melton Mowbray ring road and other infrastructure requirements.</p> |   | This is a comment on the spatial distrobution of housing and not the principles of reserve sites. Please refer to policy SS2 for commentary on spatial hierachy and settlement roles. | None. |
| Richard Simon   | 266 | <p>There are over 540 houses potentially identified on reserve sites including 240 at Melton Mowbray. Sites for Large numbers of potential dwellings are being sat on while some locations are 'overwhelmed'. The 162 dwellings, re allocated due to lack of sites in some villages, could be located on the Melton Mowbray reserve site with far less impact than in the rural areas. This would also increase the funds to support the Melton Mowbray ring road</p>   |   | This is a comment on the spatial distrobution of housing and not the principles of reserve sites. Please refer to policy SS2 for commentary on spatial hierachy and settlement roles. | None. |
| Robert Galij BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI, Planning Director - Barratt | 430 | <p>Concern is expressed over the statement "None available" in relation to "Bottesford".</p> <p>Land east of Belvoir Road, Bottesford (SHLAA Site</p>   | Land east of Belvoir Road, Bottesford under "Site Reference" MBC/012/13 should be included within Policy C1 (B) and a "Capacity" of 200 dwellings inserted.                             | Where sites were assessed as suitable and there was a surplus of sites, reserve sites were selected. In some settlements, there was no surplus of available sites thus no reserves.   | None. |

|                                   |     |   |   |  |       |
|-----------------------------------|-----|---|---|--|-------|
| David Wilson Homes North Midlands |     | Ref. MBC/012/13) is 'available' for development as well as being suitable, developable, deliverable and capable of being planned on a comprehensive basis.  | Policy C1(B) should be amended accordingly.   |  |       |
| Martin S Herbert                  | 413 | We object to most of the reserved sites suggested on the basis that they are not sustainable and will not help to deliver the infrastructure as much as the site which we are promoting Site MBC/049/13. To advocate, for example, a further growth of 168 houses in Waltham (Site MBC/192/15), for example, and some of the other village locations is inappropriate and would not be in accordance with the Spatial Strategy given the predominance of sites proposed within the villages. The only proposal for Melton site MBC/153/15 is in alternative use and there are other more sustainable locations generally for the growth to occur. | Delete reserved sites Policy generally in view of inappropriate locations and inconsistencies with what is mentioned in Policy SS6. Policy SS6 and Policy C1(B) do not sit comfortably together in terms of the Plan. | Reserve sites are mechanisms for delivery in the sites where they exist. Reserve sites are not there to deliver borough wide, but only to meet the needs of the individual settlement where they are, in the event of other sites in settlement being proven to be undevelopable. The promoted site has been assessed and scored lower than allocated sites. | None. |