

Name	Summary of Response	Changes suggested by Respondent	MBC Response	Modifications Proposed
CHAPTER 9				
Dilys Shepherd	<p>9.4.2: 'Designing out crime, including lighting, natural surveillance and defensible space'. What does this mean...?! Very few lights in Bottesford now - will the proposed developments be lit 24/7? Defensible space?? Natural surveillance? = Nosy neighbours?</p>		<p>These are common planning and urban design principles; natural surveillance is to design public spaces and footpaths which are overlooked by neighbouring housing to discourage anti-social behaviour and crime and the perception of crime.</p>	None.
Michelle Colclough	<p>Anonymous estates and houses with a standard network of loop roads and cul-de-sacs should be avoided unless there are no other solutions. Innovative street design that uses high quality materials, street trees, street form and floorspace will be encouraged where these are safe and can be adequately maintained - not seen in recent <10 year developments in Melton town centre.</p> <p>There should also be provision to avoid intruding on existing buildings. i.e. bungalows should be matched with bungalows to avoid 3 storey houses being built next to existing single storey structures.</p>		<p>These considerations are encompassed within the scope of the draft policy D1.</p>	None.
Opun, Architecture East Midlands Ltd	<p>Policy D1 is supported, but is lost at the back of the document. The Vision for the Local Plan (page 17) seeks 'high quality development'. To achieve this, then clear place making principles need to be seen as supporting the whole Local Plan strategy. The Policy also needs to reference the local authority's design review arrangements.</p>	<p>Suggests inserting into Policy D1 that the quality of development be reviewed by an independent panel of professionals through an Accredited Design Review, that this is Opun in Melton, and that for significant projects, it should be at an early stage. Further text suggested highlights the how it would complement the achievement of Building for Life 12 and Active by Design.</p>	<p>The weight afforded to a policy is not affected by its position within the document and the policies of the local plan should be read as a whole.</p>	<p>Minor Modification - Add reference to design review, new para after 9.4.18 .Design Review Design Review is a tried and tested method of promoting good design and is a cost effective way to improve quality. Applicants will be encouraged to engage in design review for all new major development.</p>

Susan Love	<p>Brilliant! Approve of all the items in the D1 list and 9. It shows how consultation has influenced the MLP document to ensure good design.</p> <p>This will both help to preserve the rural character of the Borough and make new development more acceptable to existing residents.</p> <p>I hope all this adopted. Although the MLP is for 25 years the legacy of design and street layout will be left for more than a hundred years. The MLP is a great opportunity to ensure that the legacy is a good one.</p>		Support noted.	None.
Policy D1				
Andrew Granger & Co Ltd	<p>Support objectives of Policy D1: Raising the standard of design. The scheme for the site they are promoting has been designed with consideration for all of the criteria contained in the policy, e.g. retaining a significant proportion of trees , providing a large amount of additional landscaping to safegaurd residential amenity, and space to allow offstreet parking adjacent to all dwellings.</p>		Support noted.	None.
Carl Powell	<p>Clause C) is too subjective and weak to be effective.</p>	<p>The policy should indicate how 'reflecting local vernacular' would be judged. Suggest an independent local or national organisation/charity/trust with an interest in architecture, not h a consultant paid by the developer.</p>	<p>The interpretation of this by Planning Officers and Members of the Planning Committee could be through more detaied policies in neighbourhood plans where they are prepared and/or supplementary planning documents prepared by the Council (the Council's Local Development Scheme 2016 indicates that town centre design guidance and residential design guidance potentially require these) and/or any information contained in conservation area assessments.</p>	None.

Colin Love	<p>An excellent Chapter with clear and laudable objectives, which need to be upheld with large scale, national, developers, who may seek to use the 'subject to viability' clause that appears frequently within the current wording of this Plan.</p> <p>Viability must be understood as encompassing environmental viability as well as economic viability - in conjunction with sustainability. That is to say, development that will deliver a standard of design that will leave a high quality legacy for future generations.</p> <p>The representation goes on to outline how the land agent and planning consultant for the Rectory Farm site in Bottesford is engaging with the local community to develop an acceptable viable scheme, and this type of engagement should be adopted for all residential developments within the Borough. MBC must resist pleadings by profit orientated developers, otherwise the ideals within Policy D1 will not be achieved - to the detriment of the Borough.</p>		Support and approach noted.	None.
Hazelton Homes	Support objectives of Policy D1: They give detail indicating that the scheme for the site they are promoting has been designed with consideration for all of the criteria contained in the policy.		Support noted.	None.
Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	Support objectives of Policy D1: They give detail indicating that the scheme for the site they are promoting has been designed with consideration for all of the criteria contained in the policy.		Support noted.	None.
Lance Wiggins (on behalf of G S Developments (Leicester) Ltd	My clients accept that Active Design can play an important role in ensuring that all development meets this aim and would seek to assess the above proposed development at Lake Terrace against its criteria.		Comment noted.	None.
Ricahrd Simon, Clerk to Bottesford Parish NP Steering Group	Supported and to be commended		Support noted.	None.
Richard Simon	Supported and to be commended		Support noted.	None.

Sport England	We are particularly pleased to see the reference to Active Design Para 9.4.6	Active Design document is already referred to as key evidence.	Support noted - Active Design (Sport England -2015) already appears on the key evidence list on page 150.	None.A
Susan E Green	The council is reminded that NPPF is explicit that an SPD should not add to the financial burden of development (para 154). The Regulations are equally explicit that an SPD cannot include policy. Also, the HBF supports the use of Building for Life 12 as best practice guidance, but it should not be included as a Local Plan policy requirement which obliges a developer to use this tool; it should remain voluntary, and be referred to in supporting text only.		While BfL has been voluntary, there has been a pattern of poorer quality development in the Borough. Only a requirement will drive up the design of homes and neighbourhoods. The principles associated with Building for Life are considered good practice, and good design can help make developments more attractive and marketable.	None.
Susan Love	Brilliant! Absolutely approve of all the items in the D1 list and 9. It shows how consultation has influenced the MLP document to ensure good design. This will both help to preserve the rural character of the Borough and make new development more acceptable to existing residents. I hope all this adopted. Although the MLP is for 25 years the legacy of design and street layout will be left for more than a hundred years. The MLP is a great opportunity to ensure that the legacy is a good one.		Support noted.	None.
Terence Joyce	Policy SOUND: However build on SOM2 will have maximum negative effect on Policy D1, especially paragraph "I", no safe connection to highway, as access would have to be near a dangerous bend in main road, also lots of equestrian and walking activity close to.	To satisfy SOUNDNESS: of Policy D1. in relation to SOM2, Take SOM2 out of housing allocation.Concentrate on SOM1.	Support for policy noted. Any planning application will as a requirement have to demonstrate safe access onto the public highway, regardless if it is an allocation.	None.

<p>The Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance</p>	<p>Support objectives of Policy D1: They provide detail to indicate that the scheme for the site they are promoting has been designed with consideration for all of the criteria contained in the policy.</p>		<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Richard Crosthwaite (Gladman Developments)</p>	<p>Building for Life 12: there can be circumstances where this does not form the most practical approach to securing good design on a site. Also, over the lifetime of the plan, other guidance is likely to replace Building for Life 12.</p>	<p>Modifications should be made to Policy D1 to reflect the voluntary nature of the BfL and the likelihood that this will be updated/superseded within the plan period.</p>	<p>While BfL has been voluntary, there has been a pattern of poorer quality development in the Borough. Only a requirement will drive up the design of homes and neighbourhoods. The principles associated with Building for Life are considered good practice and good design can help make developments more attractive and marketable. Accept the point about future alternative guidance.</p>	<p>Minor Modification, so criterion J) reads "...Building for Life 12 or any subsequent guidance, and seeks.....".</p>
<p>Colin Love</p>		<p>Policy D1b : the wording should be changed to MUST rather than should</p>	<p>The wording used offers flexibility for instances where the development cannot meet this criteria, but still holds significant other benefits that warrant it coming forward.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Policy D2				
Carl Powell	Uniquely in this plan, equestrian development seem not to be constrained by biodiversity issues. Is this an oversight? - sometimes very big buildings, like just East of SOMerby.		All proposals must be assessed against the whole plan, which includes having regard to biodiversity (Policy EN2)	None.
Dermot Daly	The number of existing equestrian centres within the curtilage of Bottesford is confirmation the Bottesford is a village, not a town. Bottesford should be allowed organic growth, controlled on an annual allocation to protect against excessive development. The Council should carry out the work to investigate flooding, traffic, supporting services, public transport and village character, not asking the public for the answers. The Council should suggest, discuss, consult and change on an iterative basis.	None.	The position of Bottesford in the settlement hierarchy and the amount of development that is planned there is dealt with in responses to representations on Policy SS2.	None.
K Lynne Camplejohn	The policy makes no reference to neighbourhood plans.		As it is set out in national policy that any Neighbourhood Plan for a given area forms part of the development plan, it is not necessary to reference them in every policy. Section 1.9 of the local plan sets out how NPs relate to the local plan.	None.
Ricahrd Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	Supported		Support noted.	None.
Richard Simon	Supported		Support noted.	None.
Terence Joyce	Policy is SOUND: However any build on SOM2 will have maximum negative effect on Policy D2 because there is already a well established equestrian centre close to SOM2 this land is used by them for grazing and livery.	Ensure existing equestrian centre which is very close to and uses SOM2 for horse grazing and livery is safeguarded by taking SOM2 out of housing allocation	This policy is to guide decisions on extensions to existing equestrian centres or new equestrian centres, not to protect existing centres that come forward for other uses.	None.

Policy D3				
Carl Powell	This exception is commonly exploited by very well-off landowners to build luxurious detached houses in the middle of open fields that they own, even though they often don't work on the land themselves. The size of such houses needs to be limited. These dwellings are meant for AGRICULTURAL WORKERS, not the wealthy landowners who employ them.	Add something like: J. The size of the dwelling should not exceed three bedrooms and it should be reasonably affordable for an Agricultural Worker to buy or rent now or in the future.	Para 9.5.5 indicates appropriate size considerations and para 9.5.2 indicates the dwellings should be for the specific use of agricultural or other rural workers.	None.
K Lynne Camplejohn	The policy makes no reference to neighbourhood plans.	Make reference to neighbourhood plans.	As it is set out in national policy that any Neighbourhood Plan for a given area forms part of the development plan, it is not necessary to reference them in every policy. Section 1.9 of the local plan sets out how NPs relate to the local plan.	None.
Maurice Fairhurst	The policy does not comply with the advice of the NPPF (Para 55) on "Rural Workers Dwellings" and should relate to all dwellings which are essential to maintain uses which are lawful or which have been approved in the rural areas of the Borough.	The policy should be reworded "Rural Workers Dwellings" to comply with National Guidance and relate to all lawful uses or uses which have been approved in the rural areas of the Borough.	The first line of the policy states "proposals for the development/creation of agricultural/forestry and other rural workers dwellings"	None.
Peter Bailey	NHS centralisation issues as identified in Chapter 2.	NHS centralisation issues as identified in Chapter 2.	Comment noted. Not clear what this relates to.	None.
Ricahrd Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	Supported.		Support noted.	None.
Richard Simon	Supported		Support noted.	None.
Susan Love	Pleased to see that condition A will be required.		Support noted.	None.