

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
CROXTON KERRIAL					
CROX1					
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Belvoir Estate)	381	CROX1: Land West of Saltby Road & East of Highfields Farm Pre-application community consultation took place in November 2016 and a planning application is likely to be submitted early in 2017		Comments noted on progression of site in terms of preparing a planning application. Further information provided by agent including a masterplan of the site identified that due to the adjacent listed building the capacity is reduced slightly to preserve the setting. Consultation with Conservation Officer identifies that this is an appropriate way forward.	Capacity is reduced from 40 to 35; no change to the site boundary.
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	CROX1 (Sound) Policy CROX1 (bullet point 2) is welcomed and supported. The deletion of sites MBC/092/13 and MBC/080/13 is welcomed.		Support noted.	Capacity is reduced from 40 to 35; no change to the site boundary.
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	409	In the majority of cases the sites identified have no specific heritage concern, although several are not without known heritage implications. In the latter context are BOT1, BOT4, CROX1, HAR1, HOS2 and 3, WAL1 and 2, WYM2, EAS1 and FRIS2. Development management decisions should give careful consideration		Noted. Detailed consideration of the impact of a development scheme on heritage assets would be required as part of a planning application in accordance	Capacity is reduced from 40 to 35; no change to the site boundary.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		to the heritage implications as required by national and local planning policy and informed by relevant guidance.		with paragraphs 126 to 141 of the NPPF. Further information provided by agent including a masterplan of the site identified that due to the adjacent listed building the capacity is reduced slightly to preserve the setting. Consultation with Conservation Officer identifies that this is an appropriate way forward.	
CROX2					
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Belvoir Estate)	381	CROX2: Land East of Saltby Road and South of A607 This site does not reflect the submitted SHLAA site MBC/095/13. The site should focus on the paddock fronting Saltby Road which has a capacity that is significantly less than the proposed 16dw.	CROX2: Land East of Saltby Road and South of A607 Modifying the allocated site as shown on the attached plan.	It is recognised that a drafting error in the draft plan has led to a reduced site area being identified. The site assessment however was carried out on the full site area submitted through the SHLAA process and takes account of the full site area. It is also identified that the capacity should be reduced due to the sensitive location of the site and this will be reflected in the Update to the Site Assessments document.	Increase in site boundary to reflect original SHLAA site submitted. Reduction in capacity from 16 to 10.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				Highway access is considered to be a safer option from Saltby Road which is achievable from the larger site area. The capacity was assessed in the original site assessment work as being limited to 10 due to a lower density development being more appropriate in this location due to visual impact.	
CROX3					
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Belvoir Estate)	381	<p>CROX3: Land South of Main Street (A607) and West of the Nook</p> <p>This site does not reflect the submitted SHLAA site MBC/096/13. The site should include the whole field and not be arbitrarily reduced. The Belvoir Estate are negotiating with the GP surgery with a view to increasing the car park. The car park will take up most of the allocated site.</p>	<p>CROX3: Land South of Main Street (A607) and West of the Nook</p> <p>Modifying the allocated site to include the whole field as shown on the attached plan.</p>	<p>The site area was reduced from the originally submitted site identified in the SHLAA process as it is considered the development of the entire field put forward would have a detrimental impact on the setting and character of the entrance to the village. It would also impact on protected trees which are located to the west of the site along the roadside boundary. Development of the whole site would have extended the village significantly to the west and would alter the setting and scale of the settlement. The update to the site assessments takes</p>	Reduce capacity from 20 to 11.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				account of the presence of the doctors car park and allows for a car park of at least the same size to be retained somewhere on the site. This has reduced the potential capacity of the site from 20 dwellings to 10 dwellings to allow for this facility to be retained. There is no new information in the representations received that indicates that the allocated site as shown should be increased.	
EASTHORPE					
EAST1					
Richard Simon	266	EAST1. I would reject this site but I believe that consent may already have been given.		Comments noted. This site has planning permission for 9 dwellings.	Change to site boundary to align with red line boundary of planning permission 15/01016/OUT. No change to capacity.
Marilyn Robinson	248	EAST1; EAST2. In principle, we agree that Bottesford should take its fair allocation of the housing needed for the borough, and can most probably take the 428 houses forecast. HOWEVER, this allocation MUST be spread over the 20 year period of the Melton Plan. Our concern is that the (building) vultures are already circling		It is extremely unlikely that all of the housing will be built in the next three years. House builders will only build as many homes as they expect to sell each year. An industry	Change to site boundary to align with red line boundary of planning permission 15/01016/OUT. No

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		intending to build as many houses as possible over the next 3 years or so, and Bottesford does not currently have the infrastructure in place to cope.		norm is for a large site to deliver no more than 50 home per annum, this is rarely achieved, especially where more than one site is being built concurrently, as the local market is unlikely to support that number of sales at any one time. All allocated sites will also have to go through the planning process and on the larger sites may require the provision of significant infrastructure works (eg new access and utilities supply) before homes are constructed.	change to capacity.
Norman Robinson	249	EAST1; EAST2. In principle, we agree that Bottesford should take its fair allocation of the housing needed for the borough, and can most probably take the 428 houses forecast. HOWEVER, this allocation MUST be spread over the 20 year period of the Melton Plan. Our concern is that the (building) vultures are already circling intending to build as many houses as possible over the next 3 years or so, and Bottesford does not currently have the infrastructure in place to cope.		It is extremely unlikely that all of the housing will be built in the next three years. House builders will only build as many homes as they expect to sell each year. An industry norm is for a large site to deliver no more than 50 home per annum, this is rarely achieved, especially where more than one site is being built concurrently, as the local market is unlikely to support that number of sales at any one time. All allocated sites will also have to go	Change to site boundary to align with red line boundary of planning permission 15/01016/OUT. No change to capacity.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				through the planning process and on the larger sites may require the provision of significant infrastructure works (eg new access and utilities supply) before homes are constructed.	
Jo Althorpe on behalf of Stephen Lee and the VB Trust	402	<p>EAST1 supported. However, it is considered the site can comfortably accommodate a higher number of units than the 10 identified within the policy.</p> <p>The Illustrative Layout submitted alongside these representations demonstrates how “in the region of” 20 units could be satisfactorily accommodated on site by increasing the density proposed and providing a greater range of house types, including smaller units. The Illustrative Layout also ensures that Easthorpe Lodge is retained, alongside the existing gardens to the south and an element of the gardens to the east.</p> <p>The site is in a sustainable location to accommodate development and therefore its development potential should be maximised to reduce the number of sites which the Council needs to release for development. As part of the approved planning application the widening of Green Lane was secured via condition. These highways works would also be required to support the increase in dwellings provided on site.</p>		Support noted. The site currently has consent for 9 dwellings (15/01016/OUT). The increase in capacity would have to be dealt with through the development management process through a fresh application. It is however considered that heritage assets, particularly the scheduled ancient monument list entry 1009195 shifted Medieval Village Earthworks and Moat to the north and the setting and character of Easthorpe as a settlement which is limited in size constrain the site in terms of the amount of development and therefore it is not recommended that the potential capacity be uplifted for these reasons.	Change to site boundary to align with red line boundary of planning permission 15/01016/OUT. No change to capacity.
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	EAST1/2. Reduction of BOT4 in line with our previous comments is welcomed. There are strong concerns regarding the impact of EAST1 and EAST2 upon the		Site EAST1 has planning permission for 9 dwellings (15/01016/OUT).	Change to site boundary to align with red line

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		scheduled monument immediately to the north, the 'Shifted medieval village earthworks and moat at Easthorpe (1009195) and subsequently the soundness of the Plan. It is disappointing that the scheduled monument is not referenced within the site assessment.			boundary of planning permission 15/01016/OUT. No change to capacity.
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	409	In the majority of cases the sites identified have no specific heritage concern, although several are not without known heritage implications. In the latter context are BOT1, BOT4, CROX1, HAR1, HOS2 and 3, WAL1 and 2, WYM2, EAS1 and FRIS2. Development management decisions should give careful consideration to the heritage implications as required by national and local planning policy and informed by relevant guidance. A number of sites poses greater concern including LONG2, SOM2, EAST1, GADD2 and THOR1, these latter sites have significant and outstanding heritage implications potentially warranting objection in principle to their development.		Site EAST1 has planning permission for 9 dwellings (15/01016/OUT).	Change to site boundary to align with red line boundary of planning permission 15/01016/OUT. No change to capacity.
Mr D. And Mrs. L. Henson	126	(EAST1) 1.0 INTRODUCTION, SCOPE AND CONTEXT 1.1 My Clients' ownership comprises the dwelling, with its extensive curtilage, defined on the attached O.S. extract - being Drawing Number 0331-1A. 1.2 These representations relate wholly and solely to the residential development identified and referred to as "EAST 1" on the plan for Bottesford and Easthorpe which comprises page 13 of Local Plan Appendix 1, entitled "Site allocations and policies" 2.0 THE CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH APPLY 2.1 Site "EAST 1" is that which was the subject of an outline application:- a) Dated 22nd December, 2015. b) Proposing the "...demolition of domestic outbuildings and the erection of nine dwellings, garage block and associated infrastructure". c) In respect of which the Council	3.0 THE CHANGES NECESSARY AND SOUGHT 3.1 The southern enlargement and extension of "EAST 1" is required to incorporate the whole of the land identified at paragraph 2.2 above. 3.2 The Council's reference for that enquiry is 051/16G. 3.3 The enlargement and extension sought would	These comments relate to an area of neighbouring land to EAST1 and how it could be incorporated into EAST1 providing additional land for further development. This area of land was not submitted through the SHLAA process and therefore did not form part of the initial assessment of sites. EAST1 has already gained planning permission for 9 dwellings and this site was assessed on the basis of the planning	Change to site boundary to align with red line boundary of planning permission 15/01016/OUT. No change to capacity.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>granted conditional planning permission dated 22nd April, 2016.2.2 On 21st June, 2016 this Practice submitted a pre-application enquiry to the Council proposing the southern extension of the development authorised by the permission identified in the preceding paragraph. This proposal was upon the basis of:-a) The erection of two/three additional dwellings.b) Servicing those additional dwellings via the adjacent development to the north.2.3 The ability to combine these two areas to secure a wider comprehensive development is confirmed by the owners of that adjacent land, whose communication to my Clients, dated 2nd February, 2016, stated, inter alia, that:-“Just to confirm that providing we are successful in obtaining planning permission on the land to the east of Green Lane, we would be prepared to look to come to an agreement to give you access to the land behind your house, subject to contract and obtaining planning permission.”2.4 The Council’s response to the pre-application enquiry is in two parts, comprising the planning reaction (dated 6th September, 2016) and the highway authority’s observations (dated 16th September, 2016). That combined response identified no material objection to the development proposed upon either planning or highway grounds.2.5 This conclusion is supported by the considerations that:-a) The southern extremity of my Clients’ ownership is the logical and recognisable southern limit of Easthorpe hereabouts, with the land beyond that boundary being part of the open countryside setting of the settlement.b) It is this southern boundary of my Clients’ ownership, with its clear physical demarcation, which comprises the logical, obvious and defensible boundary</p>	<p>render it appropriate to indicate the approximate capacity of the whole site as 14 dwellings or thereabouts.</p>	<p>consent which was the most up to date information on this site at the time of the assessment.</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>hereabouts between this settlement pattern of Easthorpe and the countryside beyond.2.6 Ignoring these considerations, as the present draft Plan does, means that the Plan in its current form is not:-a) “Positively prepared” - because such an approach would recognise a situation where development has been identified as satisfactory and acceptable in terms of planning principle.b) “Justified” - because there is no such justification for not recognising the availability for development of this land.c) “Effective” - because it ignores the consideration that this site is available to contribute to the housing needs of the locality.2.7 There is additional justification and support for the changes necessary and sought by this representation (as set out below) in that:-a) Assessment of Easthorpe (on pages 17 and 18 of Local Plan Appendix 1) confirms that it is a sustainable location for residential development and categorises it as a “Rural Hub”.b) The considerations identified in the case of site “EAST 1” apply with equal force and validity to the land which is the subject of these representations.c) As a result the logical and un-objectionable extension of the definition of site EAST 1” as sought, will have no detrimental effect whatsoever upon the “Area of Separation” approach adopted by this Plan.</p>			
EAST2					
Richard Simon	266	EAST2 . I reject this site. This site in conjunction with EAST1 is too great an expansion of Easthorpe. The site is on the Area of Separation and is partially affected by a flood zone. Easthorpe is prone to external flooding from local watercourses and building here could impact on adjacent properties. Flood Zone 3 covers the entire		Comments noted. Policy EAST2 requires that flood mitigation measures and drainage infrastructure are provided as part of any scheme. The site area	No change

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>western boundary of the site and the site proper shows that FZ 2 and 3 cover 50% of the site.</p> <p>I support the Melton Borough Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space study 2015 .</p>		<p>theoretically could accommodate 33 dwellings (at 30 dwellings per hectare) however this has been reduced to a capacity of 12 to limit the scale of development to be more reflective of the existing size and scale of Easthorpe as a settlement. Support of the Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study is noted.</p>	
Marilyn Robinson	248	<p>EAST1; EAST2. In principle, we agree that Bottesford should take its fair allocation of the housing needed for the borough, and can most probably take the 428 houses forecast. HOWEVER, this allocation MUST be spread over the 20 year period of the Melton Plan. Our concern is that the (building) vultures are already circling intending to build as many houses as possible over the next 3 years or so, and Bottesford does not currently have the infrastructure in place to cope.</p>		<p>It is extremely unlikely that all of the housing will be built in the next three years. House builders will only build as many homes as they expect to sell each year. An industry norm is for a large site to deliver no more than 50 home per annum, this is rarely achieved, especially where more than one site is being built concurrently, as the local market is unlikely to support that number of sales at any one time. All allocated sites will also have to go through the planning process and on the larger sites may require the provision of significant infrastructure</p>	No change

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				works (eg new access and utilities supply) before homes are constructed.	
Norman Robinson	249	EAST1; EAST2. In principle, we agree that Bottesford should take its fair allocation of the housing needed for the borough, and can most probably take the 428 houses forecast. HOWEVER, this allocation MUST be spread over the 20 year period of the Melton Plan. Our concern is that the (building) vultures are already circling intending to build as many houses as possible over the next 3 years or so, and Bottesford does not currently have the infrastructure in place to cope.		It is extremely unlikely that all of the housing will be built in the next three years. House builders will only build as many homes as they expect to sell each year. An industry norm is for a large site to deliver no more than 50 home per annum, this is rarely achieved, especially where more than one site is being built concurrently, as the local market is unlikely to support that number of sales at any one time. All allocated sites will also have to go through the planning process and on the larger sites may require the provision of significant infrastructure works (eg new access and utilities supply) before homes are constructed.	No change
Jo Althorpe on behalf of Stephen Lee and the VB Trust	402	EAST2 supported. Flood mitigation measures have been put in place and drainage infrastructure is available. SUD features will also be potentially provided. The four protected trees to the site frontage are retained. The character of the settlement maintained. The trees and hedgerow along the northern boundary of the site would be retained. That suitable measures are		Support noted.	No change

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>incorporated to ensure there will be no adverse impacts to protected species. The site is currently used for grazing, and therefore, has limited ecological value. Opportunities to enhance wildlife habits as part of the open space and landscaping of the development could also be facilitated as part of the design process.</p> <p>That there is sensitive boundary treatment to the south and southwest boundary with the additional of soft attractive edging, additional landscaping and sensitive boundary treatments.</p>			
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	<p>EAST1/2. Reduction of BOT4 in line with our previous comments is welcomed. There are strong concerns regarding the impact of EAST1 and EAST2 upon the scheduled monument immediately to the north, the 'Shifted medieval village earthworks and moat at Easthorpe (1009195) and subsequently the soundness of the Plan. It is disappointing that the scheduled monument is not referenced within the site assessment.</p>		<p>The Update to Site Assessments does identify and consider heritage assets in the vicinity of the site including the scheduled ancient monument to the north. It is considered that by reducing the potential capacity of the site significantly from 33 to 12 will allow for a sensitive design and layout which can leave appropriate space to limit the impact on the setting of the heritage asset to the north as well as respecting the character and scale of the existing settlement of Easthorpe. Detailed consideration of the impact of a development scheme on heritage assets would be</p>	No change

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				required as part of a planning application in accordance with paragraphs 126 to 141 of the NPPF.	