

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
<b>ASFORDBY</b>				
<b>ASF1</b>				
JELSON LIMITED	401	<p>Suggesting extending NSN to include land immediately to east of Land to east of Melton Spinney Road and allocate higher number of dwellings in this location.</p> <p>Strongly support ASF1 (MBC/148/14 and MBC/106/13), both in Jelson’s control. Jelson submitted application in May to seek approval of reserved matters, which is under consideration (Site has outline permission for 100 dwellings granted in July 2015. This site to be considered as ‘commitment’ rather than allocation. Sites to be combined in accordance with ‘approved Illustrative Masterplan’.</p> <p>ASF2 (MBC/104/14) suggests 60 dwellings, while Asfordby NP proposes to allocate for 55 dwellings. Acknowledge that site is well related to primary school and has also received support from local people. Note the outline application received in Aug 2016 and is currently under consideration and has viability issues. Viability report submitted with application (Turner Moran, Sept 2016) confirms scheme is not viable if all s106 contributions were to be met, applicant will proceed if affordable housing provision is</p>	<p>Site assessment process is done over a period of time which broadly can cover period from when it gets submitted, till it is recommended to Full Council or after until submission. Within this period, the situation on a site can change whilst we are assessing the sites at any particular time. Having an outline or a full application does not preclude the site from being considered for a Local Plan allocation, also considering the fact that a planning permission may expire on a site, whereas the allocation is a bit longer term. Having said that, an allocation by itself does not allow development on a site, it still has to go through the planning application process of the Council. Site boundary of Policy ASF1 is the same as that shown in your illustrated plan</p> <p>The Local Plan does not have to be in conformity with the NP, it is the other way round, also the site assessments have used a consistent approach to site capacities considering the overall constraints and the net capacity.</p> <p>Regarding different ownerships, there is a legal agreement prepared by Freeths Solicitors which is held by the agent.</p> <p>The local plan assessments take into account overall red constraints and any other constraints</p>	<p>Include the land suggested adjacent to ASF1 on Hoby Road in SHLAA 2017. Part of rep (NSN) moved to Policy SS5.</p> <p>Include in the boundary of ASF1 the land at the corner as shown in Suggested changes of the updated site assessment work.</p> <p>Change the site boundary in the policies map, and the Appendix 1 – Site specific policies.</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>zero, but this would still result in landowner receiving less than half of market land value, returns projected in viability not competitive, site owned by 5 different landowners and there is no legal evidence of agreement between them. Reservations about whether site can deliver suggested development due to various constraints – noise / disturbance from bypass to be mitigated (separation distance and bunding, for which no design detailing that confirms the land take for it), appropriate distance between existing dwellings, access. Doubt on site’s deliverability and if deliverable, doubt delivery of affordable housing as per local plan policies. The planning application has received about 52 objections to this site.</p> <p>Proposing land owned by Jelson for allocation in Policy C1 – land adjacent to ASF1 between Station Lane and Hoby Road. Outline application for this was refused in Dec 2016 as Council claims to have 5 year land supply which is questionable as it relies and supports the emerging Local Plan and does not accord with national policy. Merits of site’s ‘suitability’, ‘availability’ (owned by a builder), and ‘deliverability’ have been included. Site will make affordable and infrastructure contributions and meet the housing need particularly in light of</p>	<p>to arrive at ‘suitability’ of a site considering the appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The detailed design considerations are not taken into account to conclude a site is suitable, which are suggested to be submitted as part of the planning application. Distance from the existing dwellings was considered at the site assessment stage, and that should be addressed through the design and mitigation measures in the planning application which should not harm the existing character (Policy SS3 and other policies). Access did not seem to be a big constraint for this site. Updated work on deliverability suggests that the agent has raised no technical constraints that would affect delivery of the site and has identified that they are intending on delivering the site in full within 5 years.</p> <p>Land proposed will now be included in SHLAA 2017. An up-to-date statement on 5 year housing land supply was published last year, the government recommends doing this as a yearly exercise and also recommends the local plan strategy demonstrate a 5 year land supply, which prior to the publication of draft plan in November was done. An update to the five year land supply and housing trajectory will be prepared and published in line with the timescales of the submission of the plan in March 2017. A further update will be prepared</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>constraints and deliverability doubts posed by alternative sites– is the only site in Asfordby where deliverability cannot be questioned.</p> <p>Housing Land Supply – Support the 20% buffer to address the underperformance in previous plan years, but disagree with ‘Liverpool’ approach that has spread the shortfall over the remaining plan period. NPPG makes clear that undersupply must be dealt within the first 5 years of plan period where possible, if not, through DtC. Council has done that as its strategy is reliant on the SUEs which have long lead in times, this will result in undersupply in early part of plan period, this is not NPPF compliant, and is inappropriate strategy and should be corrected. This should be done through identification and release of a series of smaller sites that are self-contained and deliverable in sustainable locations. Sedgefield method will result in undersupply in the early part of the plan period. Further allocations will be required to meet the deficit, Jelson land at Hoby Road is available and must be considered.</p> <p>In light of this, Plan does not make provision for 5 year supply at point of adoption and will not address short term housing need</p>	<p>and published as the plan is examined. These will be assessed as part of SHLAA (suitability, availability and deliverability)</p> <p>Whilst the PPG states that authorities should aim to deal with any shortfall of development within the first five years, this level of frontloading of development would be unrealistic in the current situation within Melton Borough due to several reasons including the lead in times for development, the low proportion of sites which currently have the benefit of planning permission and the anticipated build out rates. The strategy proposed by the Plan and the accompanying trajectory intends to concentrate development on the main town of Melton Mowbray, mainly through the provision of two urban extensions, the North Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood and the Melton South Sustainable Neighbourhood, and to provide further housing delivery in the most sustainable settlements. The two urban extensions equate to a total of 3200 dwellings within the plan period. However, due to the scale of the urban extensions, the lead in times for commencement of development is expected in the latter years of the five year period with developers indicating they will commence in late 2018. This therefore impacts on the ability of these two key sites to deliver a significant amount of development within the first five years, but they do provide for</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		and so is unsound.	<p>and underpin the spatial strategy over the longer term, concentrating development within the most sustainable settlement in the Borough, Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>The five year land supply and housing trajectory identifies there is sufficient land to meet the housing requirement over the plan period. It also demonstrates that the lead in times for the allocated sites will be staggered and certainly with the majority of sites, the time taken to get planning permission in place needs to be taken into account.</p> <p>If an average target was taken of 347 dwellings per year over the next five years to meet the five year requirement of 1734 dwellings, and a build out rate of 36 dwellings per year for volume housebuilders was used, it would need at least 9 sites to be operating at the same time and at the same capacity for the full five year period in order to meet the target. This is not considered to be achievable or realistic, based on the historic completion data and our understanding of developer preparations. A staggered approach building up the delivery rate is considered to be a more realistic approach that would see a step change in housing supply over the five year period and the necessary uplift of supply to meet the 5 year supply requirement.</p> <p>We have considered the Sedgefield approach,</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
			<p>however the build out rate that would be needed is just not realistic for the Borough and the NPPF requires that the plan is realistic.</p> <p><b>No change in capacity has been suggested in the site assessment update. However change in the boundary has been suggested and can be seen in the updated site assessment work (Service Centres).</b></p>	
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Asfordby Parish Council)	380	ASF1: Land east of Station Lane and south of Klondyke Way - The site has planning permission in outline, but Local Plan Appendix 2 makes no reference to Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan Policy A16 which provide criteria that would inform any reserved matters, full or new outline planning application for the site.	This matter is now resolved through the determination of the reserved matters application which took account of the Neighbourhood Plan. Appendix 2 is about the Saved Policies that does not make reference to any policies in the emerging Local Plan. These are the policies 'saved' from the adopted Local Plan. Also, the Local Plan makes appropriate reference with connection to the Neighbourhood Plans in the Borough within Chapter 1. It must be noted that the Local Plans do not have to be in conformity with the Neighbourhood Plans, it is the other way round.	None.
<b>ASF2</b>				
JELSON LIMITED	401	<p>Suggesting extending NSN to include land immediately to east of Land to east of Melton Spinney Road and allocate higher number of dwellings in this location.</p> <p>Strongly support ASF1 (MBC/148/14 and MBC/106/13), both in Jelson's control. Jelson submitted application in May to seek</p>	Site assessment process is done over a period of time which broadly can cover period from when it gets submitted, till it is recommended to Full Council or after until submission. Within this period, the situation on a site can change whilst we are assessing the sites at any particular time. Having an outline or a full application does not preclude the site from being considered for a	None for the Plan, include the land suggested adjacent to ASF1 on Hoby Road in SHLAA 2017. Part of rep (NSN) moved to Policy SS5.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>approval of reserved matters, which is under consideration (Site has outline permission for 100 dwellings granted in July 2015. This site to be considered as ‘commitment’ rather than allocation. Sites to be combined in accordance with ‘approved Illustrative Masterplan’.</p> <p>ASF2 (MBC/104/14) suggests 60 dwellings, while Asfordby NP proposes to allocate for 55 dwellings. Acknowledge that site is well related to primary school and has also received support from local people. Note the outline application received in Aug 2016 and is currently under consideration and has viability issues. Viability report submitted with application (Turner Moran, Sept 2016) confirms scheme is not viable if all s106 contributions were to be met, applicant will proceed if affordable housing provision is zero, but this would still result in landowner receiving less than half of market land value, returns projected in viability not competitive, site owned by 5 different landowners and there is no legal evidence of agreement between them. Reservations about whether site can deliver suggested development due to various constraints – noise / disturbance from bypass to be mitigated (separation distance and bunding, for which no design detailing that confirms</p>	<p>Local Plan allocation, also considering the fact that a planning permission may expire on a site, whereas the allocation is a bit longer term. Having said that, an allocation by itself does not allow development on a site, it still has to go through the planning application process of the Council. Site boundary of Policy ASF1 is the same as that shown in your ‘illustrated plan’</p> <p>The Local Plan does not have to be in conformity with the NP, it is the other way round, also the site assessments have used a consistent approach to site capacities considering the overall constraints and the net capacity.</p> <p>Re the different ownerships, there is a legal agreement prepared by Freeths Solicitors which is held by the agent.</p> <p>The local plan assessments take into account overall red constraints and any other constraints to arrive at ‘suitability’ of a site considering the appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The detailed design considerations are not taken into account to conclude a site is suitable, which are suggested to be submitted as part of the planning application. Distance from the existing dwellings was considered at the site assessment stage, and that should be addressed through the design and mitigation measures in the planning application which should not harm the existing</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>the land take for it), appropriate distance between existing dwellings, access. Doubt on site's deliverability and if deliverable, doubt delivery of affordable housing as per local plan policies. The planning application has received about 52 objections to this site.</p> <p>Proposing land owned by Jelson for allocation in Policy C1 – land adjacent to ASF1 between Station Lane and Hoby Road. Outline application for this was refused in Dec 2016 as Council claims to have 5 year land supply which is questionable as it relies and supports the emerging Local Plan and does not accord with national policy. Merits of site's 'suitability', 'availability' (owned by a builder), and 'deliverability' have been included. Site will make affordable and infrastructure contributions and meet the housing need particularly in light of constraints and deliverability doubts posed by alternative sites– is the only site in Asfordby where deliverability cannot be questioned.</p> <p>Housing Land Supply – Support the 20% buffer to address the underperformance in previous plan years, but disagree with 'Liverpool' approach that has spread the shortfall over the remaining plan period. NPPG makes clear that undersupply must be</p>	<p>character (Policy SS3 and other policies). Access did not seem to be a big constraint for this site. Updated work on deliverability suggests that the agent has raised no technical constraints that would affect delivery of the site and has identified that they are intending on delivering the site in full within 5 years.</p> <p>The updated site assessment work reports <b>no known issues – Agent noted that developer contributions have to be factored in to viability tests but has confirmed that this does not mean the site is unviable.</b></p> <p>Land proposed will now be included in SHLAA 2017. An up-to-date statement on 5 year housing land supply was published last year, the government recommends doing this as a yearly exercise and also recommends the local plan strategy demonstrate a 5 year land supply, which prior to the publication of draft plan in November was done. An update to the five year land supply and housing trajectory will be prepared and published in line with the timescales of the submission of the plan in March 2017. A further update will be prepared and published as the plan is examined. These will be assessed as part of SHLAA (suitability, availability and deliverability)</p> <p>Whilst the PPG states that authorities should aim to deal with any shortfall of development within</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>dealt within the first 5 years of plan period where possible, if not, through DtC. Council has done that as its strategy is reliant on the SUEs which have long lead in times, this will result in undersupply in early part of plan period, this is not NPPF compliant, and is inappropriate strategy and should be corrected. This should be done through identification and release of a series of smaller sites that are self-contained and deliverable in sustainable locations. Sedgefield method will result in undersupply in the early part of the plan period. Further allocations will be required to meet the deficit, Jelson land at Hoby Road is available and must be considered.</p> <p>In light of this, Plan does not make provision for 5 year supply at point of adoption and will not address short term housing need and so is unsound.</p>	<p>the first five years, this level of frontloading of development would be unrealistic in the current situation within Melton Borough due to several reasons including the lead in times for development, the low proportion of sites which currently have the benefit of planning permission and the anticipated build out rates.</p> <p>The strategy proposed by the Plan and the accompanying trajectory intends to concentrate development on the main town of Melton Mowbray, mainly through the provision of two urban extensions, the North Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood and the Melton South Sustainable Neighbourhood, and to provide further housing delivery in the most sustainable settlements. The two urban extensions equate to a total of 3200 dwellings within the plan period. However, due to the scale of the urban extensions, the lead in times for commencement of development is expected in the latter years of the five year period with developers indicating they will commence in late 2018. This therefore impacts on the ability of these two key sites to deliver a significant amount of development within the first five years, but they do provide for and underpin the spatial strategy over the longer term, concentrating development within the most sustainable settlement in the Borough, Melton Mowbray.</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
			<p>The five year land supply and housing trajectory identifies there is sufficient land to meet the housing requirement over the plan period. It also demonstrates that the lead in times for the allocated sites will be staggered and certainly with the majority of sites, the time taken to get planning permission in place needs to be taken into account.</p> <p>If an average target was taken of 347 dwellings per year over the next five years to meet the five year requirement of 1734 dwellings, and a build out rate of 36 dwellings per year for volume housebuilders was used, it would need at least 9 sites to be operating at the same time and at the same capacity for the full five year period in order to meet the target. This is not considered to be achievable or realistic, based on the historic completion data and our understanding of developer preparations. A staggered approach building up the delivery rate is considered to be a more realistic approach that would see a step change in housing supply over the five year period and the necessary uplift of supply to meet the 5 year supply requirement.</p> <p>We have considered the Sedgefield approach, however the build out rate that would be needed is just not realistic for the Borough and the NPPF requires that the plan is realistic.</p>	
Colin Wilkinson	380	ASF2: Fields South of Bypass and North of Regency Road -Policy A12 of the Asfordby	Noted. However this was the situation at the time the site assessments were done last year,	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
(on behalf of Asfordby Parish Council)		Parish Neighbourhood Plan allocates most of this site for housing development. The remainder of site ASF2 is neither available, nor offers a suitable location for development, nor is achievable	this will be reflected in the updated site assessment work. Also may be dealt with when the actual application is submitted. The Site Assessment Update received the ownership details in January 2017, and the landowner is identified. The site is available and has been assessed as a suitable location for development. The updated work also reports <b>no known issues with respect to viability – Agent noted that developer contributions have to be factored in to viability tests but has confirmed that this does not mean the site is unviable.</b>	
Heritage England in Statement of common ground with MBC	~			Change Policy ASF1 to include wording to reflect Heritage England's concerns in the statement of common ground to refer to the setting of Kirby Bellars Scheduled Monument.
<b>ASF3</b>				
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Asfordby Parish Council)	380	ASF3: Paddocks west of Saxelby Road and south of Loughborough Road - This site was considered for housing development during the preparation of the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan. The site is neither available, nor offers a suitable location for development, nor is achievable.	Noted. However this was the situation at the time the site assessments were done last year, this will be reflected in the updated site assessment work. Also may be dealt with when the actual application is submitted. The updates site assessment work has not been able to find the landowner, therefore the site 'availability' of the site cannot be established. Although the site has been assessed to be 'suitable', it is not available at present moment, and hence cannot be considered 'deliverable' /	Site to be deallocated as not currently available. Change Policy C1(A) table, Appendix 1: Site specific policies and the policies map to reflect this change.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
			'developable' at this point of time.	