

| Name                    | Q3: Response  | Q4: Suggested Changes  | MBC Response  | Modifications Proposed |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|------------------------|
| <b><u>Chapter 6</u></b> |   |  |   |                        |
| Carl Powe II            | Unsound because it assumes that only employment sectors 'public administration, education and healthcare' will shrink. A larger population will require more workers in education and healthcare (and to a lesser extent public administration) not less. The intention to shrink education and healthcare contradicts the vision of a 'healthy and vibrant' population. It represents a political stance not improvement of people's quality of life. It is not justifiable. | Plan for a roughly constant number of people employed in public administration, education and health. Against a rising population this would still represent a 'saving' in money terms, if that is the objective here. | The reduction in this sector is a demonstrable trend and as such should be read as a statistic not an ambition for the Local Plan. It is not within the remit of Planning Policy to employ additional staff in any sector, merely plan with due regard for such trends. It would need to be a government policy to employ additional staff in such sectors.   | None.                  |
| Caroline Louise Stuart  | Paragraph 6.9.3 - specifically says that specific employment sites are not allocated in the rural areas, but new housing sites are - this is inconsistent. For example, Gaddesby, which has housing allocations but no proposals to create employment or provide the infrastructure for this, and public transport to surrounding employment sites and Leicester are not effective for attending work.  |  | The allocation of housing reflects reasonable access to employment. Whilst Gaddesby may not have a large employment site, there are employment sites within the nearby vicinity such as John O' Gaunt and on the Ashby Road. Given the rural nature of the Borough, there will be a higher reliance on the private car, and as such, the close proximity to Leicester makes growth at Gaddesby, at the very least, more sustainable than other similar settlements from which people might commute by way of longer car journeys. | None.                  |
| Colin Love              | Throughout the Chapters of the Plan emphasis is correctly placed on environmental sustainability. However, this is not reflected in the title of this chapter, nor in the economic objectives expressed in much of its content. This would be   | To reflect the environmental and social intentions so central to this excellent Plan, Chapter 6 would be better entitled 'Melton's Economy - Green, Equitable and Socially   | National planning policy requires us to plan positively for economic growth, or else risk having the plan being found unsound at examination. The NPPF describes sustainability as being  | None.                  |

| Name        | Q3: Response   | Q4: Suggested Changes | MBC Response   | Modifications Proposed |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|--|------------------------|
|             | confirmed by a reading of 'Prosperity Without Growth: Economics for a Finite Planet' by Tim Jackson (Routledge 2011).  | Collaborative'.       | made of the three elements, that of environmental, economic and social sustainability. The sustainability appraisal of the local plan sets out how the plan will achieve sustainable development overall.  |                        |
| David Adams | page 77 paragraph 6.3.6 justifies the needs for a proper bypass before any new housing development. Without that the plan is unsustainable. page 78 paragraph 6.4.1 The plan will not change the low paid nature of some jobs in MM. page 86 paragraph 6.12 not sure how the access is improved by the Distributor Road since the road does not propose joining St Bartholomew's Way with Welby Road and there is no connection to the Leicester Road. |                       | Part of the reason why employers are forced to bus staff from larger conurbations is because there is a lack of affordable housing in Melton, additional housing should aid this. The Council recognises the need for a distributor road to support growth, but housing is also needed, and the development of housing will finance sections of the road, so road building is unlikely to precede housebuilding. The distributor road will provide a link from A607 Leicester Road to the A606 Nottingham Road (thus with a link to St Bartholomew's Way). HGVs wanting to go directly between the A607 Leicester Road and the A606 Nottingham Road will still be able to use existing road infrastructure via Wilton Road, which should carry less traffic as a result of the distributor road. | None.                  |
| Diane Orson | The plan does not take into account the upgrading of the infrastructure required to service any increase in business, e.g. at Long   |                       | These are detailed traffic management issues that are the responsibility of and should be  | None.                  |

| Name                      | Q3: Response  | Q4: Suggested Changes | MBC Response  | Modifications Proposed   |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------|---|--|
|                           | <p>Clawson and Old Dalby, where roads are inadequate for HGVs. Old Dalby needs a road from the back of the industrial park up to the old "salt road" to significantly reduce the lorry movements in Nether Broughton. The junction of Melton Rd and Hickling lane in Long Clawson is a bottle neck for HGVs from the Dairy and the Brinvale/ White site. There should be traffic calming measures within the village of Long Clawson to ensure 40ft vehicles do not transit the village, thus destroying kerbsides and mounting pathways, used by school children</p> |                       | <p>referred to the County Council.</p>  |  |
| <p>Duncan Bennett</p>     | <p>page 85, para. 6.11.13.Crown Business Park cannot incorporate the Six Hills area. Six Hills Business Park is the AA Training and the Abattoir. They are separated by open countryside, approx. 6 miles apart. Do you mean the 'Old Dalby Business Park'?</p>   |                       | <p>Comments noted.</p>  | <p>Split into two distinct areas in Policy EC2 and change text at page 85, para. 6.11.1.</p> |
| <p>John Palmer</p>        | <p>There is a need to attract decent shops to the Town Centre to generate revenue and prosperity. Too many either empty or charity shops. Attract decent shops and people will spend locally. Can the Council build the infrastructure to attract new shops?</p>  |                       | <p>The Council is limited in what it can do to attract national shops. It knows that there is a shortage of a small number of larger units in the town, but locating shops on the car park to the rear of Anne of Cleves would affect the availability of a significant amount of car parking which serves the town and has an increasing occupancy rate.</p> | <p>None.</p>   |
| <p>Michelle Colclough</p> | <p>Chapter 6 is flawed. All areas of employment are miles outside town (with the exception of Petfoods manufacturing site), and shift patterns</p>  |                       | <p>20ha of employment land is allocating adjoining the town and an existing business park on the Leicester Road (a</p>  | <p>None.</p>   |

| Name                                      | Q3: Response  | Q4: Suggested Changes   | MBC Response  | Modifications Proposed                     |
|---|---|---|---|--|
|   | <p>mean public transport is very rarely an option. The jobs are low paid and low skilled and will not attract a diverse vibrant community to the town. The future of these foreign owned larger businesses cannot be controlled by the local plan, nor should they be relied upon for jobs growth, as some are part of a declining industry at risk from imports from low cost producers. The town centre business rent and rates are high and not attractive for start up or local businesses full term. The sizes of the retail outlets on offer are not attractive for big high street chains.</p> |   | <p>key road). A further 10ha is allocated 2.3 miles from the town centre on brownfield land. The final 1ha is allocated within the town centre. Evidence set out in the employment land study, the economic development strategy and the housing indicate that there will be an increase in manufacturing/food production and premises expansion over the plan period. Business Rates are not within the remit of planning policy. The Melton Retail Study does not identify the need for additional retail units to cater for such businesses.</p> |  |
| <p>Oadby and Wigston Borough BCouncil</p> | <p>Advocate that MBC always takes account of the most up to date evidence base to inform its Local Plan, specifically that which could have Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area wide influences, for example housing, employment and transport.</p>  |   | <p>Comments noted. The Council is doing this, taking account of the recently published HEDNA (Jan 2017).</p>  | <p>None.</p>                               |
| <p>Peter Bailey</p>                       | <p>No mention of the Town Centre Markets on Tuesday, Wednesday &amp; Saturday, all of which encourage tourism and locally reduce travelling to City shopping. Also no mention of the double parking fee farce on Tuesdays.</p>  | <p>The Markets are key to the success of the Town Centre.</p> | <p>Comments noted. Car parking pricing is not within the remit of planning policy.</p>  | <p>Add reference to Markets in 6.15.1.</p> |
| <p>Susan Love</p>                         | <p>6.2 There is a fundamental problem with the NPPF objective of economic growth and the premise that Borough's economy needs to grow. Tim Jackson's influential book "Prosperity Without Growth: Economics for a Finite Planet"</p>  |   | <p>National planning policy requires us to plan positively for economic growth, or else risk having the plan being found unsound at examination. The NPPF describes sustainability as being</p>   | <p>None.</p>                               |

| Name                          | Q3: Response   | Q4: Suggested Changes   | MBC Response   | Modifications Proposed |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--|------------------------|
|                               | [Routledge. 2011] should underpin the Borough's vision for the economy. It's impossible to change the NPPF and the whole direction of this section - but the point must be made.   |   | made of the three elements, that of environmental, economic and social sustainability. The sustainability appraisal of the local plan sets out how the plan will achieve sustainable development overall.  |                        |
| <b><u>Policy EC1</u></b>      |  |   |  |                        |
| Anthony Paphiti               | The plan's Strategic Issue 3 indicates there is insufficient available local workforce to fill low skilled and low paid positions. Is that the vision for Melton's expansion: if not, what type of industry it is intended to attract? | Make clear what type of businesses will underpin growth. - without it, it is not clear if the plan is indeed sound and well-informed. How does the creation of jobs correlate with the number of homes it is proposed to build? Will there be at least 6000 local jobs for the "6000 or so new houses" to be built by 2036? What type of jobs will they be - the low-skilled, low-paid jobs referred to in §3.2.1 of the MLP? | The Local Plan forms part of an economic strategy, informed by numerous evidence including the BE Employment Land Study and HEDNA (Housing and Economic Needs Assessment), and the Melton Housing Requirement Paper (all viewable online or by request in the Council offices). This work tells us to be aligning housing growth with employment growth, with due regard for the demographics of the area, employment rates and household formation rates, the Borough should be planning for 230 – 280 dpa. | None.                  |
| Carl Powell                   | Proportionate to anticipated population increase.  | none  | Comment noted.   | None.                  |
| Charnwood Borough Council     | The jobs target in the Local Plan (Table 11) is not consistent with the SHMA 2014 or the PACEC Leicester and Leicestershire Employment Land Study 2012 identified through Duty to Cooperate work.                                      | The HEDNA work currently being developed should provide a jobs target and the objectively assessed need for employment land ahead of submission of the plan.  | The findings of HEDNA and the Council's Housing Requirement Report indicate that jobs and housing growth are broadly aligned at a housing requirement of 245dpa.   | None.                  |
| Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of | Re: EC1(1), the site has been available for business development since coal mining ceased  | Melton Local Plan (Publication version) Policy EC1 be modified by   | MBC have engaged with the representatives of the site, who have  | None.                  |

| Name  | Q3: Response   | Q4: Suggested Changes   | MBC Response  | Modifications Proposed |
|---|--|---|---|------------------------|
| Asfordby Parish Council)                                      | in 1997 yet take-up has been very slow since the initial re-use of office, coal storage sheds etc. . As such, is it suitable to be one of 'Melton's prime locations for economic growth' and job creation?   | identifying an alternative employment site to Asfordby Business Park. | demonstrated their plans to achieve the allocated growth in the near future. Work on master planning and site promotion have already began.   |                        |
| Guy Longley, Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Development | Policy EC1(2) is supported. It will provide a logical expansion of existing employment areas to the south of the town and provide a highly sustainable development with easy access to local employment and community facilities. The Indicative Framework Plan prepared by Davidsons Developments Limited and submitted as part of these representations, includes 20 hectares of employment land in accordance with this policy requirement. |   | Support noted.  | None.                  |
| James Hollyman on behalf of Garner Holdings and Truframe      | Employment allocations should be to help to meet the growth aspirations of local businesses, such as TruFrame. 14.53ha of land off Leicester Road, adjoining the SS4 allocation could provide this, for Class B1, B2 and B8 use and also other uses appropriate to a business park location (for example, hotel, retail and food outlets serve the needs of the business park), and should be allocated in Policy EC1.                         |   | It is not clear how the overall conclusion that an additional 14ha of employment land allocation is needed has been reached. MBC concur that there is scope to increase manufacturing based jobs in the area and that Truframe is a very important local employer, and wants to support the latter's growth. The 31ha of Employment Land allocated in the Local Plan derives from the Melton Employment Land Study (2015). 14ha would be an almost 50% increase on that. This representation does not set out why this amount is necessary, above and beyond what has been allocated. Delivery of this site may | None.                  |

| Name   | Q3: Response  | Q4: Suggested Changes  | MBC Response  | Modifications Proposed |
|--|---|--|---|------------------------|
|  |   |  | adversely affect demand for the 20ha in the southern SUE, which may prejudice its ability to come forward within the plan period, and the delivery of a section of the MMDR associated with it. Furthermore, the delivery of 14ha of additional employment land in that location would almost certainly be expected to pay towards the cost of the southern link of the Melton Mowbray Outer Distributor Road. Melton Borough Council will work with Truframe to ensure a suitable solution is reached, that will ensure they are able to continue to operate and thrive within the locality. |                        |
| LCC (Highways, Education, Early Years, Waste, Property Assets, LLFA, Libraries & Culture, LRERC) |   | Para 6.12.1: Holwell works and Asfordby Business Park: Suggest the last sentence of this paragraph be rewritten 'Improved access will be considered as part of the Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy and will likely be secured through development specific mitigation. | Comment noted.  | None.                  |
| Michelle Colclough   | The areas cited for development (excluding PERA) are out of town. They are manufacturing sites and shift patterns mean public transport is not viable. The Holwell Works/St Gobain site is not suitable for building due to likely contamination. |  | Contamination can be remediated to an appropriate level for employment use.   | None.                  |

| Name   | Q3: Response   | Q4: Suggested Changes   | MBC Response   | Modifications Proposed |
|--|--|---|--|------------------------|
| Ricahrd Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group                      | Supported. Note that most businesses will be in Melton Mowbray, and for sustainability, most housing should be in Melton Mowbray. Villages around Melton Mowbray may not require a large increase in services and retail to become sustainable, given their proximity to the town's facilities. However there is nothing in the strategy that allows all or even most villages to develop sustainably. |   | Policies SS2 and SS3 and EC2, all allow growth in all settlements subject to certain criteria being met.                                   | None.                  |
| Richard Simon  | Supported. Note that most businesses will be in Melton Mowbray, and for sustainability, most housing should be in Melton Mowbray. Villages around Melton Mowbray may not require a large increase in services and retail to become sustainable, given their proximity to the town's facilities. However there is nothing in the strategy that allows all or even most villages to develop sustainably. |   | Policies SS2 and SS3 and EC2, all allow growth in all settlements subject to certain criteria being met.                                   | None.                  |
| <b><u>Policy EC2</u></b>   |  |   |  |                        |
| Andrew Russell-Wilks (on behalf of Stephen Vickers, Buckminster) | Policy EC2 – Employment Growth in the Rural Area (Outside Melton Mowbray) is a positive and welcome policy as it acknowledges that to survive and be sustainable the rural areas need small scale employment opportunities to be encouraged.   |   | Support noted.   | None.                  |
| Anthony Paphiti  |  | Criterion 3 understates the potential for tourism, which is excellent in the entire Borough. We need a detailed and coordinated | Melton Mowbray is the most sustainable location in the Borough and as such the most logical place to deliver the majority of the Borough's | None.                  |

| Name  | Q3: Response  | Q4: Suggested Changes  | MBC Response   | Modifications Proposed |
|---|---|--|--|------------------------|
|   |   | <p>tourist strategy. But tourism could be seriously harmed by over development of the town, which changes its character beyond recognition - and beyond its current (and, if further developed, future) attractiveness as a tourist resort.</p>  | <p>growth. It is not expected that more housing will detract from the area's attractiveness - more people living locally could help tourism, by sustaining a wider selection of shops, restaurants and night life.</p> |                        |
| Carl Powell                                   | logical and uncontroversial   | none   | Comment noted.   | None                   |
| Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Belvoir Estate) | <p>The Belvoir Estate provides an attractive rural location for small business units, office space, meeting rooms and conference facilities, and could make use of many redundant or underused buildings. Draft Policy EC2 is unduly restrictive in its approach to rural business by limiting tourism and employment developments to small-scale (which is undefined).</p> | <p>Draft Policy EC2 be modified to allow for a wider range of tourism and employment activity. For example, the lack of overnight accommodation means that visitor spending is generated principally by day-visitors. Visitors who stay overnight contribute more to the local economy by spending money on overnight accommodation, food, refreshment and ancillaries. Policy EC2 should be more supportive to opportunities to provide visitor accommodation, including holiday lodges, and to the hosting of events such as weddings, concerts, fairs. The restrictions in relation to criteria 2,3 and 5 of Policy EC2 are unduly restrictive without further clarification of the term 'small-scale'.</p> | <p>The reuse of buildings would be within the terms of Policy EC2. The wording of the criterion 3 allows some flexibility.</p>   | None.                  |

| Name   | Q3: Response   | Q4: Suggested Changes   | MBC Response  | Modifications Proposed |
|--|--|---|---|------------------------|
| Diane Reed   | Criterion 8: - there are no plans to accommodate extra traffic in the village, let alone find any additional new off road parking for new businesses.  |   | The plan is to guide new developments. Future planning applications could be refused if the criteria listed in the policy are not met.  | None.                  |
| K Lynne Camplejohn   | The policy does not make any reference to a neighbourhood plan, if there is one for that area, so it fails on duty to cooperate.   | Make reference to any neighbourhood plans in the development area.          | It is not necessary to reference neighbourhood plans in every policy. NPPF sets out the role and relationship of NPs to local plans as does Section 1.9 of the draft local plan.  | None.                  |
| LCC (Highways, Education, Early Years, Waste, Property Assets, LLFA, Libraries & Culture, LRERC) | Policies EC1 and EC2 provide the necessary platform to deliver future economic growth and are therefore welcomed. However, the plan needs to be sufficiently flexible to enable further sites to be brought forward to replace existing employment areas that become unviable or unfit for purpose as detailed in Policy EC3. Policy EC2 – Employment Growth in rural areas should mention that this is dependent on being able to access good broadband speeds. |   | 6.11.5 allows some review and flexibility, but this is under the employment in rural areas section. Criteria 4-6 of Policy EC1 provide the flexibility sought. Policy EC4 allows for some employment growth on non allocated sites. | None.                  |
| Melanie Steadman   | On farm diversification, I think there is also a need to consider location. There are a lot of farms on the top of the escarpment, if they were to build caravan sites, glamping sites or industrial units, it could ruin the scenic beauty of the Vale.   | Enhance this policy to include aesthetics. Location, scale and environment. | These considerations would be picked up by Policy EN1 and D1.   | None.                  |
| Michelle Colclough   | I support the soundness of this policy.  |   | Support noted.  | None.                  |
| R H B Ranns  | Support all principles   |   | Support noted.  | None                   |
| Ricahrd Simon, Clerk to BPNP   | Supported  |   | Comment noted. Two employment sites are retained in Bottesford under  | None                   |

| Name           | Q3: Response  | Q4: Suggested Changes | MBC Response   | Modifications Proposed |
|----------------|---|-----------------------|--|------------------------|
| Steering Group | <p>The same principles apply in rural locations as in Melton Mowbray. The jobs available must be met by suitable housing and the available employment must be suitable for most of the working age population if travel, particularly by car, is to be avoided.</p> <p>In Bottesford most of the work available is semi-skilled or unskilled. Much of the working population of Bottesford is professional, qualified or skilled and so many work outside the Parish and indeed outside of Leicestershire. The public transport system is inadequate and most people opt to use a car for work. So although Bottesford might approach sustainability in its services it fails on the matter of sufficient employment of the right type.</p> |                       | policy EC3. The people who will live in new housing may increase demand for public transport to make service improvements viable.  |                        |
| Richard Simon  | <p>Supported : The jobs available must be met by suitable housing, and the available employment must be suitable for most of the working age population if travel, particularly by car, is to be avoided. Most work in Bottesford is semi-skilled or unskilled, whereas much of the working population of Bottesford is professional, qualified or skilled working elsewhere. The public transport system is inadequate for their purposes. So although Bottesford might approach sustainability in its services, it fails on the matter of sufficient employment and the right type and</p>  |                       | Comment noted. Two employment sites are retained in Bottesford under policy EC3. The people who will live in new housing may increase demand for public transport to make service improvements viable. | None.                  |

| Name   | Q3: Response  | Q4: Suggested Changes  | MBC Response   | Modifications Proposed  |
|--|---|--|--|---|
|  | travel.   |  |  |   |
| Terence Joyce  | I agree with SOUND: I agree with part B)  |  | Support noted.   | None  |
| Duncan Bennett   | page 85, para. 6.11.13. :Crown Business Park cannot incorporate the Six Hills area. Six Hills Business Park is the AA Training and the Abattoir. They are separated by open countryside, approx. 6 miles apart. Do you mean the 'Old Dalby Business Park'?  |  | Comments noted.  | Split into two distinct areas in Policy EC2 and change text at page 85, para. 6.11.1.   |
| <b><u>Policy EC3</u></b>                               |   |  |  |   |
| Carl Powell  | logical and uncontroversial   | none   | Support noted.   | None  |
| Colin Love   | There is a strong planning case to move the present industrial estate on Normanton Lane out of the centre of Bottesford to Orston Lane, as it is presenting a major traffic problem that was not there when the site was originally developed. the existing site, so close to the village centre, could then provide housing suitable for the less physically able.   |  | A sensible idea, but the landowners have to make land available for this to happen. The Neighbourhood Plan Group could pursue it and see if appropriate agreements can be made with the tenants and the land owners. Criterion 4 of EC3 could permit its change of use.  | None.   |
| Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Asfordby Parish Council) | Asfordby Parish Council broadly supports the retention of Asfordby Business Park, Holwell Works and Stanton Plc (St Gobain) for employment uses. The reference in the policy to Melton Mowbray Business Park at Holwell is not recognised and should perhaps be 'Holwell Business Park'. Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan Policies A25 to A27 supports business development in these locations. The Parish Council want o see the redevelopment of the Holwell Business Park site for employment so | Melton Local Plan (Publication version) Policy EC3 be modified by allowing for 'enabling' residential development at Holwell Business Park site in accordance with Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan Policy A27. Cross reference to Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan Policies A25 to A26 should also be made. | Comments noted. Refer to Chapter 1 for more information on aligning Local and Neighbourhood Plans. The Holwell Works site is within the Local Plan Policy EC3 to be retained for such use. The site promoter has predominantly engaged with the Neighbourhood Plan process and not the Local Plan process, thus the argument for the need for residential development on the Holwell works | Minor modifications - Deletion of figure 8 which incorrectly shows expansion of allocated employment area. Deletion of para 6.12.3. |

| Name | Q3: Response  | Q4: Suggested Changes   | MBC Response  | Modifications Proposed |
|------|---|---|---|------------------------|
|      | <p>that it can provide job for local people. But it has been difficult to achieve. New housing development may be required to enable this to happen as set out in Neighbourhood Plan Policy A27. Asfordby Business Park also includes the former coal railway, which is in use as a test track for Network Rail. The test track is of national importance and should be safeguarded yet the Melton Local Plan makes no reference to it. The Policies Map incorrectly shows the extent of Asfordby Business Park to include for the land to the north west of the current allocation. Harworth Estate’s planned extension of Asfordby Business Park was considered as part of the preparation of the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan and rejected following Historic England advice: “There are heritage assets nearby, including the Grade II* listed Church of St Bartholomew to the north and a scheduled monument, Sysonby Grange to the north east. The proposed employment allocation in its entirety ... may impact upon heritage assets and further assessment will be required to determine the impact upon the significance of these heritage assets; we would recommend that you are guided by the advice of your Conservation and archaeology specialists. Paragraph 6.12.3: The Melton Local Plan (Publication version) paragraph 6.12.3 questions the viability of Holwell Works and Asfordby Business Park as employment sites, yet Policy EC1</p> | <p>A new policy be included relating to the development and safeguarding of the Melton Rail Innovation and Development Centre.</p> <p>The north-western extension to Asfordby Business Park be deleted.</p> <p>Melton Local Plan (Publication version) paragraph 6.12.3 be deleted.</p> <p>Melton Local Plan (Publication version) figure 8 be deleted.</p> | <p>site has not been made to the Local Authority. As the test track is ran and operated by National Rail, it seems unnecessary to safeguard it within planning policy. Should they, nor other suitable users wish to have it anymore, it seems overly restrictive to safeguard redundant track. - The expansion of Asfordby Business Park is now to be achieved via reworking of the existent site, rationalising the space, not outward expansion.</p> |                        |

| Name               | Q3: Response   | Q4: Suggested Changes   | MBC Response   | Modifications Proposed |
|--------------------|--|---|--|------------------------|
|                    | <p>allocates 10 hectares of employment land within Asfordby Business Park for class B employment uses. Paragraph 6.12.3 goes on to suggest that other uses for the sites may need to be considered but does not explain what other uses are appropriate. This is also at odds with Policy EC3 which broadly supports the retention of Asfordby Business Park, Holwell Works and Stanton Plc (St Gobain) for employment uses. Paragraph 6.12.3 is therefore confusing and contradictory. Figure 8: The Melton Local Plan (Publication version) figure 8 incorrectly shows the extent of Holwell Business Park to include Local wildlife Site(s). It also incorrectly shows the extent of Asfordby Business Park to include for the land to the north west of the current allocation. Harworth Estate's planned extension of Asfordby Business Park was considered as part of the preparation of the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan and rejected following Historic England advice: The key to Figure 8 does not show all the symbols used on the map, but the diagram seems to suggest the expansion of both Holwell Works and Asfordby Business Park, yet this is not provided for by the policies of the Local Plan (nor Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan).</p> |   |  |                        |
| K Lynne Camplejohn | The policy does not make any reference to a neighbourhood plan, if there is one for that area, so it fails on duty to cooperate.   | Comply with duty to cooperate by including a reference to the neighbourhood plan. | It is not necessary to reference neighbourhood plans in every policy. NPPF sets out the role and relationship of NPs to local plans as | None.                  |

| Name  | Q3: Response   | Q4: Suggested Changes   | MBC Response  | Modifications Proposed |
|---|--|---|---|------------------------|
|   |  |   | does Section 1.9 of the draft local plan.   |                        |
| R H B Ranns   | Fully support  |   | Support noted.  | None.                  |
| Ricahrd Simon,<br>Clerk to BPNP<br>Steering Group   | Supported  |   | Support noted.  | None.                  |
| Richard Simon   | Supported  |   | Support noted.  | None.                  |
| Robert Hughes<br>(on behalf of<br>Nigel Griffiths,<br>First Provincial<br>Properties Ltd) | Policy EC3 identifies employment facilities listed for retention and other key employment sites, and sets out the circumstances in which planning permission for the change of use of existing employment sites to non-employment uses will be permitted. The policy is considered to be consistent with the advice in the NPPF in relation to existing employment land and employment land allocations and it is supported in its current form. |   | Support noted.  | None.                  |
| Susan Love  | The Normanton Lane industrial site is inappropriately located - it was once the village gas works. A 20 year plan should seek to move it to the west of the village (Orston Lane) near the by-pass, and release the current industrial area for housing.   | Omit Normanton Lane industrial site as a protected employment /industrial area.           | A sensible idea, but the landowners have to make land available for this to happen. The Neighbourhood Plan Group could pursue it and see if appropriate agreements can be made with the tenants and the land owners. Criterion 4 of EC3 could permit its change of use. | None.                  |
| <b><u>Policy EC4</u></b>  |  |   |   |                        |
| Carl Powell   | logical and uncontroversial  | none  | Support noted.  | None                   |
| K Lynne<br>Camplejohn   | The policy does not make any reference to a neighbourhood plan, if there is one for that area, so it fails on duty to cooperate.   | To comply with the duty to cooperate include a reference to a neighbourhood plan for that | It is not necessary to reference neighbourhood plans in every policy. NPPF sets out the role and  | None.                  |

| Name   | Q3: Response   | Q4: Suggested Changes  | MBC Response  | Modifications Proposed  |
|--|--|--|---|---|
|  |  | settlement.  | relationship of NPs to local plans as does Section 1.9 of the draft local plan.   |   |
| LCC (Highways, Education, Early Years, Waste, Property Assets, LLFA, Libraries & Culture, LRERC) |  | 6. 6.12 Holwell works and Asfordby Business Par. 6.12.1 Suggest the last sentence of this paragraph be rewritten 'Improved access will be considered as part of the Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy and will likely be secured through development specific mitigation.  | Comment noted.  | Minor Modification - 6.6.12 - Last sentence modified to read "Improved access will be considered as part of the Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy and will likely be secured through development specific mitigation" |
| Ricahrd Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group  | Supported  |  | Support noted.  | None.   |
| Richard Simon  | Supported  |  | Support noted.  | None.   |
| <b><u>Policy EC5</u></b>   |  |  |   |   |
| Andrew Astin   | Draft Policy EC5 seeks to provide flexibility in the mix of uses whilst protecting the vitality, viability and character of the town centre. It sets a sequential approach and a retail impact test threshold for development over 200sqm. Draft Policy EC7 requires an impact assessment for all retail proposals in service centres, with the exception of small independent village shops, post office and social enterprises. Sainsbury's questions the low impact test threshold set in Policy EC5, and can find no evidence of why it is | We consider that the proposed impact threshold for new retail development in edge of and out of centre location should be increased. The policy wording should also be clarified to ensure it applies to new development in edge of and out of centre locations not identified as an existing retail use. Further greater clarity should be provided to policy EC7 about | The Council consider that the 2015 Melton Retail Assessment does evidence the proposed threshold. This does not prohibit developments larger than this coming forward, merely ensures they provide sufficient justification that they will not detriment the town centre. The reinforcement of the town centre is the best way to ensure the town functions as sustainably as possible. | None.   |

| Name                   | Q3: Response   | Q4: Suggested Changes  | MBC Response   | Modifications Proposed |
|------------------------|--|--|--|------------------------|
|                        | <p>set at 200sqm and the significant adverse impact that would arise if not, and refers to NPPF which sets the threshold at 2,500sqm, and Planning Practice Guidance which notes that if Local Plans are based on meeting the assessed need for town centre uses with the sequential approach, issues of adverse impact should not arise. They argue that the Council should consider the scale of proposals relative to town centres, cumulative effects of recent developments and whether local town centres are vulnerable in setting the threshold.</p> | <p>what the council would support as a small independent village shop, either in the policy or supporting text.</p>  | <p>Since 2010, there have been planning approvals for an Aldi, a Lidl and Sainsbury's, with only the Co-Op closing. The Retail Study states even with housing growth, no further retail (except some as part of the Southern SUE) is required. Moreover, some existing retail stores in the town are reporting sub-optimal sales and footfall, thus a policy on approach is needed to ensure this does not worsen.</p> |                        |
| <p>Anthony Paphiti</p> | <p>New businesses to the town are welcome, but the type and locations matter - the variety of shops has been diluted. MBC should be helping businesses thrive.</p> <p>Consistency in shop frontage is good - one can see the effects of this policy in eg Stamford.</p>  | <p>Stricter control over business approval, ensuring diversity in business types along a street/road and avoiding placing businesses in direct competition with each other - this has the potential to deliver the very opposite effect: business failure.</p> <p>Attract larger department stores into the town, by ensuring suitable sites where there is good parking - Marks and Spencer's location was poor, as ingress/egress was very difficult, especially if turning right on exit.</p> | <p>Planning Policy can be limited in its scope to control the type of retail and other town centre uses, unless there is demonstrable evidence a problem is being caused by prevalence in a certain type/types of establishment. Changes of use, apart from those which have permitted development rights, will still have to follow the planning process and comments can be made on individual applications.</p>     | <p>None.</p>           |
| <p>David Adams</p>     | <p>page 89 paragraph 6.15.3 The new businesses mentioned have indeed had a positive effect. Unfortunately this is countered by the development of the Council Offices at Parkside.</p>   |  | <p>Parkside has ample car parking to cater for its own needs. Policy EC5 allows for new retail development within the town centre boundary,</p>  | <p>None.</p>           |

| Name         | Q3: Response  | Q4: Suggested Changes  | MBC Response   | Modifications Proposed |
|--------------|---|--|--|------------------------|
|              | <p>This was land for retail and that retail prospect is lost. The impact of users of Parkside parking on Ankle Hill has had a detrimental effect on safety and traffic congestion.</p> <p>Page 91 Policy EC5 . It seems sensible to focus retail growth in the town centre. Why has recent policy been to grant planning for residential conversion? That process makes it more difficult to deliver the stated policy and arguably makes it unachievable</p>   |  | <p>should a viable scheme come forward. Elements of the GPDO (General Permitted Development Order) allow conversion to residential without planning permission and thus do not fall in the remit of planning policy.</p> |                        |
| Derek Fraser | <p>The statement that MMBC will "Make adequate provision for car parking where possible and appropriate." is not a properly prepared plan. Its absence means it will not be effective in making Melton a better place. Proper provision for significant new parking must be put in place at an early stage well before the large number of houses planned in NSN and SSN are built. It is already very difficult to find parking spaces at busy times and the new housing will make this a lot worse.</p> <p>The Council wants to promote Melton town centre shopping but its proposals to increase bus and cycle use is highly unlikely to appeal to those carrying home bags of shopping. The SSN is located well over 1 mile from the town centre. While 37% of houses are "affordable" and may house residents less able to afford cars the other 63% are for more affluent residents who are</p> | <p>A very early provision should be made to identify where additional car parking is to be provided. For instance one of the existing ground level car parks in the town centre could be converted to a multi-storey car park capable of holding a much large number of cars. Although this would temporarily reduce existing parking space, once built it would have a much improved long term benefit.</p> | Comments noted.  | None.                  |

| Name   | Q3: Response  | Q4: Suggested Changes   | MBC Response   | Modifications Proposed |
|--|---|---|--|------------------------|
|  | likely, based on experience elsewhere, often to own two cars. Based on what happens at present, such residents will inevitably want to drive into town. In the absence of a substantial amount of additional parking space the frustration will be even more intense. This in turn is likely to cause residents to drive to other towns for their shopping. |   |  |                        |
| Dilys Shepherd   | Presumably MBC is aware that people from Bottesford rarely access the shops and facilities of Melton?   |   | It is accepted that Bottesford is better connected to Grantham, Bingham and the Nottingham conurbation.  | None.                  |
| Howard Blakebrough   | Critically the plan does not mention traffic, parking and parking charges. These all inhibit/discourage visitors and locals. Traffic is key to the development of the Borough in general and Melton Town Centre in particular   | The solutions include the ring road which will improve access to the town centre and parking, especially charges which would benefit by being lowered, especially on the days when we are trying to attract people, e.g. market days.   | Policies IN1 and IN2 include proposals for the Melton Mowbray Distributor Road, which will relieve traffic congestion and improve the environment in and around Melton Mowbray Town Centre. Parking charges are not within the remit of Planning Policy.   | None.                  |
| LCC (Highways, Education, Early Years, Waste, Property Assets, LLFA, Libraries & Culture, LRERC) | Policy EC places unnecessary restrictions on the retail development of the edge of the centre, but it would attract additional business and potential footfall to the town creating further potential economic benefits.  | Policy EC5 in the economy chapter regarding the town centre, should be commended as a Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan (led by the BID) is being developed which will be steered by the businesses and the people who live in the town centre boundary and will investigate sites for development. This will include the Town Centre investment model that Melton | Development Proposals may come forward outside of the Town Centre, so long as they are justified by appropriate evidence. The Melton Retail Study does not indicate a need or requirement for great amounts of retail. Melton Borough Council will continue to work with LCC to ensure delivery of essential services, including those listed in the representation. | None.                  |

| Name | Q3: Response | Q4: Suggested Changes   | MBC Response | Modifications Proposed |
|------|--------------|---|--------------|------------------------|
|      |              | <p>town centre acted as a pilot for. Paragraph 6.15.3 Need to emphasise that the evening economy is becoming a vital reason why people use the town centre and hence a growth in good quality restaurants should be encouraged, as opposed to fast food takeaways, to encourage people to use the vital resource of the independent cinema and theatre attached to the college. The strengthening of Melton Mowbray town centre as a desirable evening destination will help to ensure it provides a destination of choice for people living within the town and in the surrounding villages. Furthermore the encouragement of high quality residential development should be encouraged in secondary locations to increase footfall and usage of the town centre.</p> <p><b>Communities and Wellbeing Services</b> LCC delivers Libraries, Museums and Adult Learning Services in the Melton Area through the following venues: • Melton Library, Situated within Melton Brooksby College; • Melton Carnegie Museum; and •</p> |              |                        |

| Name               | Q3: Response  | Q4: Suggested Changes  | MBC Response   | Modifications Proposed |
|--------------------|---|--|--|------------------------|
|                    |   | <p>Bottesford Library (which is a library managed as a Community Interest Company (CIC) with a support package from the County Council. The County Council would be interested in any developments that would assist in reducing costs in delivering services in Melton Town, possibly by linking the Library with the Museum into a single venue that would also enable the delivery of adult learning services.</p> <p>In the recent past, some venues have been explored, however these have not been viewed as viable to cater for the demand on services.</p> |  |                        |
| Michelle Colclough | <p>The revised manner in which business rates are calculated will have an impact on the town centre businesses. Some will effectively double. MBC needs to apply the maximum discount levy to support local independent businesses. Rent is not particularly competitive when you take into account most buildings are owned by investment companies and individuals from the area and there is no real choice for appointing agents for business lets with one company being dominant in the local market.</p> <p>As floor space in Melton is not attractive to larger names in the retail industry there are more</p> |  | Comments noted. Business rates and control of most types of retail operator are beyond the remit of Planning Policy. | None.                  |

| Name  | Q3: Response   | Q4: Suggested Changes  | MBC Response   | Modifications Proposed |
|---|--|--|--|------------------------|
|   | charity shops, takeaways and convenience stores.   |  |  |                        |
| Peter Bailey                                | Granting Aldi planning permission out of town solution contradicts the focus on the Town Centre, especially now the Co-op has disappeared.   | Inconsistent planning fails to satisfy prime objectives.   | Comment noted. The granting of Aldi has informed the evidence of which this local plan is based.   | None.                  |
| Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group | Supported  |  | Support noted.   | None.                  |
| Richard Simon                               | Supported  |  | Support noted.   | None.                  |
| Russell Collins                             | Plans for the town centre are not sound as set out in NPPF paragraph 182, 23 - 37 Ensuring the vitality of town centres.   | Crosstown through traffic is still planned for the southern half of the town centre. This could be addressed by the construction of a Melton Town Centre Relief Road connecting Thorpe End to the bottom of Burton Road and across to Dalby Road, running south of the river and railway for much of its length on what is at present open land. Additional parking for the town centre could also be provided on this land within walking distance of the town centre. The proposed outer relief road alone would do nothing to revitalise the town centre. | The evidence to support this proposal is now 30 years old, and much more recent advanced traffic modelling by LCC and partners has shows that the best benefits to the town come from an outer distributor road. | None.                  |
| Susan Love                                  | Support. I would like to see some specific mention for support of charity shops. Charity shops encourage recycling and upcycling thus helping to prevent waste, benefit charities, and | Add 6. Support charity shops through low or nil business rates and encourage their appropriate use in publicity sent out to Borough  | Support noted. This proposal is not within the remit of planning policy.   | None.                  |

| Name  | Q3: Response  | Q4: Suggested Changes  | MBC Response   | Modifications Proposed |
|---|---|--|--|------------------------|
|   | benefit the psychological and social well-being of the people who give their time to volunteer. I have seen a great deal of furniture (both for indoors and gardens) discarded in our local tip which could well have made some money for a charity and been re-used.   | residents about refuse collection days.  |  |                        |
| <b><u>Policy EC6</u></b>  |   |  |  |                        |
| Colin Wilkinson<br>(on behalf of<br>Asfordby Parish<br>Council) | <p>The Use Classes Order in England (updated 15 April 2015) grants permitted development rights for change of use where planning permission is not needed for changes in use of buildings within each subclass and for certain changes of use between some of the classes. With respect to Class A1: Shops permitted changes include to or from a mixed use as A1 or A2 &amp; up to 2 flats, Temporary permitted change (2 years) for up to 150 sq.m to A2, A3, B1 (interchangeable with notification)</p> <p>Permitted change of A1 or mixed A1 and dwellinghouse to C3 (subject to prior approval)</p> <p>Permitted change to A2</p> <p>Permitted change to A3 (inclusive of buildings and other operations subject to prior approval)</p> <p>Permitted change to D2 (subject to prior approval)</p> <p>This extensive range of permitted changes makes Melton Local Plan (Publication version) Policy EC6 ineffective.</p> | Melton Local Plan (Publication version) Policy EC6 should be amended to reflect the range of permitted development rights allowed by the Use Classes Order in England (updated 15 April 2015). | Policy EC6 already reflects that where permitted development rights are relevant the policy would not be operable. | None.                  |
| Michelle Colclough  | I support this policy.  |  | Support noted.   | None.                  |

| Name  | Q3: Response  | Q4: Suggested Changes   | MBC Response  | Modifications Proposed |
|---|---|---|---|------------------------|
| Peter Bailey  | There are many Town Centre unused shops with unsightly frontages as left by the last tenants, for many years.   | All such properties need effective action to comply with local strategy.  | Comment noted.  | None.                  |
| Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group                                   | Supported   |   | Support noted.  | None.                  |
| Richard Simon   | Supported   |   | Support noted.  | None.                  |
| <b>Policy EC7</b>   |   |   |   |                        |
| (Jon Kirby) GVA on behalf of Richborough Estates and Leicester County Council | The Developers welcome the amendments made to Policy EC7 following concerns identified in response to the Emerging Options local plan. As previously highlighted, the quantum of retailing which could reasonably be accommodated within a new local centre within the NSN would be insignificant and fall well below the NPPF threshold of 2,500 m2, thus avoiding the need to assess town centre impacts. Notwithstanding the above, the supportive wording set out in Chapter 6 and preceding Policy EC7 continues to make reference to providing a Retail Impact Assessment in respect of retail provision brought forward as part of a local centre within the NSN. For consistency, this should be removed. | The final sentence of paragraph 6.16.2 of the draft plan should be removed.   | The reason why a retail unit is acceptable without impact assessment in the South and not the North Sustainable Urban Extension is contained within the evidence document Melton Retail Assessment 2015. Melton Borough Council is yet to receive sufficient evidence to counter the rationale as explained by this document. | None.                  |
| Andrew Astin  | Draft Policy EC7 sets out the approach to retail development in the Borough, and requires an impact assessment for all retail proposals in service centres, with the exception of small independent village shops, post office and social enterprises. National Policy sets the threshold at 2,500sqm. However, local planning authorities  | We consider that the proposed impact threshold for new retail development in edge of and out of centre location should be increased. The policy wording should also be clarified to ensure it applies to new development in | 200 square meters was assessed by industry experts as being appropriate, with uses within that size having a negligible impact on established centres. It is difficult to quantify at which point a threshold would be reached, above which damage would  | None.                  |

| Name  | Q3: Response  | Q4: Suggested Changes  | MBC Response  | Modifications Proposed |
|---|---|--|---|------------------------|
|   | <p>are able to set local thresholds. Planning Practice Guidance notes that if Local Plans are based on meeting the assessed need for town centre uses with the sequential approach, issues of adverse impact should not arise. Local planning authorities in setting local thresholds should consider the scale of proposals relative to town centres, cumulative effects of recent developments and whether local town centres are vulnerable. There is no evidence that a new retail proposal over 200sqm would result in a significant adverse impact on Melton Mowbray town centre and its service centres. Sainsbury's therefore, questions the low impact test threshold set in Policy EC5. It is not clear from the Retail Study where the identified threshold of 200sqm is evidenced, and as such it is not justified.</p> | <p>edge of and out of centre locations not identified as an existing retail use. Further greater clarity should be provided to policy EC7 about what the council would support as a small independent village shop, either in the policy or supporting text.</p> | <p>be caused. MBC are of the view however that in setting this threshold too high, damage would be done and be irreversible before a policy intervention could rectify it. Moreover, there is no evidence provided by the objector that development above 200 square meters would not cause damage to the town centre. These thresholds do not set limits to development, just ensure necessary work is completed in advance.</p> |                        |
| <p>Colin Wilkinson<br/>(on behalf of<br/>Asfordby Parish<br/>Council)</p> | <p>The Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan Policy A20 ensures that the Local Centre provides a diverse range of uses which appeal to a wide range of age and social groups will be permitted. The local planning authority has failed to take the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan into account when preparing the Local Plan Policy EC7. Furthermore, Policy EC5 seeks to encourage town centre developments in places that are not towns.</p>  | <p>Melton Local Plan (Publication version) Policy EC7 should be amended to accurately reflect Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan Policy A20.</p>   | <p>Comment noted. Please refer to Chapter 1 regarding alignment of Local and Neighbourhood Plans.</p>   | <p>None.</p>           |
| <p>K Lynne<br/>Camplejohn</p>   | <p>The policy does not make any reference to a neighbourhood plan, if there is one for that area, so it fails on duty to cooperate.</p>   | <p>To comply with the duty to cooperate include a reference to a settlements neighbourhood plan.</p>   | <p>It is a given that Neighbourhood Plan for a given area form part of the development plan, it is not necessary</p>  | <p>None.</p>           |

| Name   | Q3: Response   | Q4: Suggested Changes                                       | MBC Response   | Modifications Proposed                                    |
|--|--|---|--|---|
|  |  |   | to reference them in every policy.   |   |
| Maurice Fairhurst                              | Proposals for small retail developments such as farm shops in the rural area up to 200 square metres should not have to provide retail impact assessments.   | Amend penultimate paragraph in Policy EC7 to exclude these. | Comment noted.   | Minor Modification - Policy EC7 -Add Farm Shop to Policy. |
| Melton North Land Consortium - GVA Consultants | <p>Welcomes the changes to EC7 from the emerging option stage. The quantum of retailing which could reasonably be accommodated within a new local centre within the NSN would be insignificant and fall well below the NPPF threshold of 2500sq mts, thus avoiding the need to assess the town centre impacts.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the supportive wording set out in Chapter 6 and Preceding Policy EC7 continues to make reference to providing a retail impact assessment in respect of retail provision brought forward as part of a local centre within the NSN. For consistency this should be removed.</p> |   | <p>Comments noted. The Employment Land Study (2015) is explicit in its rationale as to why a local centre is required in the Southern SUE but not the Northern. Existing retail offer and easier access to the town centre in particular are relevant. The Borough Council however has not stated a centre cannot be provided, more that it must be sufficiently evidenced as not causing harm to Melton Mowbray town centre. Town Centre Retail outlets are already citing subpar performance and MBC must ensure that in allowing additional retail at the peripheries of the town, they do not compromise those in the town centre.</p> | None.   |
| Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group    | Supported . In the case of Bottesford this is severely limited, there being no spare plots and the retail offer is within the Heritage area  |   | Support noted.   | None.   |
| Richard Simon                                  | Supported . In the case of Bottesford this is severely limited, there being no spare plots and the retail offer is within the Heritage area  |   | Support noted.   | None.   |
| <b><u>Policy EC8</u></b>                       |  |   |  |   |

| Name  | Q3: Response   | Q4: Suggested Changes   | MBC Response  | Modifications Proposed  |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| Anthony Paphiti                               | <p>Tourism is vitally important to the town and environs and is something we should capitalise on and promote overseas. We have lots to see here: beautiful countryside, local heritage sites (which you list), Belvoir Castle, country parks - all with easy cycling distance. We do need to enhance cycle paths, to make them traffic free and safe - this can be done through a combination of options, from new build to closing low use lanes and re-routing traffic or making access purely on the basis of eg residents only, improving and using canal towpaths. These options have worked very successfully on the continent.</p> <p>The benefits to local businesses will be significant - hotels/guest houses, pubs, restaurants, shops. It will also open the door to more meaningful international town exchanges/twinning as a mechanism of boosting our tourist industry.</p> |   | Comments noted. Provision and promotion of cycle routes is a County Council function. | None.   |
| Carl Powell                                   | Unsound - 'particular protection' is not given to the Leicester Round public footpath. This is very important economically to village shops and pubs in the settlements along its route. I have canvassed the village shop and pub in my own village of Somerby and they confirm this belief.  | After '... Belvoir Castle and Burrough on the Hill Iron Age Fort' add 'The Leicester Round where it crosses the Borough'.   | Comment noted. Protection is granted through national policy as it is a right of way. | None.   |
| Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Belvoir Estate) | The principal visitor attraction is the castle and its grounds, and the range of events that are held there. A wide variety of people come to the castle as day visitors, corporate guests and to attend events such as weddings, concerts, fairs  | Melton Local Plan (Pre-Submission) Draft Policy EC8 be modified to allow for a wider range of tourism and employment activity. For example, the lack of overnight | Comment noted.  | Minor Modification – Para EC8 - Additional sentence to say larger proposals will be supported provided it |

| Name  | Q3: Response  | Q4: Suggested Changes  | MBC Response   | Modifications Proposed  |
|---|---|--|--|---|
|   | <p>and the annual firework display. This provides the Estate with a significant income which helps with the upkeep of the Castle.</p> <p>To continue to retain such high-quality environments, the Estate needs to respond to the modern day demands and duties of the landscape, community and built environment of which it comprises. A significant barrier to progressing projects within the Estate is the planning process.</p> <p>Melton Local Plan (Pre-Submission) Draft Policy EC8 is unduly restrictive in its approach to rural tourism. It is unrealistic to apply a sequential approach to tourist related development when Belvoir Castle and the Vale of Belvoir are the area's principal tourism assets.</p> | <p>accommodation means that visitor spending is generated principally by day-visitors. Visitors who stay overnight contribute more to the local economy by spending money on overnight accommodation, food, refreshment and ancillaries. Policy EC8 should be more supportive to opportunities to provide visitor accommodation, including holiday lodges, and to the hosting of events such as weddings, concerts, fairs.</p> <p>Policy EC8 should not impose a sequential approach with respect to rural tourism development.</p> <p>Other policies protecting the landscape and heritage assets make the last sentence of Policy EC8 unnecessarily restrictive.</p> |  | <p>can be proven to add significantly and demonstrably to the Boroughs economic or tourist offer.</p> |
| Howard Blakebrough                          | <p>A coherent approach to promoting the Rural Capital of Food by means of encouraging retail offerings to match (delicatessens, a purpose built food centre (see Ludlow) etc.) to give people a real reason for visiting Melton. This is a real opportunity to develop Melton.</p>  |  | <p>Comment noted. Melton Borough Council already has a range of initiatives to this end, principally the FEZ (Food Enterprise Zone).</p> | <p>None.</p>  |
| Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group | <p>Supported</p>  |  | <p>Support noted.</p>  | <p>None.</p>  |
| Richard Simon                               | <p>Supported</p>  |  | <p>Support noted.</p>  | <p>None.</p>  |
| Susan Love                                  | <p>Belvoir Castle and the Vale of Belvoir are</p>   |  | <p>Comment noted.</p>  | <p>None.</p>  |

| Name          | Q3: Response  | Q4: Suggested Changes   | MBC Response  | Modifications Proposed |
|---------------|---|---|---|------------------------|
|               | <p>important tourist attractions. For most part of the year about 50 cyclists a day come through Belvoir Rd out to all the routes in the Vale. The settings of the Vale villages should be protected to maintain this and the development of the Rectory Farm area in the north of the village will provide a good new Sustrans link to Kilvington.</p> <p>Pleased to see that the significance of Belvoir castle has been recognised in this document.</p> |   |   |                        |
| Terence Joyce | <p>I agree with SOUNDNESS: however with regard to Somerby (SOM) , Any build on SOM2/3 will have maximum negative effect on this policy as they are adjacent country walks and riding school which attracts people from miles around. The village as a whole attracts walkers, which boosts visitors to local pub/restaurant, also within walking distance Burrough on the Hill Iron Age Fort .</p>  | <p>To maintain SOUNDNESS: Avoid build in Somerby on SOM2/3. Whilst trying to generate new tourists projects we should cherish what is already established in the Borough and not spoil it. Villages like Somerby with its own features and close proximity to Burrough on the Hill, should be treated as Tourist attraction and not a humdrum service centre.</p> | <p>Comments noted. It may be possible to secure improvements to the walking routes where they cross or are adjacent to development sites.</p> | None.                  |