

# SHLAA Panel notes

18/May/2017. 9.30 am

## Attendance:

- Aaron Sandhu. Taylor Wimpey
- Jessica Miln. Taylor Wimpey
- Andrew-Rusell Wilks. Godfrey Payton
- Ben Matthews. Richard Watkinson
- Matt Lacey. Richard Watkinson
- Chris Green. Andrew Granger
- Helen Prangley. Davidsons Group
- Jenny Keen. Marrons Planning
- Judith Wise. Waterloo Organisation
- Katie Gulliver. Barwood Homes
- Paul Collins. Middletons
- Phill Bamford. Gladman
- Valerie Adams. MBC
- Ripple Gupta. MBC
- Gemma Dring. MBC
- Jorge Fiz Alonso. MBC

## Declarations of interests

Andrew Granger – MBC/004/17, MBC/027/17 and other sites in Hose

## Site comments

### Melton Mowbray

- 1) MBC/019/17 Melton Mowbray, Thorpe Road Playing Field**  
No interest for developers due to Flood Zone 3b. Considering mitigation for that small size is not realistic – a technically challenging site
- 2) MBC/020/17 Melton Mowbray, Dalby Road and Hartopp Road**  
The site is good assuming that MBC has an alternative playfield nearby. There is some interest for 100% affordable and small builders can be interested, if available now. However, the potential Local Community's objection and the high level of traffic on the street need to be taken into account.
- 3) MBC/021/17 Melton Mowbray, Top End Cattle Market**  
Good site assuming that the contamination mitigation is a minor constraint. However, if the site is contaminated and the costs are high then it can be a problem due to the small size of the site. It can generate more traffic on Scalford Road, street quite busy, especially at school time.
- 4) MBC/022/17 Melton Mowbray, Burton Street**  
Not the best site especially if other sites that are available. It's on Flood Zone 3 something that is likely to stop the development (sometimes even Flood Zone 2 is a problem). In addition to that, this is a well-used car park.
- 5) MBC/023/17 Melton Mowbray, Pavilion Site, Willow Drive**

Good place in terms of market as it is a much appreciated area. Alternatives for car parking are required. The site is deliverable in less than 5 years if it's available now.

## Service Centres

### 6) **MBC/001/17 Old Dalby, Land south of Station Road**

It's advisable to take views from Historic England regarding the Listed Building at the southwest of the site as it would give a better perspective of the possibilities of the site. That part of the proposed development is quite high and the costs involved will increase. 70 units are definitely too much for the village. 30-40 units for this kind of villages are a good amount; in this case the northern part of the site looks better than the southern bit. One of the main issues is our (MBC) own policy regarding the Areas of Separation. In addition to this it would be good to consider if the services on the village need a boost (benefit from development) or if they have already reached their limit.

### 7) **MBC/004/17 Old Dalby, Land west of Longcliffe House**

There is some slope, but still deliverable.

### 8) **MBC/025/14, Long Clawson, Land off Mill Lane**

Access is an important issue. The site is quite isolated. There are better sites available.

### 9) **MBC/026/17 Long Clawson, Land off Waltham Lane**

The fact that LONG3 is there makes this site quite a good option as issues as the speed limit due to its location at the edge of the village, have been previously assessed and considered for LONG3. If the site is available it can be delivered in the range of 1-5 years.

### 10) **MBC/010/17 Hose, Land west of Harby Lane**

There is interest on developing this site depending on the number of units MBC would like to see built in Hose. In theory, deliverable in the range of 1 to 5 years but it is a small village with an approved planning application that is going to be developed soon so the impact of too much development in a really short period of time can be negative. Building rate of 36 units per year is fine as average for the whole Borough but something more realistic is to consider 25 per annum in villages and 50 in town, all these reasons make more likely to have the site developed in the 6-10 years range. This site should be considered in the context of MBC/011/17 and MBC/027/17. There is a declaration of interest regarding these sites in Hose from [Andrew Granger](#) as they are actively involved on MBC/027/17.

### 11) **MBC/011/17 Hose, Land off track off Canal Lane**

The deliverability of the site depends on the other schemes in Hose as stated before. If the access is not a problem then the site is considered as a good option (as the others).

**12) MBC/027/17 Hose, Extension of HOS1**

The deliverability of the site depends on the other schemes in Hose as stated before. If the access is not a problem then the site is considered as a good option (as the others). This site would be the second phase of a pre-Submission Allocation with planning permission and access can be resolved via the first phase. *Andrew Granger* is involved in this site.

**13) MBC/012/17 Harby, Land south of Colston Lane**

If Highways doesn't have objections because of the bend then the site is good, especially in the context of the allocations located opposite to the site.

**14) MBC/006/17 Stathern, Land north of Stathern**

The site is flat but it is too large for a development of that scale. Deliverable if the access is off Blacksmith End, however, there could be difficulties in terms of construction as it is a single lane road. Sustainability issues due to the size of the site versus the size of the village, making the development of just part of the site the most reasonable option. Time frame will depend on the scale.

**15) MBC/018/17, Scalford, Land south of Melton Road**

There are not relevant issues related to the site and the village is attractive for the housing market. Access could be a minor issue. There are builders with interest on medium-small sites. Waterloo Organization – interest on small sites (>4 units).

**16) MBC/015/17 Wymondham, Land southeast of Wymondham**

Flooding issues are too relevant. No hope for the development of the site.

## Rural Hubs

**17) MBC/002/17 Ab Kettleby, Land east of A606**

Concerns about the location of the site in a corner/bend with poor visibility so it could increase the difficulties of developing the site despite that the site looks good and flat. It is deliverable depending on the costs associated to deal with the Highways conditions.

**18) MBC/008/17 Ab Kettleby, Land off Quorn Avenue**

If the access is solved then the site looks good for development. Taylor Wimpey has concerns about the demand of this kind of sites in these small villages. These sites are usually for big houses so a study would be required. In the perspective of the Affordable Homes, Waterloo Organization has exception sites but this is driven by the needs of the village that should be known in advance.

**19) MBC/003/17 Great Dalby, Land off Burdett Close**

Good access depending on the on street parking issues. If the access just allows one line then the site could accommodate 5 to 10 units. If the access is good enough then it could accommodate more units.

**20) MBC/005/17 Gaddesby, Land north of Pasture Lane**

The site is not well related and too large; however, the southern part of the site seems reasonable to deliver a few units.

**21) MBC/009/17 Frisby on the Wreake, Land east of Frisby**

Resolving the access is the main constraint here. It relies on the development of FRIS1 in order to grant access. There are concerns about the stress that all that development will cause in the village and in the School. A new School using part of the land could solve the problem.

## Rural Settlements

**22) MBC/007/17 (a & b) Burton Lazars, Land off New Road**

The problem of Burton Lazars is that it doesn't have a village centre and people rely on the car to go to Melton which affects the sustainability of the village. Location within the village is good.

**23) MBC/014/17 Freeby, Land north of Main Street**

Good site for one or two houses but nothing larger than this.

**24) MBC/016/17 Grimston, Land off Main Street**

Grimston is ok for a few units and this development can accommodate a few dwellings, no more than 4-6 as in previous developments in the village.

**25) MBC/017/17 Grimston, Builders Yard off Main Street**

Good site for one or two units.

**26) MBC/024/17 Queensway, Land north of Old Dalby Lane**

Site quite away of the settlement and Queensway is quite isolated and not really walkable. This is not a quite desirable area in terms of the housing market.

**27) MBC/013/17 Wyfordby, Land north of Main Road**

This site is too large for this settlement. This site is in an unsustainable location.

**28) Additional site – Melton Mowbray**

No potential issues, as soon as the playfield is either retained or relocated. This site is similar to the other playfield site in Melton Mowbray (MBC/020/17). If just the strip in the front of Sandy Lane is proposed for development then the football pitch can be retained but this might bring problems in terms of construction works. Probably a good option for self-build. More information is required in order to have a better understanding of the proposal.

## General Comments

- 70 units are definitely too much for the village. 30-40 units for villages are a good amount. Comment made by an estate agent about whether the size was marketable.

- It would be good to consider if the services in the villages need a boost (benefit from development) or if they have already reached their limit.
- Building rate of 36 units per year is fine as average for the whole Borough but something more realistic is to consider 25 per annum in villages and 50 in town.
- There are builders with interest on medium-small sites. Waterloo Organization – interest on small sites (>4 units).