

Chapter 4, Policy SS2

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Mrs Joyce Noon - CPRE Leicestershire	NPPF para 154 states “Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan”. In Policy SS2 the proposal for 245 dwellings per annum for the period (6125 over the 25 year period) is based on the SMHA 2014 Document Table 85 (Table 85: OAN Conclusions, 2011-36). The assessment has been made on a policy off basis. In developing local plans, the local authorities will need to consider how there emerging evidence for housing and employment align and may need to adjust the level of housing provision planned for to support economic growth. The table in SS2 states a range of between 195 and 245 dwellings per annum so why has the upper figure been used for this Local Plan? The Melton Employment Land Study (MELD) 2015 appears to indicate that the reasoning for the higher figure relates to the MELD 2015, but since this shows a very low level of employment growth for Melton (indicated below) there is no justification for an overall target of 6125 dwellings over the period. Table 2 of the MELD indicates that the Leicester and Leicestershire (HMA) Employment Land Study forecast a very low level of employment growth for Melton, a 300 jobs net increase over 2010-2031, a 1.3 percent change on 2010. In part this reflects a drop in employment from 2012, which is not fully reversed until 2031. An employment decrease of this severity and duration is not forecast for any of the other local authority areas of Leicester and Leicestershire. In the “Open Countryside” paragraph relating to settlements outside Service Centres, the phrase necessary and appropriate is not sustainable, as this is open to interpretation. Other Local Plans (Charnwood) are less flexible using the term ‘local social and economic need’, requiring some form of control. The term used in this Policy is too open to variation. The Policy needs to be precise.	Given the forecast low level of employment growth SS2 should align with the SMHA advice to aim for the lowest figure of 195 which would equal 4875 dwellings of the plan period . In the “Open Countryside” paragraph relating to settlements outside Service Centres, the last phrase should be replaced by “local and economic need”. This proposed amendment aligns with the first criteria of SS3.	MBC consider the figure of 245 per annum (6125) necessary to meet the vision, priority and objectives set out in Chapter 3. The lower options suggested in the SHMA would not facilitate the necessary infrastructure, housing choice or economic (workforce) supply and as such would be misaligned with the economic strategy for the area. It would also undermine 5 year housing land supply requirements if the Sustainable Neighbourhoods were retained in order to provide infrastructure necessary for the Borough to unlock its economic potential and restrict housing choice by creating an over concentration within Melton Mowbray and lesser opportunities elsewhere.	None proposed
A.Thomas	Vast housing estates should not be unilaterally imposed on the villages. Long Clawson for example will not be sustainable if the quantity of houses proposed in the draft plan is imposed upon the village.	Build new villages with new infrastructure at Six Hills &/or Great Dalby. Only allow individual, one off new builds in the villages thus preserving the rural ambience of those villages.	The sites proposed in Long Clawson are limited in scale. Each has been assessed for its suitability and availability prior to being selected as an allocation. The analysis Large Sites Options undertaken in July 2015 is considered to remain relevant and the	None.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
			reasons why these options were not selected remain applicable. No evidence has been provided to deviate from these conclusions.	
Andrew Gore obo Mary A Donovan	<p>There are significant flaws in the Council's evidence base in respect of the creation of a suitable settlement hierarchy. Proposed development should be significantly reduced in Somerby and the village should be reclassified as being a Rural Supporter settlement. This representation reiterates previous comments submitted in Spring 2016 (Emerging Options). These are resubmitted and summarised as follows. The settlement scoring matrix, used to classify settlements, contain errors in that public transport services, post office service and civic amenities (waste tip) are overstated. Land off Burrough Road, Somerby (MBC/048/13) as a reserve site should be deleted from the plan, particularly in respect of Draft Policy C1 (see representation to SOM3) for reasons of substantial harm to the Conservation Area; demonstrable harm to the historic landscape; the importance of the site forming a landscape edge and a prominent gateway to the settlement and that there are other more appropriate housing sites in Somerby. The current proportionate housing approach is flawed as it does not allow for higher levels of development in the most appropriate and sustainable locations. The distribution of housing should be allocated based on levels of sustainability and the capacity of SCRHS to accommodate further development to comply with paragraph 182 of NPPF. Some villages are substantially less sustainable than others, yet they have been allocated relatively high numbers of dwellings due to higher population levels. This is especially evident in SCRHS such as Wymondham, Croxton Kerrial and Asfordby Hill which are to receive 6.1%, 5.1% and 5.7% of proposed development respectively but only fulfil 6, 7 and 8 of the 43 categories of the SRRR respectively when assessing the sustainability of each village. In comparison, Waltham on the Wolds, for instance, is to receive only 8% of the proposed development but fulfils 15 of the 43 categories in the SRRR (when recalculated to take account of the correct village services and facilities) and Harby is to receive only 8.9% of the proposed development but fulfils 15 of the 43 categories in the SRRR. The Settlement Roles and Responsibilities Report (SRRR) identify proximity to</p>		<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. Somerby is correctly identified owing to the presence of all of the key services identified This is not dependant upon the services mentioned) . The comments relating to the specific sites are addressed in comments relating to Chapter 5 (policies C1 and C1A)</p>	None.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	employment generating uses as part of the scoring considerations for the settlement hierarchy. However, there appears to be a complete absence of any proper investigation as to the size, nature and quality of the employment generating uses. This has serious implications on the soundness of the plan on the grounds that its approach to the distribution of housing is not properly justified. For example, the proximity of John O Gaunt Employment Estate (4.6km away) is a consideration in identifying a) the suitability of Somerby as a Service Centre and b) the suitability of potential allocations within Somerby. However, it is understood that just 14 people are employed at John O Gaunt Employment Estate.			
Andrew Granger & Co Ltd	Fully support the recognition of the development requirements outlined in Policy SS2 in that the Development Strategy is a minimum, and this part of the Policy enables some flexibility to be applied. Furthermore, support is given to the identification of Hose as one of the Service Centres, which are to support 35% of the total residential requirement across the Borough. Hose is a sustainable settlement with comparatively good access to local services and facilities and is suitable for a proportion of residential development. However, not all of the relevant issues have been taken into account when determining the amount of residential development that is required. For the Local Plan to be compliant with NPPF paragraph 158 the Local Plan is based on “adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental prospects of the area”. The Councils of the Leicester and Leicestershire are currently working on producing their Housing and Employment Development Needs Assessment Report [HEDNA] and this is anticipated to be published in January 2017. The updated Objectively Assessed Housing Needs [OAHN] contained within this document are likely to have a significant impact on the residential requirements for the borough, and as such the current anticipated housing requirements are likely to require revising prior to the Local Plan’s submission in order for it to pass the tests of soundness.	With the publication of the HEDNA report anticipated for January 2017, it may be beneficial to delay submission and adoption of the new Local Plan until the Council has had an adequate opportunity to review its housing requirements, to reflect the updated OAHN that will be outlined in this report. Furthermore, it is necessary for the Local Plan to remove the current limit on the amount of development on unallocated sites as it restricts the likelihood of affordable housing being delivered in rural areas. If the Council is minded to make these changes, then it will ensure that the submitted Local Plan is flexible, robust and more likely to pass the test of soundness.	The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving at a housing target for the Local plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available. The HEDNA incorporates all of the inputs referred to. The Plan positively provides for the quantum of growth proposed (6125 dwellings) and allows 'headroom'. flexibility and consideration of new sites that represent sustainable development through policy SS3 (the approach of which is contained in SS2). The Plan positively provides for the quantum of growth proposed (6125 dwellings) and allows 'headroom'. flexibility and consideration of new sites that represent sustainable development through policy SS3 (the approach of which is contained in SS2). It is agreed that the specification of a numerical limit may be inflexible and limit the ability to respond to specific circumstances, especially bearing in mind the length of the Plan to 2036.	Proposed to amend Policy SS3 as a ‘focussed change’ so as to delete references to 3, 5 and 10 and allow greater flexibility as needs and circumstances change over time. Control over scale would be managed by reference to compatibility with the settlement concerned. HEDNA and ‘towards a housing requirement for Melton’ evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on ‘focussed changes’

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
			The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st Septemer 2016).	
Andrew Russell-Wilks (on behalf of Stephen Vickers, Buckminster)	Support Policy SS2 because1) the objective of at least 6,125 new homes linked to population growth is ambitious and forward thinking, and will help address the local aging population and shortages in the labour market; and 2) the distribution of growth across the borough of 65% in Melton and 35% in the rural areas reaches the right balance. Buckminster Estate (BE) is a major long-term investor in the north eastern part of Melton Borough, around the villages of ThorpeArnold, Saxby, Garthorpe, Coston, Sproxton, Buckminster, Sewstern and Wymondham. BE has been an investor in the area for over 200 years and through its various activities is a significant direct and indirect employer. It has a vested interest in the rural areas of the borough thriving. Buckminster owns residential, commercial and retail properties within the villages and much agricultural land in between. Whilst the principal activity of the business is agriculture with farms both held in hand and leased to third parties, it takes a holistic approach to the management of its rural assets, and recognises that all the various elements are connected. For example, for its main business of agriculture to be successful, it needs a good workforce, and that workforce needs to have good places to live, places to shop, and places for other family members to work. The existing community facilities in the rural area such as schools, shops and pubs need a wide 'customer' base if they are to thrive and stay in business. In the earlier iterations of the Local Plan BE made		Noted : this accords with the objectives behind policy SS2.	None proposed

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>representations setting out its view that there should be greater flexibility within some of the policies affecting the rural areas of the borough, especially in relation to the amount of residential growth to be permitted on sites within the rural areas of the borough; there should be less of a focus upon Melton Mowbray in isolation, which could be to the detriment of the rural areas of the borough. BE was concerned that the rural parts of the borough must be allowed to evolve and ‘breathe’ and that countryside and rural policies should be positive and not too restrictive. In the current consultation draft of the Local Plan it is good that Melton BC has generally taken on board the comments made meaning that BE can be a supporter of the principles of SS2 and the plan as currently drafted.</p>			
Angela Smedley (on behalf of Burrough Court Estate Ltd)	<p>Policy SS2 changes the previous Emerging Options stage of rural settlement distribution of new homes from a specific 5% apportionment to ‘windfall’ sites, being small unallocated sites of 3 dwellings or less. This is not considered to be the most appropriate or flexible means of achieving housing and therefore will mean needs not being met on a single site, where development of 6 dwellings, for example, on a single site may be the most appropriate solution for the settlement. In light of the restrictive nature of the policy, sites presented for development cannot be built out to capacity, and development may become fragmented as opposed to a more comprehensive approach adopted when planning marginally larger schemes. The potential for developer contributions dedicated to the local community may also be threatened as a result of limitations placed on development. In light of the lack of a 5 year housing land supply, it is considered that this policy will further exasperate the situation in that it will effectively limit potential housing coming forward to meet local housing needs. Along with the above issues raised, we are concerned that the overall level of housing need (6,125 over the plan period; 245 per annum) is based on the 2014 SHMA, when the Leicester and Leicestershire wide Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment</p>	<p>Policy SS2 should be revised to omit the limit to the number of dwellings permitted in a single application in the ‘Rural Settlements’ (category for reasons outlined above). The onus should be on identifying appropriate sites to accommodate development, within and adjoining settlement boundaries that place more emphasis on design and use of vernacular styling and local materials as opposed to setting a limit to development which would undermine the Local Plan and housing delivery. The 5% proportion of housing as set out within the Emerging Local Plan should be re-instated to spread development across the Borough.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the specification of a numerical limit may be inflexible and limit the ability to respond to specific circumstances, especially bearing in mind the length of the Plan to 2036.</p> <p>The 'windfall allowance' in the spatial strategy maintains flexibility is all settlements, subject to the criteria listed. The increase from 3 to 6 would not affect the thresholds for developer contributions which are most commonly 10 or more. The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving at a housing requirement for the Local Plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies.</p>	<p>Proposed to amend Policy SS3 as a ‘focussed change’ so as to delete references to 3, 5 and 10 and allow greater flexibility as needs and circumstances change over time. Control over scale would be managed by reference to compatibility with the settlement concerned.</p> <p>HEDNA and ‘towards a housing requirement for Melton’ evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on ‘focussed changes’</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	(HEDNA) will be published for stakeholder consultation early in 2017 and is intended to supersede the SHMA. We support the desire to progress the Local Plan swiftly, but it is vital that it takes full account of the most up-to-date evidence on both housing and employment needs, which is not available at the time of this consultation. Clearly this will have an impact on many of the Local Plan policies. In the event the SHMA identifies a greater housing need there will need to be alternative options for delivering the additional requirement. Smaller scale sites will assist in delivering this whilst maintaining vitality in villages.			
Barbara Yandell	SOM2 MCB/023/16. Melton BC has erroneously classed Somerby as a service centre and capable of absorbing such a new large development site. This is a flawed assessment. The majority of public services are at least 7 miles away.		The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st Septemebr 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. Somerby is correctly identified as a service centre owing ot the presence of the key services identified.	None.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Barwood Homes	<p>Support and endorse the classification of Waltham on the Wolds as a Service Centre, but seek to increase the percentage level of growth intended for the Service Centres/Rural Hubs, re-classify the largest four Service Centres to recognise their importance in the Borough and re-evaluate the distribution of development between centres. The overall level of housing and employment growth to be planned for within Melton Borough to 2036 is under review as part of the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment for Leicester and Leicestershire. Until the results of this exercise are published, and the Councils (particularly Leicester City) have demonstrated and agreed to accommodate their needs within their administrative area, it is not possible to comment on whether the 6,125 homes proposed for the plan period is robust. Notwithstanding this, Policy SS2 identifies that provision will be made for at least 6,125 homes between 2011 and 2036, and also references that at least 3,980 of these homes are to be built in the Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area (MMUA). However, this flexible approach is not reflected throughout the policy with reference to a proposed rigid percentage of growth to be allocated to MMUA (65%) and the Service Centres and Rural Hubs (SCRHs) (35%) and the reference to “remaining need (1,822) on a proportionate basis” in relation to the specific allocation for SCRHs. Paragraph 182 of the NPPF states that LPA’s should be demonstrating synergy between each aspect of the policy approach and, above all, consistency with the overarching presumption in favour of sustainable development identified (in Policy SS1). To propose such a rigid percentage breakdown and remaining need figure of 1,822 for the SCRHs is contradictory to the flexibility provided in the phrase “at least” when referring to the overall provision of homes and the number that will be directed to the MMUA. This is not in accordance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF and such inflexibility in their approach to development in the SCRHs does not provide the “sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change”. The LPA should provide more flexibility for development to be delivered across the Borough if required. It is not disputed that most development should be directed to the MMUA using phraseology such as “at least” but this approach also needs to be reflected throughout the policy. “At least” should also be noted for the housing target for the SCRHs and the references to</p>	<p>The four largest SCRHs should be acknowledged for their high levels of sustainability and should be set above other SCRHs as higher order centres in the settlement hierarchy as previously proposed in the emerging Local Plan. They should in turn be allocated more development where it can be demonstrated that they have the capacity to do so.</p> <p>The distribution of housing should be allocated based on levels of sustainability and the capacity of SCRHs to accommodate further development.</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing and all villages attracting allocations display these characteristics. The apportionment of the rural allocation based upon exiting size recognises that larger settlements should accommodate a greater quantity and Waltham is treated accordingly, both in itself and in relation larger and smaller villages. Though amongst the larger 4 service centres, Waltham does not display a significantly greater range of facilities than several lower order villages.</p> <p>The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving at a housing target for the Local plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. This means that there is significant 'headroom' and flexibility to accommodate unmet need and in the event that it is insufficient in quantity arising from this reason or others, Policy SS6 will trigger a review. The identification of 65% in the MMUA and 35% in the rural area is derivative of the need for the quantum required to deliver the economic strategy envisaged for the Borough centring upon Melton Mowbray and the plan's overall vision, priorities and objectives set out in Chapter 3. However it is agreed that the policy is unduly prescriptive in terms of the expression of this balance and</p>	<p>A proposed change to insert the word 'approximately' into Policy SS2 prior to the citation of "65%" and "35%"</p> <p>HEDNA and ‘towards a housing requirement for Melton’ evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on ‘focussed changes’</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>percentage growth should equally reflect this approach by stating “circa 65% and 35%” rather than a definitive split. The SCRHS should be allocated more growth in any event. The NPPF paragraph 55 states, that “to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities”. The Planning Practice Guidance provides further guidance on this issue, stating: “A thriving rural community in a living, working countryside depends, in part, on retaining local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of these local facilities” (Rural Housing: Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20140306). Rural housing is therefore best directed to settlements where it can help sustain and enhance facilities and services without complete restriction to lower order settlements. The Council should consider redirecting rural growth to the more sustainable rural settlements, where it can be demonstrated that growth can be sustainably accommodated. There are various references in section 2.3 of the PSD to the importance of supporting business development in rural areas. Specifically paragraphs 2.3.1 and 2.3.3 highlight the importance of business start ups in rural parts of the Borough where there is a growing trend for home working. It is also importantly acknowledged in paragraph 4.2.3 that a positive approach will be taken to the rural economy and states that, “Plan policies should support the long term sustainability of the Boroughs villages, building on and furthering the attractiveness of the Borough for homeworking and small business start-ups...” Providing a higher proportion of homes in the SCRHS will provide the support needed to allow this sector to further expand and secure the long term sustainability of these businesses. There are a number of businesses located in Waltham on the Wolds such as the local shops and services noted in the Review of the Settlement Roles and Responsibilities Report May 2016 (SRRR). However, there are a number of businesses that have not been acknowledged in the review such as the variety of Bed and Breakfasts, Chocolate Flip Flop Shop, Concept Controls IT Assistance, a car dealership/garage, the Waltham Centre for Pet Nutrition, and various builders/joiners/plumbers etc. The SCRHS, and especially Waltham on the Wolds (which clearly has not been given the correct sustainability</p>		<p>it is recommended that the wording is amended to increase flexibility.</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>rating to date), should be allocated a larger proportion of dwellings in order to support business development in the rural areas. This would accord with the strategic housing objective of the PSD in developing a housing stock to provide for the future aspirations for the local economy. Paragraph 2.3.5 of the PSD identifies that aside from Melton Mowbray, Waltham on the Wolds is one of the most sustainable SCRHS and acts as a local service centre alongside other villages such as Asfordby, Bottesford, and Long Clawson. In addition, Map 1 of the Settlement Roles and Relationship Study 2015 shows how the settlement roles are spread across the Borough. The Study concludes that generally settlements to the north of the Borough perform better than those to the south in terms of sustainability. Map 3 of the Study shows the average service score for each community aggregated by Parish Area. The areas on the Map shaded purple, of which Waltham and the Wolds is included, show locations where access to services and employment are highest highlighting the north and west as the better served parts of the Borough. Waltham on the Wolds is considered to be a sustainable location for new development due to the availability of those local facilities and services which reduce the need to travel. The settlement is reasonably well served by public transport to enable journeys to higher order centres to be undertaken as an alternative to the motor car. Consequently, Waltham on the Wolds therefore performs a key role in the Borough and as such it is considered that the settlement is an appropriate location to which a higher level of growth should be directed. Whilst Bottesford and Asfordby have been allocated higher levels of development than other villages (23% and 16% respectively), this is not reflected in the approach to Waltham on the Wolds and Long Clawson. We acknowledge that this is because the approach to development has been based on settlement size and population numbers rather than on sustainability credentials and land availability. The current approach is flawed as it does not allow for higher levels of development in the most appropriate and sustainable locations and is not compliant with paragraph 182 of the NPPF. A review of the SRRR identifies that some villages are substantially less sustainable than others, yet they have been allocated relatively high numbers of dwellings due to higher population levels. This is especially evident</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>in SCRHS such as Wymondham, Croxton Kerrial and Asfordby Hill which are to receive 6.1%, 5.1% and 5.7% of proposed development respectively but only fulfil 6, 7 and 8 of the 43 categories of the SRRR respectively when assessing the sustainability of each village. In comparison, Waltham on the Wolds, for instance, is to receive only 8% of the proposed development but fulfils 15 of the 43 categories in the SRRR (when recalculated to take account of the correct village services and facilities). In relation to capacity to accommodate further development, it is noted that the tables at Policy C1 (A) of the PSD identify a capacity of 405 dwellings in Bottesford but it is proposed to allocate 427 dwellings at this location. Again, in the case of Wymondham there is capacity for 63 dwellings but it is proposed to allocate 68 dwellings to this village.</p> <p>Whilst settlements such Waltham on the Wolds have a capacity to accommodate 132 dwellings but it is proposed to allocate only 91 dwellings to this centre. This approach to the distribution of housing is clearly flawed and could lead to the plan being found unsound (NPPF paragraph 182). This means that Plans should be deliverable over the plan period, and in accordance with NPPF paragraph 47, need to identify a supply of deliverable and developable sites for housing. Overestimating housing number and deliverable or developable sites means the Local Plan is in danger of being considered unsound. Fundamentally, this approach will lead to issues when dwellings are delivered as villages could become akin to housing estates with unsustainable patterns of travel to other villages for services and facilities rather than being self sufficient villages in their own right. In addition, allocating more development to villages with less land capacity could lead to a shortfall in development, especially if developers seek to provide low density schemes on those allocated sites to assimilate with the character of surroundings.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Ben Hunt on behalf of Mr A Birley	<p>Overall, the general approach to the Development Strategy for the Borough set out in paragraphs 4.2.1 – 4.2.15 and Policy SS2 is supported. This support includes: the proposed Settlement Hierarchy; 65% of the Borough’s development needs directed to the Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area; and 35% of the Borough’s development needs directed to Service Centres and Rural Hubs. However, suggest that the policy wording needs to be revised to remain genuinely strategic. As currently worded, the policy provides strategic guidance on the overall distribution of the Borough’s development needs, but then strays into more detailed wording for dealing with different types of site for rural areas, without saying anything more about the Melton Main Urban Area. Also, Policy SS2 is not consistent in the level of guidance which it provides for allocations and windfall sites in Service Centres and Rural Hubs. There is some danger (particularly in delivering a significant proportion of windfall sites within 35% of the housing distribution to Service centres and Rural hubs) that in relying on these smaller sites coming forward in a more piece-meal fashion, they will not be able to deliver the range of sustainable benefits which planned allocations will. Whilst to an extent this depends on the wording and application of Policy SS3, it needs to be addressed in the overall strategy embodied in Policy SS2. The detailed wording of the policy needs to be altered</p> <p>to achieve its stated aims. The fourth paragraph states that “Service Centres and Rural Hubs will accommodate 35% of the remaining need (1822)” The strict meaning of this would be that a total of 638 homes (= 35% of 1822) would be allocated to these settlements.</p>	<p>Therefore in that respect, the following are amendments are suggested: The third and fourth paragraphs could usefully refer to Policies SS4, SS5 and C1 for further guidance on allocations - (see paragraph 4.2.17 for instance).The first sentence of the fourth paragraph of Policy SS2 is reworded to read – “Service Centres and Rural Hubs will accommodate the remaining 35% (1822) of the Borough’s housing need” . The size threshold of 10 dwellings for unallocated sites should be reviewed –suggest this should be reduced to 5 dwellings in Service Centres and Rural Hubs where sufficient allocations have been identified to meet the Plan requirement for that settlement. The section entitled “Small-scale Unallocated Development” is deleted from Policy SS2 – it repeats much of what is already stated in the fourth and fifth paragraphs and later in Policy SS3.</p>	<p>The 'windfall' allowance is informed on past trends which the Council consider will be achievable, and represent a much lower rate(21 pa) than has been achieved in previous years (70 pa). As a policy setting out the overall strategy it is not considered appropriate or necessary to refer to the approaches set out in the subsequent policies SS4, SS5 and C1.It is agreed that the changes to wording relating to the rural proportion will assist with clarity.</p> <p>No evidence has been produced to indicate what a lower threshold of 5 would be appropriate for unallocated sites in Service Centres.</p> <p>Such developments are required , under SS3, to add to the sustainability or need of the village concerned and the threshold of 10 is considered appropriate as it allows for developer contributions to address this criteria.</p>	<p>Propose a change to amend the first sentence of the fourth paragraph of Policy SS2 to read – “Service Centres and Rural Hubs will accommodate the remaining 35% (1822) of the Borough’s housing need”</p> <p>Proposed to amend Policy SS3 as a ‘focussed change’ so as to delete references to 3, 5 and 10 and allow greater flexibility as needs and circumstances change over time. Control over scale would be manged by reference to compatibility with the settlement concerned.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Carl Powell	A policy minimum (at least 6125 homes and 51 hectares of employment land) is unsound without a policy maximum. It is the same as saying 'as many as possible', which conflicts fundamentally with 'sustainability' and does not allow measurement of degrees of success or failure. A percentage of an infinite number is still an infinite number.	Set upper as well as lower targets. Slightly less than the stated figures might not be failure and greatly more might not be a great success. For example, the upward and downward parameters for 'success' could be 5%: 'Provision will be made for the development of between 5820 and 6740 homes and between some 48 and 54 hectares of employment land'.	<p>The SHMA is recognised as out of date and the most up to date evidence is contained in the HEDNA 2017. The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving at a housing target for the Local Plan, but has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies.</p> <p>The Plan is intended to be positively planned and to allow flexibility to allow for changes in circumstances and it is considered that an upper limit would impede these objectives.</p> <p>No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the 'capacity' of the area is constrained but each proposal will be individually assessed which will include these considerations. It is therefore considered that adequate control of the quantities exists from these existing provisions.</p>	HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on 'focussed changes'
Carole Brown	Melton Borough Council have not been able to take full consideration of emerging Neighbourhood Plans into account due to conflicting timelines. All allocation of sites in a community should be led by the Neighbourhood Plan which follows the minimum required housing allocation from the Local Plan.	Remove all allocated sites from the Local Plan (Policy C1(A) and allow Neighbourhood Plans, when they are in place to define the locations for development in each community. Include all possible sites in the Borough that are viable and deliverable as potential sites. If no Neighbourhood Plan is in place when a planning application is made then refer to the list of potential sites that is included in the Local Plan.	The Plan would fail in its core duties to deliver the homes and jobs that the area needs, a sustainable pattern of development and deliverable housing supply obligations if it did not include specific sites of the requisite quantity. Where Neighbourhood Plans have been produced and are 'advanced' (as defined by NPPG: have reached LPA submission stage) their content has been taken into account and there is strong synergy between the content of the LP and the NP concerned.	Please refer to changes to site allocations proposed under Policies C1 and C1(A).

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Caroline Louise Stuart	<p>A housing needs survey / Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for Gaddesby is due to be carried out by Melton Borough Council in early 2017. A housing allocation cannot be proposed for Gaddesby in the absence of a housing needs survey to inform it. Attention is drawn to the following specific examples of findings of 'unsoundness' by the Planning Inspectorate, whereby up to date SHMAs were absent: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - North West Leicestershire District Council, Inspector Michael Hetherington. Plan withdrawn following exploratory meeting 25 September 2013 - East Devon District Council, Inspector Anthony Thickett, Inspector's report 03 April 2014 - Charnwood Borough Council, Inspector Kevin Ward, Examination suspended following initial hearing sessions 19-20 March 2014 		<p>The proposed housing in Gaddesby and other villages represents the proposed approach to the provision and supply of the Borough's housing requirements overall. If the HNS study for Gaddesby produces results that are no accommodated by the Local plan provisions they can be advanced by the Neighbourhood Plan or under alternative policies of the Local plan (SS3, C5 etc.).</p> <p>The SHMA is recognised as out of date and the most up to date evidence is contained in the HEDNA 2017. The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving at a housing target for the Local plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on 'focussed changes'</p>
Charnwood Borough Council	<p>Charnwood BC is pleased to note that the Melton Local Plan recognises the objectively assessed need for housing identified through the 2014 Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). This was produced jointly by the local authorities that form the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area through the Duty to Cooperate. Policy SS2 – Development Strategy reflects this with a requirement of 245 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>The spatial strategy identified in the Plan appears the most suitable, by focussing large scale development on Melton Mowbray, providing better access to existing services and is the most likely means of achieving sustainable development.</p>		<p>The SHMA is recognised as out of date and the most up to date evidence is contained in the HEDNA 2017. The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving as a t a housing target for the Local plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available.</p>	<p>HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on 'focussed changes'</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Chris Jesson, Planning & Design Group (UK) Ltd on behalf of JGP Properties Ltd	<p>The plan is unsound on the premise that the proposed settlement hierarchy no longer includes the category of 'Rural Supporter' settlements as a basis of establishing future expectations of growth and how this may be appointed across the Borough. In the earlier iteration of the Local Plan this category was included in the settlement hierarchy, with some settlements highlighted for their role in providing a small but important number of amenities, and others to highlight their distinctive spatial relationship to the main settlement of Melton Mowbray. While the proposed Local Plan spatial hierarchy suggests rural hub settlements which is welcome, the policy's lack of distinction or consistency on settlements that are close to service centres and Melton Mowbray, and applying the candidacy as a 'Rural Hub' makes the policy unsound. The Council has expressed a commitment in the policy that settlements which are within a 500m of a service centre or 2.5km of Melton Mowbray will be regarded as rural hubs. Why is it that settlements referenced in this way include Asfordby Hill, in excess of 2.5km from Melton Mowbray town centre but much closer to the town's amenities on it's edge, when others including Burton Lazars, which has an identical service and amenities score to Asfordby Hill in the Settlements Roles and Relationships Study 2016, are discounted? Burton Lazars is only 1.3km from the outer edges of Melton Mowbray and local amenities in those estates, within 2 miles of Melton Town Centre, on suitable bus routes and close to the proposed sustainable urban extension planned as part of the same Local Plan, the amenities within will be a key consideration to the future sustainability of that settlement. Following the comprehensive review in the Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study, the Local Plan now provides an up to date approach to the merits of Local Green Spaces, but the approach for Neighbourhood Plans to suggest additional sites must take into account evidence contained in the study only. It cannot, for instance, seek to identify sites that have already been justifiably de-allocated from previous designations, nor include sites that have no absolute recommendation for potential future designation in the Study. To enhance and reinforce a site does not automatically mean, in the absence of such a recommendation, that it would be a suitable candidate as a Local Green Space.</p>	<p>There needs to be consistency applied to the settlement review to commit to the distinctive relationship settlements have when they are close to service centres villages and Melton Mowbray. There also needs to be consideration of the proposed urban extension to the south of Melton Mowbray and the implications this may have upon the settlements of villages that lie in close proximity to it and the rest of Melton, to determine a robust and positively prepared approach to the hierarchy.</p> <p>Either consistency has to be applied to rural hubs to truly be accurate to the policy's expectation where they are close to their larger counterparts, or there needs to be a distinction provided for rural settlements that lie in close proximity to those areas and reflect their expected growth levels accordingly.</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st Septemebr 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The approach takes into account the proximity of Melton Mowbray and other service centres in identifying further locations for housing. The approach has been applied consistently because the villages included can demonstrate the same characteristics of key service provision and are similar in this respect, regardless of proximity to Melton or other population/service centres. Asfordby Hill is identified as a 'rural hub' under this methodology in its own right owing to facilities present (i.e 3 of the 4 key services, including a primary school). Burton Lazars does not have the same range of facilities nor is it in sufficient proximity to a service centre.</p>	None proposed

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Chris Sinton (GL Hearn) on behalf of Severn Trent Water	<p>The housing and employment requirement in SS2 (6125 homes and 51 ha of employment land over 25 years) is based on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) published in 2014. The strategy also states that outside identified settlement boundaries within the open countryside, new development will be restricted to that which is necessary and appropriate in the open countryside. This assessment is currently being updated in the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing and Employment Development Need Assessment (HEDNA) which will identify an Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) to inform the overall development targets. The housing requirement should be fully aligned with the OAN once published and should be viewed as minimum, not ceiling figure. Outside of those sites allocated through the Local Plan, draft policy SS2 also seeks to restrict development to: “10 dwellings in Service Centres; 5 dwellings in Rural Hubs; and 3 dwellings in rural settlements.” The inclusion of a development ‘cap’ does not accord with national planning policy and its aim to boost significantly the supply of housing. Indeed, each site should be judged on its own merits having regard to the prevailing planning context. Furthermore, the limit proposed does not appear to be justified by supporting evidence.</p>		<p>The SHMA is recognised as out of date and the most up to date evidence is contained in the HEDNA 2017. The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving as a housing target for the Local plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available. The allocations within the local plan fulfil the OAN requirements and provide a large margin of flexibility.</p>	<p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>Proposed to amend Policy SS3 as a ‘focussed change’ so as to delete references to 3, 5 and 10 and allow greater flexibility as needs and circumstances change over time. Control over scale would be managed by reference to compatibility with the settlement concerned.</p> <p>HEDNA and ‘towards a housing requirement for Melton’ evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on ‘focussed changes’ HEDNA and ‘towards a housing requirement for Melton’ evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on ‘focussed changes’</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Christopher Noakes	<p>Please see representations made in Chapter 4 re-appropriate split of development between Melton and rural areas.</p> <p>This Policy (as written) appears rather confusing , repetitive and possibly contradictory:</p> <p>1. It is inaccurate to state that 1822 dwellings (in Service Centres and Rural Hubs) = 35% of 'remaining need' . It is 85% Of 35% (i.e. c 80% of remaining need) as identified in para 4.2.14.</p> <p>(Probably it is intended to read that SC's and RH's will accommodate 1822 dwellings on allocated sites, supplemented by the majority of the remaining need for 322 windfall sites in the rural area.)</p> <p>2. As it currently reads, the policy implies that the 1822 dwellings assigned to SC's and RH's includes both allocations AND windfall sites, thereby resulting in a requirement of the full 322 rural windfall sites in the Rural settlements. (Probably not intended and leading to contradiction of earlier text).</p> <p>3. The reference in the policy to 'small scale development is otiose and adequately dealt with by Policy SS3.</p>	<p>To be more correct and read clearer, amend paras 4 and 5 as follows:</p> <p>"Service Centres and Rural Hubs will accommodate will accommodate 1822 dwellings on a proportional basis through allocated sites, supplemented by the majority of the remaining need for 322 windfall sites in the rural area. This will be delivered by planning positively for the development of sites allocated within and adjoining the Service Centres and Rural Hubs by 2036, and by encouraging small scale development of unallocated sites , where they enhance the sustainability of the community in accordance with policy SS3 - Sustainable Communities."</p> <p>OR - "Service Centres and Rural Hubs will accommodate approx 80% of the remaining need (1822 dwellings) on a proportional basis through allocated sites, supplemented by the majority of the remaining 5% need for 322 windfall sites in the rural area. This</p> <p>Rural Settlements will accommodate a small proportion of the Borough's housing need, to support their role in the Borough through planning positively for new homes as</p> <p>'windfall' sites within and adjoining settlements by 2036. This development will be delivered through small unallocated sites enhance the sustainability of the settlement in accordance with policy SS3 -Sustainable Communities"</p> <p>Omit paras referring to small scale development.</p>	It is agreed that revisions to wording relating to the rural proportion will assist with clarity	Amend the first sentence of the fourth paragraph of Policy SS2 is reworded to read – “Service Centres and Rural Hubs will accommodate the remaining 35% (1822) of the Borough’s housing need

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Clawson in Action	<p>Object to Policy SS2. This states that Service Centres and Rural Hubs will accommodate 35% of remaining need (1,822) on a proportional basis.</p> <p>Long Clawson has been identified as a Service Centre and if the sustainability issues raised above are completely addressed, we will support a proportionate approach.</p> <p>However, do not support the allocation of additional housing redistributed as a proportion of a deficit identified in other Service Centres and Rural Hubs. This is not justified, nor effective, because as this is a 20-year plan not all possible sites will have been identified across the Borough at the start of the plan. The plan is therefore not effective as it does not cater for future unforeseen sites and is inflexible.</p> <p>Question the lack of consideration for the Six Hills Garden Village development? This would address many of the concerns of rural Parishes and villages about over-development and showcase this nationally as a fine example of a sustainable and environmentally sound village.</p>		<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing and all villages attracting allocations display these characteristics. The apportionment of the rural allocation based upon existing size recognises that larger settlements should accommodate a greater quantity and Long Clawson is considered accordingly, both in itself and in relation larger and smaller villages. Provision is made for the delivery requirements of individual sites in Appendix 1 of the Plan, - please refer to responses to policies C1 and C1A for site specific issues.</p> <p>The review of site allocations and introduction of new sites has removed the need for 'reallocation' between villages</p> <p>The allocations within the local plan fulfil the OAN requirements and provide a large margin of flexibility. In this context the criteria based policy SS3 for unallocated provide a further level of additionality and flexibility.. These provisions apply equally to villages which do not have site availability at present equally as those which do, and as such allow development in these locations should it come forward at later stages. The Plan will also be subject to review which</p>	<p>Proposed to amend Policy SS3 as a 'focussed change' so as to delete references to 3, 5 and 10 and allow greater flexibility as needs and circumstances change over time. Control over scale would be managed by reference to compatibility with the settlement concerned.</p> <p>HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on 'focussed changes' HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on 'focussed changes'</p> <p>Revise the approach and reasoned justification to Policy SS2 to reflect the most up to date evidence on site availability and capacity, and delete the references to 'redistribution' in the associated tables. This gives rise to a new, lower, allocation for Long Clawson and other service centres.</p> <p>Please refer to responses to policies C1 and C1A for site specific issues.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
			<p>provides opportunity to incorporate additional sites, whether arising due to unforeseen need, the delivery of the spatial strategy or the emergence of new opportunities (see also policy SS6).</p> <p>Six Hills village and other large sites proposals were considered as part of the Assessing Large Scale Development Site Options (July 2015) against a series of environmental and sustainability criteria but was not selected in favour of other large sites. It is now proposed in addition to the provision of 6125 houses within the Plan but it is considered that there is no need for such additional scale of development at present (policy SS6 allows for review of this and other options should a greater need emerge or problems with delivery occur).</p>	
Colin Love	<p>On sustainability grounds alone, there is a justification for a reduction in the percentage allocated to Bottesford and a percentage higher than the 65% proposed for allocation in Melton Mowbray as the acknowledged core centre for present employment and future employment growth within Melton Borough. Whilst the first Local Plan submission was not accepted, in part because the allocation of housing development of 'only' 20% to the rural areas was considered inadequate, no evidence based justification has been given for the present intention to allocate 35% to the rural areas. Since the non-acceptance of the first Melton Plan submission, there has been a substantial increase in national concern to ensure that the delivery of 'sustainability' is applied to all new developments. A significant component of 'sustainability' is the 'travel to work' factor. Whilst the 20% figure of development in rural areas might, with some justification, be considered too low a percentage, the 'sustainability' of 35% can similarly be considered too high if this would involve a substantial number of additional 'travel to work' journey miles, most probably by car, to an urban centre of employment. This can be demonstrated by the example of Bottesford - a village that is acknowledged as being primarily a commuter village and the furthest Service Centre from Melton. The proposed 'proportionate' allocation to Bottesford of the rural 35% would far</p>		<p>The 'Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015' assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough's housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance. This evidence is considered to remain valid</p> <p>Bottesford's population represents approximately 7% of the Borough's total, and the plan proposes it accommodates just under 7% of the Borough's growth requirements. Bottesford has a wide range of services and good transport links and is regarded as a highly sustainable location for housing development in its own right. evidence within the HEDNA 2017 shows that part of the HMA demand is generated by urban centres on the north and east of the HMA itself and Bottesford has a stronger</p>	<p>HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on 'focussed changes' HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on 'focussed changes'.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>outnumber the local housing needs as evidenced by the Midland Rural Housing Needs assessment (commissioned by MBC) and consequently add substantially to the 'travel to work' mileage and hence contribute to 'unsustainability'.</p>		<p>relationship with such centres than it does with Melton Mowbray. It is considered that 'migrating' greater proportion of development to Melton would be less sustainable in terms of meeting this aspect of overall need.</p> <p>The revised site allocation work propose a reduced allocation for Bottesford and the deletion of 'redistribution' from other locations.</p>	<p>Revise the approach and reasoned justification to Policy SS2 to reflect the most up to date evidence on site availability and capacity, and delete the references to 'redistribution' in the associated tables. This gives rise to a new, lower, allocation for Bottesford and other service centres.</p> <p>Please refer to responses to policies C1 and C1A for site specific issues.</p>
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Asfordby Parish Council)	<p>Housing Provision</p> <p>Policy SS2 fails to identify the housing provision for individual settlements and therefore fails to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ensure that the Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing; and 2. fails to provide a sound basis for the preparation of neighbourhood plans. <p>Windfall</p> <p>The Local Plan should identify a supply of specific, deliverable/developable sites to meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing. Instead, the Local Plan relies on the delivery of windfall sites throughout the plan period to help meet objectively assessed needs even though there is no compelling</p>	<p>Policy SS2 of the Melton Local Plan (Publication version) should be modified to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set out a suitable housing provision for individual settlements. In the case of Asfordby, this should reflect the housing policies of the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan; 2. There should be no allowance for windfall sites. Instead a supply of specific, deliverable/developable sites to meet the full, objectively assessed needs should be identified; 3. Allow for the definition of Village Envelopes to reflect the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan; and 4. Delete the 'Neighbourhood Plans' section. 	<p>The specific provisions for each are set out in chapter 4 and Policy C1 in particular and are explained in the narrative following Policy SS2 . It is not considered that they need to be repeated (or relocated) into Policy SS2 itself. This includes Asfordby and Asfordby Hill.</p> <p>The most up to date evidence is contained in the HEDNA 2017. The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving at a housing target for the Local Plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence of housing need that is available. The allocations within the local plan fulfill the OAN</p>	<p>None proposed.</p> <p>HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on 'focussed changes' HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on 'focussed changes'.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area nor will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. It is important to note that the National Planning Policy Framework definition of ‘windfall’ states ‘they normally comprise previously-developed sites that have unexpectedly become available’. The ‘windfall’ sites allowed for by the Draft Melton Local Plan are essentially greenfield sites.</p> <p>Open Countryside</p> <p>Policy SS2 defines open countryside as ‘outside the settlements identified as Service Centres, and those villages identified Rural Hubs and Rural Settlements’ (interestingly it does not include land outside Melton Mowbray). In the Open Countryside ‘new development will be restricted to that which is necessary and appropriate in the open countryside’. This is in conflict with Policy SS3 which allows unallocated housing development on the edge of settlements.</p> <p>Village Envelopes</p> <p>The Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan makes provision for at least 148 dwellings over the period to 2036. Taking account of houses built since 2011 and commitments this equates to 350 dwellings over the period 2011-2036. This exceeds the Draft Melton Local Plan’s requirement for the parish (Asfordby and Asfordby Hill).</p> <p>Policy SS2 makes no provision for the identification of Village Envelopes. Village Envelopes provide clear, defensible boundaries around settlements within which development will normally be confined. They have been used as a planning policy tool in Melton Borough for a considerable time and are a well understood planning tool for managing development.</p> <p>Updated Village envelopes have been designated in connection with the preparation of the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan. They distinguish between areas of development and development potential and areas of</p>		<p>requirements and provide a large margin of flexibility. The 'windfall' allowance is informed on past trends which the Council consider will be achievable, and represent a much lower rate(21 pa) than has been achieved in previous years (70 pa) as set out in the Five Year Land Supply and Housing Trajectory Position (2nd November 2016) (page 11). Inclusion of such an allowance is considered to meet the circumstances set out in the NPPF. The Policy describes opportunities for small scale and windfall development to be 'within and adjacent' to existing settlements whilst describing the countryside as 'outside' such settlements. It is considered such wording provides sufficient distinction and is not in conflict. The policy is considered to allow for 'village envelopes' (or similar) where they are preferred by Neighborhood Plans and such choices would not be regarded as incompatible. Whilst understood as a clear planning tool, village envelopes are not considered appropriate for the Local plan due to the need to allow for flexibility and adaption to rapidly changing circumstances. The advantages listed are considered to be achievable through the criteria for development within and adjoining villages set out in Policy SS3 and elsewhere in the Plan</p> <p>. The inclusion of the paragraph supporting neighbourhood plans is in recognition of their standing as equal to the Local plan in future decision making and that their content may differ from the Local Plan but of the same 'standing' in law nevertheless.</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>restraint, such as countryside. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework the up-to-date Village Envelopes provide:</p> <p>a) Certainty: with a boundary shown on the Neighbourhood Plan Policies Map, Limits to Development make it clear what will or will not be permitted and where. They provide a transparent and consistent approach to development control decisions;</p> <p>b) A managed approach to housing growth;</p> <p>c) Protection for the countryside from ribbon development and the coalescence of settlements. The latter is particularly important for the villages of Asfordby parish, where the individual identity of settlements is highly valued but fragile;</p> <p>d) Reduces the hope of obtaining planning consent for development outside Village Envelopes with resulting impact on land values. Reduced 'hope value' facilitates the release of land for rural exception site affordable housing schemes and the provision of community facilities.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans</p> <p>The local planning authority has a statutory role to play in supporting neighbourhood planning. There is no need for this section of Policy SS2.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Belvoir Estate)	<p>Housing Provision</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that the Local Plan should be based on adequate, up to date and relevant evidence (para 158) in terms of housing this is a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (para 159). The Local Plan should be based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing (OAHN) (para 182) based on evidence (para 47) with emphasis on joint working on cross boundary issues especially when housing needs cannot be wholly met within individual Local Planning Authority (LPA) areas (para 178 – 181). The 2014 SHMA is out of date which means that there is no clear evidence on an up to date OAHN, where housing needs will be met, if unmet needs arise or the role of individual LPAs in meeting any unmet needs. As the Melton Local Plan is based on these uncertainties it must be unsound because it cannot be positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy. Whilst there are benefits for development management purposes of having an adopted Plan these benefits should not outweigh the requirements for a sound Plan based on up to date evidence.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that the Leicester & Leicestershire HMA authorities seem unable to co-ordinate the production of supporting evidence and Local Plan preparation in a timely manner. The up to date Housing & Employment Needs Assessment (HEDNA) remains unpublished even though it is believed that this work has been completed. As a commissioning authority of the new HENDA the Council must know the OAHN figures set out in the yet to be published report and whether the figure for Melton is above or below the proposed housing requirement of 6,125 dwellings for the period 2011-2036 set out in Policy SS2.</p> <p>Memorandum of Understanding</p>	<p>The housing land requirements calculations on which Policy SS2 is based should be modified to reflect the up to date Housing and Employment Needs Assessment (HEDNA) being prepared by the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA authorities and an updated Memorandum of Understanding between the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities.</p> <p>There should be no allowance for windfall sites. Instead a supply of specific, deliverable/developable sites to meet the full, objectively assessed needs should be identified.</p>	<p>The SHMA is recognised as out of date and the most up to date evidence is contained in the HEDNA 2017. The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving at a housing target for the Local plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available.</p> <p>The allocations within the local plan fulfil the OAN requirements and provide a margin of flexibility. It is agreed that the specification of a numerical limit may be inflexible and limit the ability to respond to specific circumstances, especially bearing in mind the length of the Plan to 2036.</p> <p>The HMA authorities have agreed a revised Joint Statement of Co-operation Relating to Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (January 2017) which sets out its shared approach to the redistribution of any unmet need arising from the OAN identified in HEDNA via the Strategic Growth Plan process whilst also recognising that individual LPA's will need to proceed in advance of this with the production of their respective Local Plans. The provisions within the Melton LP provide flexibility to accommodate a significant amount of unmet need but in addition. Policy SS6 provided trigger points for review if there is more arising, setting out the process by which it will consider options to accommodate it.</p> <p>The 'windfall' allowance is informed on past trends which the Council consider will be achievable, and represent a much lower</p>	<p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on 'focussed changes' HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on 'focussed changes'.</p> <p>Proposed to amend Policy SS3 as a 'focussed change' so as to delete references to 3, 5 and 10 and allow greater flexibility as needs and circumstances change over time. Control over scale would be managed by reference to compatibility with the settlement concerned.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>All the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities have signed up to a Memorandum of Understanding which endorses figures for OAN covering 2011 to 2028 to correspond with the period covered by the Core Strategy. These are derived from the annual figures for 2011 to 2031 set out in the 2014 SHMA. Based on Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAAs), the Memorandum of Understanding also confirms that each authority considers that it can meet the upper figure for identified needs within its own area to 2028. However, the Memorandum of Understanding does not extend to 2036, the plan period for the Melton Local Plan. There is no evidence that housing needs to 2036 can be wholly met within individual Local Planning Authority (LPA) areas and therefore if unmet needs do arise whether Melton Borough should play a role in meeting those unmet needs.</p> <p>Windfall</p> <p>The Local Plan should identify a supply of specific, deliverable/developable sites to meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing. Instead, the Local Plan relies on the delivery of windfall sites throughout the plan period to help meet objectively assessed needs even though there is no compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area nor will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. It is important to note that the National Planning Policy Framework definition of ‘windfall’ states ‘they normally comprise previously-developed sites that have unexpectedly become available’. The ‘windfall’ sites allowed for by the Draft Melton Local Plan are essentially greenfield sites.</p>		<p>rate(21 pa) than has been achieved in previous years (70 pa) as set out in the Five Year Land Supply and Housing Trajectory Position (2nd November 2016) (page 11). Inclusion of such an allowance is considered to meet the circumstances set out in the NPPF</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Earl of Rutland and Dr Fleming's Hospital Trust)	<p>Housing Provision</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that the Local Plan should be based on adequate, up to date and relevant evidence (para 158) in terms of housing this is a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (para 159). The Local Plan should be based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing (OAHN) (para 182) based on evidence (para 47) with emphasis on joint working on cross boundary issues especially when housing needs cannot be wholly met within individual Local Planning Authority (LPA) areas (para 178 – 181). The 2014 SHMA is out of date which means that there is no clear evidence on an up to date OAHN, where housing needs will be met, if unmet needs arise or the role of individual LPAs in meeting any unmet needs. As the Melton Local Plan is based on these uncertainties it must be unsound because it cannot be positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy. Whilst there are benefits for development management purposes of having an adopted Plan these benefits should not outweigh the requirements for a sound Plan based on up to date evidence.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that the Leicester & Leicestershire HMA authorities seem unable to co-ordinate the production of supporting evidence and Local Plan preparation in a timely manner. The up to date Housing & Employment Needs Assessment (HEDNA) remains unpublished even though it is believed that this work has been completed. As a commissioning authority of the new HENDNA the Council must know the OAHN figures set out in the yet to be published report and whether the figure for Melton is above or below the proposed housing requirement of 6,125 dwellings for the period 2011-2036 set out in Policy SS2.</p> <p>Memorandum of Understanding</p> <p>All the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities have signed up to a Memorandum of Understanding which endorses</p>	<p>The housing land requirements calculations on which Policy SS2 is based should be modified to reflect the up to date Housing and Employment Needs Assessment (HEDNA) being prepared by the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA authorities and an updated Memorandum of Understanding between the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities.</p> <p>There should be no allowance for windfall sites. Instead a supply of specific, deliverable/developable sites to meet the full, objectively assessed needs should be identified.</p>	<p>The SHMA is recognised as out of date and the most up to date evidence is contained in the HEDNA 2017. The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving at a housing target for the Local plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available. The allocations within the local plan fulfil the OAN requirements and provide a large margin of flexibility.</p> <p>Policy SS3 provides a further level of additionality and flexibility.</p> <p>The HMA authorities have agreed a revised Joint Statement of Co-operation Relating to Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (January 2017) which sets out its shared approach to the redistribution of any unmet need arising from the OAN identified in HEDNA via the Strategic Growth Plan process whilst also recognising that individual LPA's will need to proceed in advance of this with the production of their respective Local Plans. The provisions within the Melton LP provide flexibility to accommodate a significant amount of unmet need but in addition. Policy SS6 provided trigger points for review if there is more arising, setting out the process by which it will consider options to accommodate it. The 'windfall' allowance is informed on past trends which the Council consider will be achievable, and represent a much lower rate(21 pa) than has been achieved in previous years (70 pa) as set out in the Five Year Land Supply and Housing Trajectory Position (2nd November 2016) (page 11). Inclusion of such an allowance is considered to meet the circumstances set out in the NPPF</p>	<p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>HEDNA and 'Towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on 'focussed changes' HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on 'focussed changes'.</p> <p>MBC propose to commit to the Memorandum of Understanding relating to HEDNA..</p> <p>Proposed to amend Policy SS3 as a 'focussed change' so as to delete references to 3, 5 and 10 and allow greater flexibility as needs and circumstances change over time. Control over scale would be managed by reference to compatibility with the settlement concerned.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>figures for OAN covering 2011 to 2028 to correspond with the period covered by the Core Strategy. These are derived from the annual figures for 2011 to 2031 set out in the 2014 SHMA. Based on Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAAs), the Memorandum of Understanding also confirms that each authority considers that it can meet the upper figure for identified needs within its own area to 2028. However, the Memorandum of Understanding does not extend to 2036, the plan period for the Melton Local Plan. There is no evidence that housing needs to 2036 can be wholly met within individual Local Planning Authority (LPA) areas and therefore if unmet needs do arise whether Melton Borough should play a role in meeting those unmet needs.</p> <p>Windfall</p> <p>The Local Plan should identify a supply of specific, deliverable/developable sites to meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing. Instead, the Local Plan relies on the delivery of windfall sites throughout the plan period to help meet objectively assessed needs even though there is no compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area nor will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. It is important to note that the National Planning Policy Framework definition of ‘windfall’ states ‘they normally comprise previously-developed sites that have unexpectedly become available’. The ‘windfall’ sites allowed for by the Draft Melton Local Plan are essentially greenfield sites.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Connolly Land and Developments (North Midlands) Ltd	<p>Connolly Land and Developments have legal control over land off Main Road, Nether Broughton LE14 3EU via an Option Agreement. In particular, the objection is to Policy SS2 (and SS3). The settlement hierarchy has been revised since the Emerging Option stage (supported in January 2016). It has been simplified from 5 tiers to 4 tiers and the criteria have been altered. Some settlements which were originally considered 'rural supporters' (considered suitable for up to 5 dwellings outside of those sites allocated through the local plan) have been reclassified as 'rural settlements' (considered suitable for up to 3 dwellings outside of those sites allocated through the local plan). For example, Nether Broughton was originally identified as a rural supporter, and given an overall score of 15 in the 'Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities' Report (SRROR) April 2015. The same report confirmed that Nether Broughton has direct bus routes to neighbouring villages and cities and local services including a village hall, public house, garage, place of worship, and employment sites. However, in the revised settlement hierarchy, Nether Broughton is identified as a 'rural settlement' (now the bottom tier of the settlement hierarchy). The simplification of the criteria used to classify settlements to just 4 'essential criteria' (whether the settlement has a primary school, access to employment opportunities, fast broadband and a community building) disregards many of the sustainability credentials of Nether Broughton and other settlements, including Plungar, (scored 16) and Kirby Bellars (scored 15) in the SRROR. It seems perverse that settlements which originally scored lower in the SRROR have remained within the same tier (now called rural hubs) and considered suitable for up to 5 dwellings, for example Great Dalby (scored 12), Thorpe Arnold (scored 11), and Ab Kettleby (scored 11). The new methodology is over simplified and is not an accurate reflection of the Borough's rural settlements and the suitability to take housing development. This unnecessary restriction of development in some rural settlements may lead to the Council not delivering its housing OAN. The number of settlements in the penultimate tier of the settlement hierarchy (in which up to 5 dwellings may be permitted) has been reduced from 18 to 7 and this may jeopardise the ability of the Council to meet and maintain its 5 year housing land supply obligations - particularly given the</p>	<p>Return to the previous settlement hierarchy and classification of settlements in the Borough, which is based on the thorough and evidence based assessment of the sustainability of the Borough' settlement in the Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report(SRROR) 2015.</p> <p>Alternatively, in recognition of the valuable contribution that rural settlements can make to overall housing provision in the District, and reflecting advice set out in paragraph 55 of the NPPF, the classification requirements should be widened (as set out in paragraph 4.2.5. of the Pre Submission Draft).</p> <p>In particular, there should be a lower threshold for 'rural hubs', achieved by removing the requirement for rural hubs to contain a primary school (a requirement that is considered overly onerous and contrary to paragraph 55 of the NPPF).</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites.. The Five Year Land Supply and Housing Trajectory Position (2nd November 2016) indicates that supply is adequate based on the approach taken and no evidence has been produced offering a different outcome.</p>	<p>Proposed to amend Policy SS3 as a 'focussed change' so as to delete references to 3, 5 and 10 and allow greater flexibility as needs and circumstances change over time. Control over scale would be managed by reference to compatibility with the settlement concerned.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Council's evident and longstanding problems in this regard to date. The revised spatial strategy and housing distribution set out in draft Policies SS2 and SS3 not only underestimates the importance of rural housing development to overall housing provision, and the ability of smaller settlements to accommodate additional (small scale) housing, but also disadvantages these settlements by preventing housing development which would help enhance or maintain the rural economy and the vitality of these rural communities in line with paragraph 55 of NPPF. In this connection, the SRROR highlights that development in 'rural supporters' could help make these settlements more self-sustaining and encourage more services (Table 6). In the case of Nether Broughton, the village now benefits from one of the fastest broadband speeds in the country, and in granting planning permission for up to 20 dwellings at land of Hecadeck Lane, Nether Broughton (LPA ref: 15/01019/out), the Council clearly considers the settlement sufficiently sustainable to accommodate much more than the 3 dwellings threshold suggested in this latest Draft Melton Local Plan.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Crofts Developments	<p>Wholly support and endorse the classification of Harby as a Service Centre, but seek to increase the percentage level of growth intended for the Service Centres/Rural Hubs, re-classify the largest four Service Centres to recognise their importance in the Borough and re-evaluate the distribution of development between centres. The overall level of housing and employment growth to be planned for within Melton Borough to 2036 is under review as part of the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment for Leicester and Leicestershire. Until the results of this exercise are published, and the Councils (particularly Leicester City) have demonstrated and agreed to accommodate their needs within their administrative area, it is not possible to comment on whether the 6,125 homes proposed for the plan period is robust.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Policy SS2 identifies that provision will be made for at least 6,125 homes between 2011 and 2036, and also references that at least 3,980 of these homes are to be built in the Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area (MMUA). However, this flexible approach is not reflected throughout the policy with reference to a proposed rigid percentage of growth to be allocated to MMUA (65%) and the Service Centres and Rural Hubs (SCRHs) (35%) and the reference to “remaining need (1,822) on a proportionate basis” in relation to the specific allocation for SCRHs. Paragraph 182 of the NPPF states that LPA’s should be demonstrating synergy between each aspect of the policy approach and, above all, consistency with the overarching presumption in favour of sustainable development identified (in Policy SS1). To propose such a rigid percentage breakdown and remaining need figure of 1,822 for the SCRHs is contradictory to the flexibility provided in the phrase “at least” when referring to the overall provision of homes and the number that will be directed to the MMUA. This is not in accordance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF and such inflexibility in their approach to development in the SCRHs does not provide the “sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change”. The LPA should provide more flexibility for development to be delivered across the Borough if required. It is not disputed that most development should be directed to the MMUA using phraseology such as “at least” but this approach also needs to be reflected throughout the policy. “At least” should also be noted for the housing target for the SCRHs and the references to percentage growth should equally</p>	<p>The SCRHs should be allocated a larger proportion of dwellings in order to support business development in the rural areas. This would wholly accord with the strategic housing objective of the PSD in developing a housing stock to provide for the future aspirations for the local economy.</p> <p>The distribution of housing should be allocated based on levels of sustainability and the capacity of SCRHs to accommodate further development.</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing and all villages attracting allocations display these characteristics. The apportionment of the rural allocation based upon exiting size recognises that larger settlements should accommodate a greater quantity and Harby is treated accordingly, both in itself and in relation larger and smaller villages. The SHMA is recognised as out of date and the most up to date evidence is contained in the HEDNA 2017. The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving at a housing target for the Local plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available. The identification of 65% in the MMUA and 35% in the rural area is derivative of the need for the quantum required to deliver the economic strategy envisaged for the Borough centring upon Melton Mowbray and the plan's overall vision, priorities and objectives set out in Chapter 3. However it is agreed that the policy is unduly prescriptive in terms of the expression of this balance and it is recommended that the wording is amended to increase flexibility.</p>	<p>The word 'approximately' to be inserted into Policy SS2 prior to thje citation of "65%" and "35%". Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>HEDNA and ‘Towards a housing requirement for Melton’ evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on ‘focussed changes’ HEDNA and ‘towards a housing requirement for Melton’ evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on ‘focussed changes’.</p> <p>MBC propose to commit to the Memorandum of Understanding relating to HEDNA..</p> <p>Proposed to amend Policy SS3 as a ‘focussed change’ so as to delete references to 3, 5 and 10 and allow greater flexibility as needs and circumstances change over time. Control over scale would be managed by reference to compatibility with the settlement concerned.</p> <p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites to produce a ‘better fit’ between sites in Service centres and Rural Hubs and a margin of flexibility circa 15% The effect of this is to remove the need for redistribution between villages.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>reflect this approach by stating “circa 65% and 35%” rather than a definitive split. The SCRHS should be allocated more growth in any event. The NPPF paragraph 55 states, that “to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities”. The Planning Practice Guidance provides further guidance on this issue, stating: “A thriving rural community in a living, working countryside depends, in part, on retaining local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of these local facilities” (Rural Housing: Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20140306). Rural housing is therefore best directed to settlements where it can help sustain and enhance facilities and services without complete restriction to lower order settlements. The Council should consider redirecting rural growth to the more sustainable rural settlements, where it can be demonstrated that growth can be sustainably accommodated. There are various references in section 2.3 of the PSD to the importance of supporting business development in rural areas. Specifically paragraphs 2.3.1 and 2.3.3 highlight the importance of business start ups in rural parts of the Borough where there is a growing trend for home working. It is also importantly acknowledged in paragraph 4.2.3 that a positive approach will be taken to the rural economy and states that, “Plan policies should support the long term sustainability of the Boroughs villages, building on and furthering the attractiveness of the Borough for homeworking and small business start-ups...” Providing a higher proportion of homes in the SCRHS will provide the support needed to allow this sector to further expand and secure the long term sustainability of these businesses. . It is acknowledged that this is because the approach to development has been based on settlement size and population numbers rather than on sustainability credentials and land availability. The current approach is flawed as it does not allow for higher levels of development in the most appropriate and sustainable locations and is not compliant with paragraph 182 of the NPPF. A review of the SRRR identifies that some villages are substantially less sustainable than others, yet they have been allocated relatively high numbers of dwellings due to higher population levels. This is especially evident</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>in SCRHs such as Wymondham, Croxton Kerrial and Asfordby Hill which are to receive 6.1%, 5.1% and 5.7% of proposed development respectively but only fulfil 6, 7 and 8 of the 43 categories of the SRRR respectively when assessing the sustainability of each village. In relation to capacity to accommodate further development, it is noted that the tables at Policy C1 (A) of the PSD identify a capacity of 405 dwellings in Bottesford but it is proposed to allocate 427 dwellings at this location. Again, in the case of Wymondham there is capacity for 63 dwellings but it is proposed to allocate 68 dwellings to this village. Whilst settlements such Harby have a capacity to accommodate 115 dwellings but it is proposed to allocate a mere 99 dwellings to this centre. This approach to the distribution of housing is clearly flawed and could lead to the plan being found unsound (NPPF paragraph 182). This means that Plans should be deliverable over the plan period, and in accordance with NPPF paragraph 47, need to identify a supply of deliverable and developable sites for housing. Overestimating housing number and deliverable or developable sites means the Local Plan is in danger of being considered unsound. Fundamentally, this approach will lead to issues when dwellings are delivered as villages could become akin to housing estates with unsustainable patterns of travel to other villages for services and facilities rather than being self sufficient villages in their own right. In addition, allocating more development to villages with less land capacity could lead to a shortfall in development, especially if developers seek to provide low density schemes on those allocated sites to assimilate with the character of surroundings.</p>			
David Adams	<p>Worth revisiting the inspector's letter to MBC (in relation to the Melton Core Strategy DPD Examination). The inspector felt there was no evidence to support the proposal of an 80%:20% apportionment between the town of Melton Mowbray and other rural centres/sustainable villages, meaning that the split was weighted too highly towards the town. In council meetings this split has been discussed and 60%:40% debated and rejected in favour of 65%:35%. Other than discussion at council meetings (attended by a majority living outside the town of Melton Mowbray) there has been discussion at reference groups established to take the views of residents which seem to have more attending from outside the town compared to those living in the</p>		<p>The 'Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015' assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough's housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance. This evidence is considered to remain valid.</p>	<p>Proposed to amend Policy SS3 as a 'focussed change' so as to delete references to 3, 5 and 10 and allow greater flexibility as needs and circumstances change over time. Control over scale would be managed by reference to compatibility with the settlement concerned.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>town. I am not sure that this can be considered as evidence supporting the split and the split is no more sound than the previous split outlined in the core strategy for exactly the same reasons.</p> <p>There was concern from the inspector that the higher proportion of new homes being built were not only in the town but that they were compressed into a SUE. The local Plan reduces the proportion in the town but the total housing delivery over the term of the plan is higher so the relevance on delivery is unaltered. The current proposals suggest two SUEs albeit that each are of a quantum in excess of that initially proposed for the single SUE in the core strategy. The inspector was concerned that there was a significant risk that delivery of the strategy could be jeopardised, in the event, for whatever reason, the SUE cannot be delivered or delivery is delayed. The same dilemma exists within the local plan document capable of being jeopardised by failure of either SUE.</p> <p>The Northern SUE envisaged by the core strategy was believed by the inspector to be not sustainable as it had unacceptable impact on the landscape, agricultural land and biodiversity. Nothing has changed to improve these matters and the proposal is still to have a northern SUE (now called a Northern Sustainable Neighbourhood) in a similar location but of greater quantum as well as something similar in the south.</p> <p>The inspector had many issues with traffic and indicated that to generate any meaningful traffic mitigation there needs to be a half or three quarters bypass option. The local plan has no bypass it just alludes to a couple of developer funded roads running across the outer edges of the proposed SUEs. MBC hopes to have central government fund a link between these roads but such funding is not potentially available until at least 5 years into the period of the local plan and at a time after the next general election thus enhancing the uncertainty of delivery. The word bypass is not suggested in the local plan but instead the thought is to have sections of a lesser quality distributor road. The local plan fails therefore to achieve the levels of mitigation which the inspector thought necessary and as such the plan is not sound as it is not sustainable.</p>		<p>The Plan proposes 2 'SUE's and a range of alternative sites and some 1900 houses outside Melton Mowbray, and a flexible approach to accommodating additional through Policy SS3 , which it proposed to make more responsive.</p> <p>The north Sustainable Neighbourhood includes a range of policies to protect ecological and other interests and requires the provision of a distributor road as part of the wider Transport Strategy in order to alleviate traffic concerns. This links to provisions in Chapter 8 regarding the timing of its delivery and the clear indication that it will be a '3/4 option' as suggested.</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>The inspector also had issues with the location of housing in the strategy being in different areas to the proposed employment growth areas. This time the latter is focussed to the west and south with most housing in the north and south. The plan makes it clear that there was no consideration whatsoever of housing in the west although if the plan fails it might be considered. Some of the land allocated as employment land in the south has been marketed as such for some time without any apparent success and that land is now being used for residential development. There does not appear to be any evidence of employment growth by new business being established or relocated to the town. The proposals seem to be justified by supply and demand arguments i.e. increasing the population by building more homes increases the labour supply and apparently the demand will appear. Not sure that one can call those hypotheses evidence or anything remotely similar. The arguments of course improve with improved road infrastructure but that is only on the wish list and not included as part of the delivery.</p> <p>In his final comment the inspector stated the obvious i.e. MBC would need to review and improve/enhance the evidence base with appropriate updating. Against that background I am at a loss to understand why so much of the supporting information used in the core strategy is used again. Particularly as it refers regularly to periods which do not coincide with the plan period referring to housing numbers which are those being considered previously and not those contemplated by the plan. It cannot be relied on as supporting evidence as it leads to the plan being unjustified and unsound.</p>			
David Haston obo Richard D. Chandler	<p>The identification of Long Clawson as a Service Centre is appropriate and properly reflects the level and range of services and facilities within the settlement.</p> <p>The principle of site allocations within Long Clawson and other Service Centre settlements is also supported.</p> <p>The methodology used by the Council in arriving at the number of dwellings proposed for Long Clawson is noted.</p>		Noted	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites to produce a 'better fit' between sites in Service centres and Rural Hubs and a margin of flexibility circa 15% The effect of this is to remove the need for redistribution between

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
				villages.
David Smith	<p>The allocation of large housing numbers to Somerby is illogical, inconsistent ,unfair and unsustainable. The existing high street cannot cope with current traffic let alone from approx. 70 further houses. Traffic will also affect the surrounding villages as all the occupants will have to rely on cars for work /shopping/leisure/post 11 education.</p> <p>Somerby does not fulfill the criteria of Policy IN1 regarding Transport & Strategic Infrastructure. SOM 2 is not located where travel can be minimized. There are no realistic local employment opportunities. The village is a commuter village with the minimum distance travelled is 7 miles for those working in either Oakham or Melton. SOM 2 will unacceptably impact on the safety and movement through the village and such impacts cannot be mitigated. It will not achieve a modal shift away from private car in accordance with policy SS4. Under NPPF there has not been a proper Transport Assessment to determine “what measures will need to be taken to deal with the anticipated transport impacts of the development”. This site will not promote sustainable modes of transport in accordance with NPPF but simply result in based on an average 1.77 cars per household) a further 74 cars in the village. It will not comply with NPPF as the increase in cars will not “support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate”. The local roads are C class and unsuited to further increases in volumes of traffic.</p> <p>There is no direct bus service to Leicester or Loughborough or Nottingham. Connectivity to those cities cannot be easily improved. A bus journey to Leicester will take two hours involve two buses and yet is only 17 miles away! Increasing the population of Somerby will simply increase the use of cars and thereby increase traffic congestion in Melton Mowbray and this will not achieve one of the key strategic objectives of the local plan.</p> <p>The existing public bus service (and no doubt subsidised service) is rarely used for a reason- it is not practical. The two hour service with no service in the evenings or Sundays or Public Holidays will not assist sustainability. People prefer using a car due to the convenience and</p>	<p>Ref: SOM 2, It would be far better to build on brownfield site such as Melton Airfield , where better transport, educational access could be planned and work opportunities exist ,this should be basis of your plan not shoehorning houses into many villages that don’t have the facilities or transport .It could even be developed in conjunction with the large southern extension to Melton and apply some joined up thinking instead of this scattergun approach of houses in villages with limited facilities and poor transport networks increasing g reliance on the car ,its sheer madness come on ,have some common sense.</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. Somerby is correctly identified as a service centre owing to the presence of key services identified. The comments relating to the specific sites are addressed in comments relating to Chapter 5 (policies C1 and C1A).</p> <p>The allocation to Somerby is approx 1% of the total and does not significantly detract from the overall strategy of focussing development (65%) in Melton Mowbray to assist with the delivery of more sustainable patterns of development and carbon reduction from travel needs. It is a small proportion and quantity commensurate with the limited facilities and connectivity of Somerby but will however support various objectives of the Plan such as supporting local services and providing housing choice, accommodating local needs etc. Melton Airfield and other large sites proposals were considered as part of the Assessing Large Scale Development Site Options (July 2015) against a series of environmental and sustainability criteria but was not selected in favour of other large sites that performed better. The smaller villages listed - including those within Somerby Parish - have weaker</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites to produce a ‘better fit’ between sites in Service centres and Rural Hubs and a margin of flexibility circa 15% The effect of this is to remove the need for redistribution between villages. This reduces the allocation to Somerby.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>speed of transport it provides. The local plan assumes the bus service provides a viable alternative but it does not. Increasing the population of Somerby and thereby increasing car journeys by development of SOM 2 MBC/23/16 will only increase carbon emissions and pollution.</p> <p>In the local plan 7.16.6 the aim is to reduce carbon emissions and notes “This emphasizes the importance of spatial strategy which concentrates growth around Melton Mowbray where existing sustainable transport infrastructure can be utilized” however such rural development is completely contrary to such an objective. The site SOM 2 will fail Leicestershire Local Transport Plan (LTP3) as it will not reduce the carbon footprint of Leicestershire.</p> <p>The draft local plan sustainability analysis of SOM 2 notes employment opportunities at John O’Gaunt or Burrough Court and yet the likelihood of any of the prospective resident finding employment at this site is virtually zero. There are businesses, which are moving out of this site as it is such a remote location! The consequence is the majority of employed residents will be commuters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site allocations in the rural area within Service Centres and Rural Hubs based on the basis of the existing settlement is neither fair nor reasonable. Pre-submission Draft Plan 4.2.15 • I do not consider it “fair” (the word used in the local plan for the distribution of sites) the following do not have any allocated sites:- Twford ; Burrough on the Hill ; Harston ; Ashby Folville; Kn; Little Daly; Nether Brou; Leesthore; Kirby B; Picwell; Thorpe Sate; Sproxton; Freeby; Garthorpe; Wartnaby; Buckminster; Branston; Grimston Eaton; Plungar; Scalford ; Barkestone; Redmile; Eastwell; Coston; Brentingby; Stonesby; Saltby; Holwell; Saxelby; Cold Overton; Knossington. It is not understood how villages such as Twyford, a village far more sustainable community on the spectrum of the NPPF, is in the same category as Little Dalby or Leesthorpe. The analysis of MBC is too binary and 		<p>sustainability 'credentials' and have not been allocated housing sites accordingly, though modest growth is encouraged under the criteria based policies set out in Policy SS3. Great Dalby is identified as a Rural Hub and has received san allocation accordingly.</p> <p>The LEA has advised that the school in Somerby is capable of expansion to the level required to meet the proposed allocations in Somerby and have actively pursued a solution to this issue.</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>fundamentally flawed. Policy SS3 works well for villages with little amenity or housing but not for the larger communities outside the service centres/ rural hubs.</p> <p>Within the Parish of Somerby it seems unreasonable to simply look towards Somerby itself for the provision of the sites. Whilst the other villages in the Parish have no greater ability to accept large sites than Somerby they can nevertheless shoulder part of the housing need. Further housing in those other villages will assist those villages becoming sustainable.</p> <p>Taking Great Dalby as an example it has a primary school, a church, is closer to Melton Mowbray than Somerby, a public House, community rooms, a bus service and is on an better road network and yet it is not allocated any dwellings. For example there is a 4 acre site off Burdetts Close in Great Dalby which is a prime development opportunity and already has a road hammerhead access installed. I do not see why such land is not designated as having potential for development. To simply ignore such sites, as the owner has not come forward to sell at this moment when the plan lasts for another 20 years is wrong. Similar comments may be applied to the Great Dalby Airfield site.</p> <p>Arguments may be made for many of the above villages such as Nether Broughton with a population greater than Somerby and closer to main road networks, or Twyford, which is on two bus routes and where the parents have a greater choice of schools such as Gaddesby, Great Dalby or Somerby. It would be more equitable for such villages to accept their fair share of dwellings rather than the burden being placed on a selected few villages. It is a policy purely based on the opportunistic desire by a few landowners, who in 2016 i.e. in a moment in time, wish to develop their land. This cannot be described as planned or considered but simply a policy based on the randomness of availability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Somerby School does not have any off road car parking or its own green space and is totally unsuitable for further development. The structure is a listed building and will not lend itself to further alteration. It is not easily adaptable for modern teaching methods including the on- 			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>going IT requirements. Furthermore the design, running costs, fabric and structure are not carbon efficient (costing an excessive amount to heat) are hardly suitable for the requirements of a modern school. The increased traffic as a consequence of SOM 2 MBC /023/16 and an increased school in terms of pupil numbers will mean additional hazard for those drivers exiting onto High Street from Manor Lane, Church Lane and Chapel Lane, Mill Lane and the Field not to mention harzadous for pedestrians given the narrow footpaths for children and parents walking to school.</p> <p>The draft local plan acknowledges the increasing ageing population (3.2.1DLP page 18) and the need for stock of housing to meet the need of an aging population. Sites such as SOM 2 in Somerby will not meet these needs as it is over 7 miles to the nearest hospital and over 17 miles to a hospital providing primary/geriatric care. It has an inadequate bus service and no bus service at all to Leicester which is the location of the main hospitals. This site will not meet the strategic objective of meeting the needs of the community. There is for example no local taxi service.</p> <p>Somerby is not capable of serving the basic day to day needs of the community. (refer Draft Local Plan (DLP) 4.2.5) It fails the key strand of policy reference SS1 sustainability. It has one small corner shop (as quaint as it is) and is 7 miles from the nearest supermarket. It is entirely dependent on towns. For example how is it possible to classify Somerby a service centre when it is reliant on the car for transportation and the nearest Petrol Station is 7 miles away? There is no employment in the village of any note; there is no bus service to Leicester. The view “sustainability” of the village is as follows:</p> <p>Residents need to travel to towns to meet their basic retail, leisure and employment needs.</p> <p>Somerby does not have a fully functioning post office as stated in in the site assessment. It provides a limited service two days a week. The convenience shop is on a tight bend does not have adequate parking and yet it is intended to service the needs of the surrounding villages! The assessment of Somerby as a rural service centre is</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	entirely flawed. It is a three mile drive to the nearest A road. (The junction of which (A606 – Pickwell Road) is notoriously dangerous and the scene of many accidents).			
Davidsons Developments Limited	<p>Pegasus Group act on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited who have land interests at Sandpit Lane, Long Clawson. The site is identified in Policy C1 (A) Housing Allocations as LONG4, capable of delivering 55 dwellings. It is also identified under Policy LONG4 Land off Sandpit Lane in Appendix 1 ‘Site Allocations and Policies’ of the Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan. The site is subject of planning application 16/00032/OUT, which is yet to be determined.</p> <p>Policy SS2 sets out the Council’s approach to the distribution of development across the Borough. As not all of the settlements have sufficient allocations with the capacity to meet their residual requirement, the 162 dwelling shortfall has been redistributed amongst the remaining Service Centres and Rural Hubs on a proportionate basis. For Long Clawson this has resulted in an increase in the housing requirement from 110 dwellings to 127 dwellings. This approach to distribution of housing to Long Clawson is supported. The site can deliver up to 55 dwellings, which together with other proposed allocations provides a total of 141 new dwellings. Whilst this is an overprovision when considered against the residual requirement of 127, it is not a significant increase in numbers and the combined proposals do not present any technical issues that cannot be overcome.</p>		<p>The revised Site Assessments have resulted in revised estimated capacities and new sites have been incorporated, and others deleted (see responses to Policies C1 and C1A in this regard). This has removed the need for reallocation between the villages concerned and revised allocations as a result.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Dermot Daly	<p>IMPACT FROM FLOODING (see MLP policies EN8 p.114 and EN11 pp.125-127)</p> <p>Bottesford has 413 (28%+) properties in flood zone 3 and ranks as one of the highest risk villages in the whole of the East Midlands. Paragraph 7.22.3 of the Plan states that “sites at risk of flooding can only be allocated for development if there is insufficient land available in areas with lesser or no flood risk”. There are many other sites in Melton Borough with lower flood risk than Bottesford.</p> <p>The Bottesford SHLAA sites of Rectory Farm, Grantham Road Clay Pit and adjacent area to the Clay Pit are subject to flooding and partially categorised as flood zone 3b (designed to flood as an alleviation method). Any development on these sites will have a knock-on effect on the whole village which will be at higher risk of flooding.</p> <p>The Melton Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2015 states 22% of suggested development sites in Bottesford are in Flood Zones and so is 49% of the Rectory Farm site. The report continues to identify Bottesford as high risk to increased impact of flooding from Grantham Canal and again from impermeable surface drainage such as roads, drives and the houses.</p> <p>The last 20 years have seen a significant increase in the number of 'one in a hundred year' flood events - two major events in 1999, one serious event in 2001 (causing severe building damage) and an increase in less major events more recently. Bottesford is now categorised in 'one in seventy-five year' flood event.</p> <p>The 2004 Entec report states that there are no flood alleviation options that can be implemented and that</p>	<p>Bottesford should be allowed organic growth, controlled on an annual allocation that can be a defence to excessive development. Furthermore, the authority should conduct the necessary investigation to impact of flooding, traffic, supporting services, public transport and village character.</p> <p>It is not necessarily the general public that should be stating the answers to these challenges. It is the responsibility of the authority to suggest, discuss, consult and change on an iterative basis.</p>	<p>The flood issues have not directly informed the spatial strategy set out in Policy SS2 but the site selections carried out to fulfil it have taken full cognisance of the most up to date information available (the SRFA 2015 and the 2016 update, and a flood risk sequential and exceptions test report) including allowances for climate change, ensuring only those with lesser flood risk are selected and contain specific provision to alleviate their vulnerability and impacts. Bottesford attract the greatest quantity of proposed development in the 'rural area' owing to it having the best range of services, facilities and transport links of any settlement and as a result of the 'proportionate approach' which distributes the quantities based on settlement size. It is able to do so because there are sufficient suitable and available sites despite the flood risk and other constraints referred to. The Highways Authority has not identified any capacity issues in the road network nor have the major junctions been deemed unsuitable for additional use. The impacts of proposals on individual sites (in isolation and cumulatively) will be carried out through the normal planning application analyses. The issues of capacity of local services have not been supported by the relevant agencies. Bottesford’s population represents approximately 7% of the Borough’s total, and the plan proposes it accommodates just under 7% of the Borough’s growth requirements. Bottesford has a wide range of services and good transport links and is regarded as a highly sustainable location for housing development in its own right. evidence within the HEDNA 2017 shows that part of the HMA demand is generated by proximity to urban centres on the north and east of the HMA itself and Bottesford has a stronger relationship with such centres than with Melton Mowbray. It is considered that 'migrating' greater proportion of</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>climate change over coming years is expected to increase flood levels within Bottesford by 39cm (15.5").</p> <p>When viewing the Environment Agency Flood Map the areas of significant risk (Zone 2 and Zone 3) within the Borough of Melton are along the Wreake to the West of Melton Mowbray, a small area to the Northwest of Redmile and the whole area of Bottesford and Easthorpe. Given this, why does the MLP place the most significant rural housing volumes in Bottesford?</p> <p>There appears to have been no credence taken of these points in respect of flooding impact to Bottesford and so Policy SS1 and Policy SS2 are found to be unsound (and not withstanding the policies EN8 and EN11 do not explicitly state any risk reduction).</p> <p>ROAD SAFETY AND TRAFFIC (see MLP policies C9 pp.71-72, IN1 p.134 and D1 pp.143-144)</p> <p>It is expected that 428+ houses will create in excess of 3,000 extra vehicle movements per day through our villages. A recent local study identified that there are currently in excess of 500 vehicle movements on Barkestone Lane around school start time. Another 428+ houses could potentially double this figure.</p> <p>The lack of parking in the village centre is already an issue. A further 428+ houses in total across the village will mean that current on-street and off-street parking will be unable to cope with the demand.</p> <p>This uplift of traffic flow through the village will increase the pollution factor especially in the centre of the village and around the schools, shops and health centre.</p> <p>The majority of the increase in traffic flows are expected to be channelled through the most highly impacted roads in the centre of Bottesford village as it travels to the key local towns of Grantham, Bingham, Newark and Nottingham, and the major routes of A52, A46 and A1.</p> <p>There appears to have been no analysis of traffic increase</p>		<p>development to Melton would be less sustainable in terms of meeting this aspect of overall need, for the reasons stated in the representation.</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>or traffic impact carried out on Bottesford by Melton Borough Council even following a promise to do so by the Head of Regulatory Services when addressing a public meeting in Bottesford at the Emerging Options stage. Policy SS1 and Policy SS2 are found not to be sound (and not withstanding the policies C9 pp.71-72, IN1 p.134 and D1 pp.143-144 do not explicitly state any element of risk reduction); (Furthermore, the policy SS3 Sustainable Communities is found not to comply with the duty to cooperate).</p> <p>STRESS ON EXISTING SERVICES (see MLP policies C9 pp.71-72, EN12 pp.127-128 and IN1 p.134)</p> <p>Schools: Applying the current ratio of children against the number of houses in the parish, which is on the low side for a modern build, this would expect to generate over 250 children. All levels of school and pre-school in Bottesford are already at or near full capacity therefore a significant increase in housing and population will be unsustainable.</p> <p>Doctors are currently stretched and will be overwhelmed with an estimated additional 1700 new patients from an extra 428+ houses. This is on top of a reduction/merging of village surgeries in 2017. Therefore a significant increase in housing and population will be unsustainable.</p> <p>Drainage: both rain water run-off and foul sewers are coming under increasing pressure, with gardens under water on a regular basis and sewers breaching. This issue will be accentuated by the significant increase in housing being proposed.</p> <p>Bus services are very limited and causing the vast majority of new households to travel by car which will impact on traffic movement in the village and in neighbouring districts (South Kesteven and Rushcliffe).</p> <p>Train services: while neighbouring stations of Bingham and Radcliffe-on-Trent receive assistance to increase the number of trains stopping aligned with increased development, Bottesford is receiving none.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Policy SS1 and Policy SS2 are found not to be sound (and not withstanding the policies C9 pp.71-72, EN12 pp.127-128 and IN1 p.134 do not explicitly state any element of risk reduction).</p> <p>ANALYSIS OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT (see MLP policies SS2 pp.29-30, EN1 p.98 and D1 pp.143-144)</p> <p>Historically, housing development in the villages in the Borough has been over allocated when compared to development in Melton itself.</p> <p>Statistics are provided by the Representor to show how excessive development has consistently been permitted in Bottesford, relative to the town of Melton.</p> <p>LOCATION Vs. SUSTAINABILITY (see MLP policies SS3 p.34, EN11 pp.125-127 and IN1 pp.134-135)</p> <p>Villages closer to Melton are more sustainable due to proximity of work opportunities, shopping, health services, transport links, etc. Bottesford has so far been identified as the most appropriate location for the majority of the rural allocation of housing. Most residents work, travel and shop in neighbouring Counties.</p> <p>Policy SS1 and Policy SS2 Development Strategy are found not to be sound (and not withstanding the policies SS3 p.34, EN11 pp.125-127 and IN1 pp.134-135 do not explicitly state any element of risk reduction).</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Diana and Anthony Taffs	<p>There is a need for more houses around Leicstershire, but why should Bottesford be the usual default position? What other sites have been investigated? Bottesford has evolved over the years from a small village, the roads being suitable for the traffic and people at that time. Today the traffic flow in the village is horrendous. Peak times at schools make it very difficult to cross the High Street. Cars, busses, pedestrians, buggies and children cause a hazard at these peak times. The population is ageing, elderly people often move here to be with their children and need their cars to shop, visit the doctors etc. The increasing pressure on schools; doctors; shops would become intolerable with more development. The middle of the village cannot be enlarged.</p> <p>There are the sites you have identified without paying due regard to flooding possibilities, and egress on to the main roads. Developers give empty promises to residents about how much they are going to do for the village, in return for being granted the right to build in Bottesford. I haven't heard what Barratts have done perhaps someone will be good enough to tell me.</p> <p>Finally, whilst not opposing development, it has to be far fewer than proposed in the Plan and the right mix of houses need to be supplied so that young people get a chance (not all 4 to 5 bedrooms making a lot of money for the developers), Development must not ruin Bottesford by turning it into a town with very modern houses all around the outskirts of the village. And you can say "problem solved".</p>		<p>Bottesford's population represents approximately 7% of the Borough's total, and the plan proposes it accommodates just under 7% of the Borough's growth requirements. Bottesford has a wide range of services and good transport links and is regarded as a highly sustainable location for housing development in its own right. Evidence within the HEDNA 2017 shows that part of the HMA demand is generated by urban centres on the north and east of the HMA itself and Bottesford has a stronger relationship with such centres than with Melton Mowbray. The Highways Authority has not identified any capacity issues in the road network nor have the major junctions been deemed unsuitable for additional use. The issues of capacity of local services, and their ability to expand, have not been supported by the relevant agencies.</p> <p>Flood risk has been a key element in the site assessment process and resultant choices. Site specific policies in Appendix 1 identify the nature of contributions required – Barratts at Belvoir Rd provided 23 affordable houses for local need and several £100,000 towards local policing and education provision.</p>	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Dr Anthony H. Cooper	The policy to put 35% of housing into the villages is unsound and not proportional. It is not planned for 20 years, just on land availability put forward by developers. It is not sustainable and does not take account of the Six-Hills proposal for a new village . The policy puts developer-led pressure on villages, it is not sustainable and is not positive.	No appraisal of sustainability in the villages has been undertaken. The allocations are based on a tick box of facilities without regard for whether they can sustain the increase. No proper appraisal has been made of transport links and the realistic assessment of employment or commuting from the villages. No proper assessment of flooding in the villages has been undertaken and the whole plan relies on developers to fix the things that are too large for them to contemplate.	The ‘Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015’ assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough’s housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance. This evidence is considered to remain valid. The sustainability of villages has been carried out and reviewed in the Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) and both the spatial strategy (policy SS2) and individual sites have been subject to detailed Sustainability Appraisal.	None proposed
Dr Peter David James		<p>I am unclear why only 65% of housing needs are met within Melton where there might be greater potential for development. Melton provides significant potential for employment, has good transport links and service facilities reducing the need for car journeys and therefore environmentally beneficial. Housing within service centres and rural communities provide less opportunities for employment and therefore are more dependant on good transport links or would require the use of a car.</p> <p>Distribution in rural areas should not be based solely on population. Presence of historic features, sustainability of services and road networks and availability of sites for potential development should also be considered when allocating housing requirements</p>	The ‘Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015’ assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough’s housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance. This evidence is considered to remain valid	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Elaine Vickers	<p>In the original draft plan Gaddesby was deemed to be a “rural supporter”. A rural supporter is identified by a clear scoring methodology (attached to this representation) in relation to role and functions of a settlement within a spatial strategy. This was evidenced by Melton Local Plan Settlement Roles and Relationships of April 2015 (MLPSRR). It will be seen that the criteria used were much more extensive and sophisticated than the four used in the latest draft plan and that Gaddesby was very much at the lower end of the rural supporter range of 10 to 20 points with 12. Why the change? Gaddesby has been upgraded and a greater proportion of housing proposed than any other village. Of the four current criteria comments, two are agreed, Primary School and Community Building. Access to employment opportunities is not agreed for the reasons in relation to bus services and employment sites. The suggestion that the 100 bus service can be used to get to work is incorrect. The 100 bus service runs very infrequently and does not run at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Gaddesby is the closest settlement in the Borough to Leicester and it is there that most people go to work rather than to Melton. A village meeting discussed the plan and 74 villagers attended and when we asked for a show of hands not one indicated they work in Melton. The only suitable bus to Leicester leaves Gaddesby at 07.49 and the last bus leaves Leicester at 17:10. It is therefore impossible to use the bus to attend work full time in Leicester. Further Leicestershire County Council will review the contract next year (2017) and there is a risk that it will be withdrawn. The suggestion that there is access to employment opportunities is incorrect and requires re-assessment because of the lack of public transport. There is minimal employment within Gaddesby itself. Fast broadband is not accepted because although Gaddesby’s phone exchange has been “upgraded” in 2016 as part of the “super-fast” Leicestershire program (It has added support for Fibre to the Cabinet broadband), there isn’t a lot of choice of provider (the majority of residents are using BT). This broadband service is sold as “up to” 56Mbps download speed, which is more than adequate for an average modern home. The actual delivered speed of writing is 20Mbps or 40% of the advertised maximum, which is the same as the pre-upgrade ADSL offering. Given this failure to perform under the existing load of the</p>	<p>1. The methodology of selecting which villages should be the subject of development should be revised and if not revised Gaddesby should be reassessed as a rural settlement for the reasons set out in the Gaddesby Community Group Representations.</p> <p>2. GADD2 should be deleted from the plan as a proposed housing allocation, for the reasons set out in the Gaddesby Community Group Representations.</p> <p>3. GADD3 should be deleted from the plan as a proposed housing allocation, for the reasons set out in the Gaddesby Community Group Representations.</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered to be sound and Gaddesby is correctly identified as a service centre owing to the presence of the key services identified .The proposed housing in Gaddesby and other villages represents the proposed approach to the provision and supply of the Borough's housing requirements overall. If the HNS study for Gaddesby produces results that are no accommodated by the Local plan provisions they can be advanced by the Neighbourhood Plan or under alternative policies of the Local plan (SS3, C5 etc.). The allocation takes account of the 5 houses with planning permission which are deducted from the mathematical allocation to identify the 'residual' need for allocation.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>village and surrounding areas, any additional load is likely to make the service deteriorate further. Many existing residents have not yet upgraded to fibre broadband, which means that when they do, this would increase the load further thereby reducing the actual delivered speed further. In the neighbouring village of Queniborough, the broadband speeds can be over double the delivered speed in Gaddesby. Gaddesby does not therefore enjoy the requisite three of the four criteria to qualify as a rural hub and should therefore be classed as a rural settlement. The methodology now proposed is unacceptable as being simplistic and unsound. The criteria should include more day to day facilities in the methodology such as a food shop, GP surgery, library, post office, primary school and pub. Not many rural villages will have employment facilities, those that do should be higher up the hierarchy and receive more development, and that facilities such as a food shop and doctors surgery are just as important as broadband in reducing the need to travel. There should also be more differentiation between the settlements, perhaps a return to the Primary and Secondary Services Centres previously proposed. A housing needs survey has not yet been carried out by Melton Council. Apparently the Council are to carry this out in the New Year (2017). If so how can it be said that there is a need for housing in Gaddesby? The Council have taken into account the 14 permitted dwellings at GADD1 but have not taken into account the 5 houses for which permission has been granted on Ashby Road (12/00530/FUL) and the one further dwelling at The Hall (15/00826/FUL). Accordingly, in reality Gaddesby has already been allocated 6 houses which, when added to the 55 houses allocated in the draft plan, takes the total allocation to 61 new houses. This cannot be sustained or justified for the reasons set out in there representations. Appendix 2 of MLPSSR it will be seen that over the period 1994 to 2014 on average one new house was built in the village every year. On the assumption that this continues and additional 20 houses will be built over the life of the Plan. Paras 4.2.21 and 22 of the draft Plan state that Gaddesby has markedly higher percentage of proposed housing than any of the other villages. There are currently 158 houses in the village itself. An increase of 61 would be a 38.6% increase and would clearly change the nature of the village. When the additional 20 houses likely to be built from “natural</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>growth” are included, this pushes the figure up to an increase of 51.2%. The calculation by estimated population of the villages at 4.2.21 and 4.2.22 of the draft plan is unsound. It is the number of houses which is material. The A607 is already a very busy road as it leads to the Hobby Horse roundabout and the A46. Both these roads are over capacity certainly. It is not unusual to be queuing from Syston/Queniborough/East Goscote all the way to the Hobby Horse. The junction between Gaddesby Lane and the A607 is very dangerous and one sometimes has to wait minutes to join the A607. In addition, Rearsby Lane (which connects Gaddesby Lane to Ashby Road) is a busy, narrow and winding road with is already unsuitable for the existing traffic burden placed on it. If the 61 (or more) houses were built this is likely to add another 120 plus cars to the mix. This impact has not been assessed by the Plan. There is a weight limit throughout Gaddesby of 7.5 tonnes, which demonstrates how minor the roads are into the village. Only in 2014 did the school intake increase to 25 each year from 15. Years 2, 1 and reception are therefore already at capacity. The catchment area for the school includes Barsby, South Croxton, Ashby Folville and almost to Queniborough and attracts pupils from further afield. Within 4 years the school will be at capacity and therefore there is no requirement to fill spaces with new families coming into the village. Having only recently been substantially extended, it is unrealistic to suggest that the school will be capable of further expansion in the short/medium term.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Elanor Wright on behalf of Featherstones PDD Ltd.	<p>Agree it is logical to direct the majority of development (65% in the draft Local Plan)) to Melton Mowbray, because it is the largest and most sustainable settlement (although there are concerns regarding delivery referenced later). However, following this core principle it should also be logical and sustainable to direct proportionately more of the remaining 35 per cent to the most sustainable settlements below Melton Mowbray in the hierarchy. The Plan does not follow this principle in relation to the rest of the Borough and is, as a result, unsound. We strongly object to the proposed distribution strategy which should direct proportionately more growth (than simply based on their current population size) to the more sustainable settlements beyond Melton Mowbray, in particular Bottesford. Although the delivery requirements for all settlements outside of Melton Mowbray have been calculated using the current population size, the main urban area Melton Mowbray has been allocated disproportionately more development. Its population is a little over half of the total population of the Borough, but it is accommodating 65 per cent of the Borough's growth. We believe that this growth strategy, which reflects the relative sustainability of the settlement, should also be applied to the distribution in the rural part of the Borough, most importantly to the most sustainable settlement, Bottesford. Bottesford, contains the only other secondary school in the Borough (outside of Melton Mowbray) and a wide range of other services and facilities which ensures that it is hub of activity. As such it has the capacity to sustainably accommodate a significantly higher level of housing than is currently being proposed over the Plan period. Bottesford currently contains around 7 per cent of the Borough population. If it were to accommodate 10 per cent of the Borough's growth to reflect its relative sustainability (as is the strategy for Melton), that would increase its housing requirement to around 600 dwellings (compared to only 428 as proposed in the Plan). The principle of directing development to the most sustainable locations is well established and a fundamental element of national planning policy. Clear and compelling evidence would be necessary to justify departure from this approach and there is no such evidence as to why Bottesford, like Melton Mowbray (but on a proportionate scale) should not be a greater focus for growth. The NPPF is clear that one of the core planning principles is that</p>	<p>Several villages across the Borough are allocated 'reserve' sites which provide flexibility in terms of development opportunities over the Plan period. However, Bottesford does not contain a 'reserve' site and we believe that this situation should also be reviewed as part of a new development distribution strategy.</p> <p>It is considered that further land should be allocated in Bottesford to ensure a balanced approach to delivery, in line with the policies of the NPPF.</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. Service centres are distinguished from Rural Hubs and the lower order settlements, 'rural settlements' in this exercise based upon their range of facilities and sustainability in absolute and relative terms. The approach is based on allocating housing growth to the settlements which contain the factors considered most important to support sustainable growth and all service centres receiving an allocation have this in common. Bottesford is identified as receiving approx 19% of the total quantum identified for the rural area. The 'Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015' assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough's housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance to achieve the objectives of the Plan and improve sustainability and travel patterns etc. This evidence is considered to remain valid and the quantum allocated to Melton Mowbray the most appropriate approach. There were no remaining suitable or</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Local Planning Authorities should: “actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus development in locations which are or can be made sustainable” (paragraph 17, NPPF). The importance of development which makes best use of sustainable modes of transport is reiterated at paragraph 30 of the NPPF which states that: “Encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. In preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should therefore support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport”</p> <p>The Local Plan does not accord with these key policies of the NPPF. The distribution strategy seeks to distribute development across the Borough, outside of Melton Mowbray, through a strategy based on existing settlement population size. Although the level of services and facilities is acknowledged, we believe that the distribution strategy must give more weight to the facilities and services which the various settlements contain, including their connectivity to the wider area (as the Plan appropriately does in relation to Melton Mowbray). The 2015 Roles, Relationships and Opportunities study correctly acknowledged that the rural villages vary in size, isolation and connectivity and that it is therefore necessary to understand them comparatively in order to allow for distribution of development which “has the greatest positive effect on the Borough”. This acknowledgement generally confirms that it is right to direct growth to the most sustainable locations. The study also notes that national policy requires Councils to plan positively for growth in the more sustainable settlements and requires that development is distributed in a way that is commensurate with existing services and the ability of the infrastructure to cope with additional growth. In the context of this national requirement, we believe that Bottesford should deliver more growth; reducing pressure on the smaller and more isolated settlements within the Borough to accommodate new housing. The current distribution strategy sees a number of smaller and more isolated villages delivering unsustainable levels of development. For example: Frisby on the Wreake is allocated 118 new dwellings (including reserve site), but the village has few services and facilities. For example it</p>		<p>available sites available in Bottesford to fulfil the role of 'reserve sites' in that location. The Five Year Land Supply and Housing Trajectory Position (Nov 2016) explains that 'frontloading' the under-delivery of development from previous years would be unrealistic given the historic completion rates and sets out an approach to boosting land supply to the level required to meet needs in a realistic manner. This accords with the PPG guidance that refer to recovering past under delivery within the first 5 years of a Plan "where possible" (the uplift in delivery required in order to do so in the first 5 years of the Plan would be unrealistic- -more than double of exiting and recent rates - and therefore not possible). The document sets out that an adequate 5 year land supply is achieved.</p> <p>Further site assessment work has been undertaken which has produced sites in locations where previously absent and prevented the need for ‘redistribution’ between the locations concerned.</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>does not have a GP surgery and therefore is reliant on other areas for this vital service; Long Clawson is allocated 181 new dwellings (including reserve site), but again the village has few services and facilities and is relatively isolated with poor public transport provision; Old Dalby is allocated 65 new dwellings (including reserve site) despite having extremely limited facilities; and Thorpe Arnold is allocated 75 new dwellings (including reserve site) but the village has very few services and facilities and relies on Melton Mowbray for education provision. There are also acknowledged heritage and environmental assets which could be detrimentally impacted through development. Bottesford has the capacity to accommodate significantly more growth than is currently being directed toward the village. Bottesford contains a wide range of services and facilities including retail, health and dental services. It is well-served in terms of employment and education with a primary school with capacity which is forecast to expand over the coming years and the only secondary school in the Borough outside of Melton Mowbray. It is extremely well connected to the wider area, both through proximity to the strategic road network but, significantly in the context of the NPPF requirements, also in terms of sustainable modes of transport. The village benefits from a train station with services to Nottingham and Grantham and bus services to Grantham and Melton Mowbray. As such Bottesford is an important hub for surrounding communities. The Plan should, in accordance with paragraph 17 of the NPPF, focus development here. Additional, suitable and sustainable sites are available in Bottesford, in terms of land adjacent to Barkestone Lane. It is a large site with the capacity to delivery housing and open space. Sub-section 4 below sets out the opportunity available. In the supporting text for Policy SS2: Development Strategy, the Pre-Submission Draft Plan identifies that Asfordby, Hose, Scalford, Stathern and Great Dalby do not have sufficient allocations to meet their residual requirement (based on the Plan's approach to distribution), creating a shortfall of 162 dwellings. This shortfall has been redistributed amongst the remaining Service Centres and Rural Hubs. Therefore, whilst we understand that there is a slightly disproportionate distribution, we do not believe that this has gone far enough. Rather than seeking to accommodate requirements after it has been identified that they cannot</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>be met elsewhere in the Borough, Bottesford, as the second most sustainable settlement, should be a focus for growth. The need to focus growth here is reinforced when the lack of services and facilities and accessibility of smaller settlements is considered. The current distribution strategy identified in the emerging Local Plan is at odds with the NPPF: In order for the Plan to be found sound, the distribution strategy needs to be amended to ensure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations in the Borough; It is not justified as the most appropriate strategy when considered against alternatives and is therefore not in accordance with national planning policy and it is not consistent because it does not deliver sustainable development across the Borough; In this context, the role played by Bottesford needs to be reviewed and the village should be required to deliver a higher number of dwellings over the Plan period. As identified above, it is considered that Bottesford is the most sustainable village in the Borough, outside of Melton Mowbray and should accommodate higher levels of development. As a Primary Service Centre the village is clearly already acknowledged as having an important role to play for the Borough providing services and facilities which support communities beyond the village itself. In accordance with the NPPF this should be recognised and the village should be a greater focus for growth. It is well-served in terms of employment, retail, health and education. It is also well connected to the wider area with sustainable transport links to Melton Mowbray, Grantham and Nottingham. In this context it is unsustainable and contrary to the core planning principles that Bottesford is not proposed to be allocated proportionately more development than some of the other more isolated and considerably smaller settlements. Through allocating proportionately more development to Bottesford, the pressure on some of these more isolated communities to deliver new dwellings would be alleviated. The Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan uses the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2014 to identify its Objectively Assessed Need for housing over the Plan period of 2011 to 2036. The Pre-Submission Draft document identifies a minimum housing delivery requirement for Melton Borough of 6,125 new dwellings over the Plan period; this equates to the delivery of 245 new dwellings per annum. However, taking into</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>consideration the completions which have taken place between 2011 and 2016, the residual requirement remaining for the Borough is 5,474 dwellings. The most recent Five Year Housing Land Supply Assessment states that the Council has a 7.6 years' supply of deliverable sites. However, significantly, the Five Year Housing Land Supply Assessment identifies that the delivery over recent years has been significantly below 245 dwellings. The table below identifies the significant shortfall in delivery since the start of the Plan period: Completions: 2011/12-157dw; 2012/2013-64dw; 2013/2014 52dw; 2014/2015-78dw; 2015/2016-151dw; 2016/2017 149dw (estimate).</p> <p>The 5 Year Housing Land Supply Statement recognises that this persistent under delivery requires the 20 per cent buffer to be applied in line with the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The document states that the chosen approach is to deal with the shortfall in delivery across the Plan period, rather than 'frontloading' it, because 'frontloading' of development would be unrealistic in the current situation within Melton Borough. However, the Planning Practice Guidance clearly states that Local Planning Authorities should aim to deal with any shortfall in delivery within the first five years of the Plan period. It is considered that there are no special circumstance in Melton Borough to justify departure from the approach advocated by the NPPF and in its current form the Plan is considered unsound. The shortfall in housing brought about through the persistent under delivery should be dealt with early in the lifetime of the Local Plan, i.e. within the first Five Years. In order to make the Plan sound the Council needs to address this issue and ensure that there is a five year supply on adoption which includes the identified shortfall in housing from persistent under delivery. Additional sites should be allocated which are capable of contributing to delivery in the first five years of the Plan. The allocation of additional land will also help to build in flexibility and certainty in the Plan, to help ensure that the identified objectively assessed needs are met in full. The current housing supply calculation is partly based on discussions with landowners and agents regarding the timescales and deliverability of sites. A wide range of sites have been identified including the challenging Melton Mowbray SUEs and various smaller sites in many villages. It is likely that some of these sites will not be delivered or that delivery will be delayed. In</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>accordance with the NPPF and advice from the Local Plan Experts Group, consideration of a non-implementation allowance should be factored in to the supply calculations. The allocation of additional land would help to address this as well as the five year supply situation. To conclude, the distribution strategy identified in the Local Plan is unsound as it does not provide sustainable development and is not justified as the most appropriate strategy considered against reasonable alternatives. As the most sustainable settlement in the Borough outside of Melton Mowbray, Bottesford should be allocated proportionately more development to help deliver the Borough's housing needs. Bottesford should be allocated to deliver growth following the principles established for Melton Mowbray. The village has the capacity to deliver more than it is currently allocated and should deliver a minimum of 10 per cent of the Borough's housing requirement for the Plan period, which would increase its growth requirement from 428 dwellings to approximately 600. Bottesford is well connected through sustainable modes of transport to Grantham, Melton Mowbray and Nottingham as well as other villages in the Borough. It contains a primary school and, significantly, the only other secondary school in the Borough outside of Melton Mowbray. It is also well-served in terms of services, facilities and employment opportunities. Land at Barkestone Lane, Bottesford should be allocated for development. It is acknowledged that the site has not been promoted previously, but this should not preclude it from being considered for allocation, because it provides a sustainable opportunity to deliver housing. The size and form of the site will enable it to deliver both new housing and public open space. The site also presents the opportunity for significant flood risk mitigation which could increase the capacity of the site to accommodate development and reduce flood risk elsewhere. In terms of housing land supply, it is considered that the persistent under supply from previous years should be dealt with in the first five years of the Plan, in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance. [Supporting documents - No 60]</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Elizabeth Crowther	<p>Clawson Hose & Harby Parish Council supports the proportionate approach to rural population distribution in the Rural Area to Service Centres and Rural Hubs based on existing settlement size but the PC regards as UNSOUND the redistribution/allocation of extra housing in Table 6 to Long Clawson and Harby as a proportion of a deficit identified in other Service Centres and Rural Hubs. This is not justified or effective because it is not possible to identify in advance all housing sites likely to come forward across the rural areas over a 20 year period. Likely to lead to an unsustainable increase in new housing in villages with limited infrastructure and service capabilities. Not consistent with NPPF 47, 48 and 54.</p> <p>Table 8 shows Site Delivery Summary for Large Scale Sites in Melton Mowbray and the delay in delivery implicitly commits the delivery of new housing in the Rural Area to be ‘front-loaded’ within the first five years period. As the majority of this would be in rural villages rapid expansion at this rate is neither sustainable nor desirable, threatening social cohesion and being out of keeping with the historic rates of increase in the villages. The PC and local people are not averse to new housing development but it should be phased over time to allow infrastructure and community services to adapt and be improved where necessary.</p>	<p>Delete the additional ‘transferred’ housing allocations in Tables 6 & 7 and ensure that monitoring keeps actual delivery of both planned and windfall supply under review so that allocations can be reviewed at five yearly intervals and adjusted as necessary.</p> <p>Review and amend phasing of housing delivery to ensure that the finally agreed Allocation Sites in Long Clawson, Hose and Harby can deliver new housing over 1st, 2nd and 3rd of the four 5 year plan periods. Ensure that this is expressly included within the adopted plan to assist transparent delivery monitoring.</p>	<p>Further site assessment work has been undertaken which has produced sites in locations where previously absent and prevented the need for ‘redistribution’ between the locations concerned.</p> <p>Policies do not address the phasing of development and it is considered that this hamper industry practices and their ability to respond to market conditions, and subsequently impact upon delivery. The evidence contained within the Five Year Land Supply and Housing Trajectory Position 2nd November 2016 contains information regarding the progression of allocated sites and does not support the view that all, or most, of the sites will come forward in the first 5 years, with a number of sites anticipated much later in the Plan period.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This results in a lower quantity for Long Clawson.</p>
Frances and John Stapleton	<p>This whole concept is quite alarming. with so much additional housing in the Borough the infrastructure will not cope.</p> <p>With successive governments (and this one is no better), there have been cuts to policing, health care (with the current round of STP's there will be even more), adult social care etc these will be set even thinner. especially if we believe what we are being told that Melton Hospital is set to close completely. it is obvious that all of the different bodies do not consult with each other when drawing up these plans.</p>		<p>The Plan has been the subject of consultation with the service providers referred to and provisions are made to increase infrastructure where required, both through physical provision as part of developments (such as the Sustainable Neighbourhoods) and through developer contributions.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Gaddesby Community Group	<p>In the original draft plan Gaddesby was deemed to be a “rural supporter”. A rural supporter is identified by a clear scoring methodology (attached to this representation) in relation to role and functions of a settlement within a spatial strategy. This was evidenced by Melton Local Plan Settlement Roles and Relationships of April 2015 (MLPSRR). It will be seen that the criteria used were much more extensive and sophisticated than the four used in the latest draft plan and that Gaddesby was very much at the lower end of the rural supporter range of 10 to 20 points with 12. Why the change? Gaddesby has been upgraded and a greater proportion of housing proposed than any other village. Of the four current criteria comments, two are agreed, Primary School and Community Building. Access to employment opportunities is not agreed for the reasons in relation to bus services and employment sites. The suggestion that the 100 bus service can be used to get to work is incorrect. The 100 bus service runs very infrequently and does not run at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Gaddesby is the closest settlement in the Borough to Leicester and it is there that most people go to work rather than to Melton. A village meeting discussed the plan and 74 villagers attended and when we asked for a show of hands not one indicated they work in Melton. The only suitable bus to Leicester leaves Gaddesby at 07.49 and the last bus leaves Leicester at 17:10. It is therefore impossible to use the bus to attend work full time in Leicester. Further Leicestershire County Council will review the contract next year (2017) and there is a risk that it will be withdrawn. The suggestion that there is access to employment opportunities is incorrect and requires re-assessment because of the lack of public transport. There is minimal employment within Gaddesby itself. Fast broadband is not accepted because although Gaddesby’s phone exchange has been “upgraded” in 2016 as part of the “super-fast” Leicestershire program (It has added support for Fibre to the Cabinet broadband), there isn’t a lot of choice of provider (the majority of residents are using BT). This broadband service is sold as “up to” 56Mbps download speed, which is more than adequate for an average modern home. The actual delivered speed of writing is 20Mbps or 40% of the advertised maximum, which is the same as the pre-upgrade ADSL offering. Given this failure to perform under the existing load of the</p>		<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered to be sound and Gaddesby is correctly identified as a service centre owing to the presence of the key services identified .The proposed housing in Gaddesby and other villages represents the proposed approach to the provision and supply of the Borough's housing requirements overall. If the HNS study for Gaddesby produces results that are no accommodated by the Local plan provisions they can be advanced by the Neighbourhood Plan or under alternative policies of the Local plan (SS3, C5 etc.). The allocation takes account of the 5 houses with planning permission which are deducted from the mathematical allocation to identify the 'residual' need for allocation.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>village and surrounding areas, any additional load is likely to make the service deteriorate further. Many existing residents have not yet upgraded to fibre broadband, which means that when they do, this would increase the load further thereby reducing the actual delivered speed further. In the neighbouring village of Queniborough, the broadband speeds can be over double the delivered speed in Gaddesby. Gaddesby does not therefore enjoy the requisite three of the four criteria to qualify as a rural hub and should therefore be classed as a rural settlement. The methodology now proposed is unacceptable as being simplistic and unsound. The criteria should include more day to day facilities in the methodology such as a food shop, GP surgery, library, post office, primary school and pub. Not many rural villages will have employment facilities, those that do should be higher up the hierarchy and receive more development, and that facilities such as a food shop and doctors surgery are just as important as broadband in reducing the need to travel. There should also be more differentiation between the settlements, perhaps a return to the Primary and Secondary Services Centres previously proposed. A housing needs survey has not yet been carried out by Melton Council. Apparently the Council are to carry this out in the New Year (2017). If so how can it be said that there is a need for housing in Gaddesby? The Council have taken into account the 14 permitted dwellings at GADD1 but have not taken into account the 5 houses for which permission has been granted on Ashby Road (12/00530/FUL) and the one further dwelling at The Hall (15/00826/FUL). Accordingly, in reality Gaddesby has already been allocated 6 houses which, when added to the 55 houses allocated in the draft plan, takes the total allocation to 61 new houses. This cannot be sustained or justified for the reasons set out in there representations. Appendix 2 of MLPSSR it will be seen that over the period 1994 to 2014 on average one new house was built in the village every year. On the assumption that this continues and additional 20 houses will be built over the life of the Plan. Paras 4.2.21 and 22 of the draft Plan state that Gaddesby has markedly higher percentage of proposed housing than any of the other villages. There are currently 158 houses in the village itself. An increase of 61 would be a 38.6% increase and would clearly change the nature of the village. When the additional 20 houses likely to be built from “natural</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>growth” are included, this pushes the figure up to an increase of 51.2%. The calculation by estimated population of the villages at 4.2.21 and 4.2.22 of the draft plan is unsound. It is the number of houses which is material. The A607 is already a very busy road as it leads to the Hobby Horse roundabout and the A46. Both these roads are over capacity certainly. It is not unusual to be queuing from Syston/Queniborough/East Goscote all the way to the Hobby Horse. The junction between Gaddesby Lane and the A607 is very dangerous and one sometimes has to wait minutes to join the A607. In addition, Rearsby Lane (which connects Gaddesby Lane to Ashby Road) is a busy, narrow and winding road with is already unsuitable for the existing traffic burden placed on it. If the 61 (or more) houses were built this is likely to add another 120 plus cars to the mix. This impact has not been assessed by the Plan. There is a weight limit throughout Gaddesby of 7.5 tonnes, which demonstrates how minor the roads are into the village. Only in 2014 did the school intake increase to 25 each year from 15. Years 2, 1 and reception are therefore already at capacity. The catchment area for the school includes Barsby, South Croxton, Ashby Folville and almost to Queniborough and attracts pupils from further afield. Within 4 years the school will be at capacity and therefore there is no requirement to fill spaces with new families coming into the village. Having only recently been substantially extended, it is unrealistic to suggest that the school will be capable of further expansion in the short/medium term.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
George Machin on behalf of Davidsons Development	<p>Policy SS2, which sets out the Development Strategy for the delivery of new homes, is supported in principle. In particular, the objective to deliver at least 6,125 new homes across Melton Borough between 2011 and 2036, thereby meeting the housing needs of all communities, is supported. The NPPF seeks to "boost significantly the supply of housing" (paragraph 47) and it is considered therefore that this overall target for new homes should be seen as a minimum.</p> <p>However, the content of Appendix 5 does not make clear how this housing target has taken into account the backlog of housing need across the area (as demonstrated through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, 2015, which indicated a housing land supply of just 1.9 - 2.5 years). Whilst it is recognised that this position has recently been updated through the Five Year Housing Land Supply Assessment of November 2016, we question the robustness of this assessment and resultant calculation of housing land supply.</p> <p>Policy SS2 seeks to establish housing delivery targets for each 5 year period, in order to achieve the overall requirement to 2036. This shows that 492 dwellings were completed in the five year period 2011-2016, which represents a shortfall of 723 dwellings (as at 2016) against the identified housing requirement of 245 dwellings a year. Appendix 5 sets out the monitoring framework for the emerging plan and confirms that the Council has used the Liverpool method to spread the shortfall across the remainder of the plan period.</p> <p>We would suggest however, that the Council should be utilising the Sedgefield Method to the calculation of housing requirements, with the established shortfall from 2011 – 2016 being made up in the next 5 year period 2016 – 2021. This would meet the requirements of the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), which stresses that Council's should seek to make up shortfalls at the earliest opportunity. By applying the Sedgefield Method and a</p>	The evidence base which underpins Policy SS2, particularly the most recently published 5 year housing land supply and Delivery Trajectory should be amended, to reflect the use of the Sedgefield Method of housing supply and to provide a clearer trajectory of delivery based on the annual housing requirement of 245 no. dwellings per year.	The Five Year Land Supply and Housing Trajectory Position (Nov 2016) explains that 'frontloading' the underdelivery of development from previous years would be unrealistic given the historic completion rates and sets out an approach to boosting land supply to the level required to meet needs in a realistic manner. This accords with the PPG guidance that refer to recovering past under delivery within the first 5 years of a Plan "where possible" (the uplift in delivery required in order to do so in the first 5 years of the Plan would be unrealistic- more than double of existing and recent rates - and therefore not possible). The document sets out that an adequate 5 year land supply is achieved in a manner compatible with PPG guidance.	None.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>20% buffer for persistent under delivery, the five year requirement for 2016 - 2021 would increase to 2,338 no. dwellings. We would also stress that, at this stage, only limited weight can be attached to the proposed allocations in the emerging Local Plan, and therefore the calculation of a five year land supply should only take account of likely completions from sites with the benefit of planning permission and anticipated windfall developments. On this basis there would be a supply of 3.55 years for the period 2016 - 2021.</p> <p>As stated above, the evidence base to the emerging local plan includes a recent updated assessment of five year housing land supply (dated November 2016), along with a Delivery Trajectory for the plan period 2011 – 2036. The basis and underlying assumptions to the trajectory are not clear and appear to indicate a phased approach to development, with significantly higher completion rates anticipated for the period 2019/20 to 2022/23, with this level of delivery reducing towards the end of the plan period. A peak level of completions is shown in 2020/21 of around 770 no. dwellings. There is no evidence to support these ambitious annual completion rates, particularly when compared to historic under-delivery.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Guy Longley, Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Development	<p>Appendix 5 sets out the proposed monitoring framework for the plan. For Policy SS2, targets are set out for each 5 year period to achieve the overall requirement to 2036. This shows that 492 dwellings were completed in the five year period 2011-2016. This represents a shortfall of 723 dwellings as at 2016 against the identified housing requirement of 245 dwellings a year. The Appendix indicates that the Council has used the Liverpool method to spread the shortfall across the remainder of the plan period.</p> <p>The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) is clear that Council's should seek to make up shortfalls as soon as possible. The Council should therefore be applying the Sedgefield method to the calculation of housing requirements with any shortfall from 2011-2016 being made up in the period 2016-2021. Applying the Sedgefield approach and a 20% buffer for persistent under delivery would mean that the five year requirement for 2016-2021 would be 2,338 dwellings. It should be noted that, at this stage, limited weight can be attached to the proposed allocations in the plan, and therefore the calculation of a five year land supply should only take account of likely completions from permitted sites and windfall. On this basis there would be a supply of 3.55 years for the period 2016-2021.</p> <p>It is noted that as part of the evidence base, the Council has produced a five year land supply assessment and a Delivery Trajectory for the period 2011-2036 in graph form. The assumptions underlying this trajectory are unclear. A full trajectory including a breakdown of the assumed components of supply year on year over the plan period should be included in the Submission Draft Plan to enable interested parties to understand the Council's assumptions underlying the trajectory.</p> <p>The trajectory appears to present a phased approach to development over the plan period, with assumed higher completion rates for the period 2019/20 to 2022/23, with completion rates reducing towards the end of the plan period. The trajectory shows annual completions peaking around 770 dwellings in 2020/21. These assumed annual completion rates for the first part of the plan period appear to be ambitious when compared with historic</p>	A full detailed trajectory for the plan period should be included in the plan and this should include a breakdown of assumed delivery from the components of supply. The trajectory should include a rolling five year land supply trajectory and the calculation of five year land supply should use the Sedgefield method base on the annual housing requirement of 245 dwellings a year.	The Five Year Land Supply and Housing Trajectory Position (Nov 2016) and associated Delivery Trajectory is based on 245 dwellings pa. as suggested and calculates a 5 year supply requirement of 1729 (including under delivery from previous years and a 20% 'buffer'. It explains that 'frontloading' the under-delivery of development from previous years would be unrealistic given the historic completion rates and sets out an approach to boosting land supply to the level required to meet needs in a realistic manner. This accords with the PPG guidance that refer to recovering past under delivery within the first 5 years of a Plan "where possible" (the uplift in delivery required in order to do so in the first 5 years of the Plan would be unrealistic- -more than double of existing and recent rates - and therefore not possible). The document sets out that an adequate 5 yr land supply is achieved. It includes a full detailed breakdown of the delivery expected to fulfil the identified requirements comprised from exiting sites/permission, those in the Plan and a small allowance for windfall, and will be regularly reviewed and updated.	None.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>completion rates. The approach needs to be further clarified and the justification for applying a phased approach should be clearly set out, if that is what is intended.</p> <p>It is considered that a trajectory based on the annual requirement of 245 dwellings a year over the plan period would provide a clearer understanding of how the Council expects the housing requirement to be delivered. This would recognise the shortfalls against the housing requirement in the period 2011-2036 and that this shortfall needs to be made up in the period 2016-2031.</p> <p>SS2 (Sound)</p> <p>Policy SS2 sets out the overall development strategy for the Borough over the plan period to 2036. It indicates that provision will be made for the development of at least 6,125 homes, with Melton Mowbray urban area identified as the priority location for growth, accommodating 65% of the Borough's housing needs. The policy sets out the proposals to deliver at least 3,980 homes and up to 31 hectares of additional employment land by 2036 and advises that development will be expected to contribute positively to the provision of key infrastructure, including traffic relief within the town.</p> <p>The policy is supported. It appropriately recognises the key role played by Melton Mowbray as the most sustainable settlement in the Borough. Melton Mowbray is the focus for a wide range of services and facilities and employment opportunities meeting the needs of its residents and those residents in smaller settlements across the Borough.</p> <p>The proposed distribution of 65% of the housing need to Melton Mowbray over the plan period is considered an appropriate and sustainable approach which recognises the role played by the town as the major sustainable centre in the Borough, whilst at the same time allowing for further growth in the more sustainable rural villages to support their services and facilities.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Hazelton Homes	<p>We fully support the recognition that the development requirements outlined in Policy SS2 are a minimum, and the flexibility that this part of the policy enables. Furthermore, we support the identification of Long Clawson as a Service Centre, which are to support 35% of the total residential requirement across the Borough. Long Clawson is a sustainable settlement with comparatively good access to local services and facilities and therefore we agree that it is suitable for a proportion of residential development.</p> <p>However, we are concerned that not all of the relevant issues have been taken into account when determining the amount of residential development that is required. Paragraph 158</p> <p>of the NPPF states that ‘each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental prospects of the area’. The Councils of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area are currently working on producing their Housing and Employment</p> <p>Development Needs Assessment Report [HEDNA] and this is anticipated to be published in January 2017. The updated Objectively Assessed Housing Needs [OAHN] contained within this document are likely to have a significant impact on the residential requirements for the borough, and as such the current anticipated housing requirements are likely to require revising prior to the Local Plan’s submission in order for it to pass the tests of soundness.</p>	<p>With the publication of the HEDNA report anticipated for January 2017, it may be beneficial to delay submission and adoption of the new Local Plan until the Council has had an adequate opportunity to review its housing requirements, to reflect the updated OAHN included within this report. Furthermore, we consider it necessary for the Local Plan to remove the proposed limits on the amount of development allowed on an unallocated site, as the current policy would restrict the likelihood of affordable housing being delivered in rural areas.</p>	<p>The SHMA is recognised as out of date and the most up to date evidence is contained in the HEDNA 2017. The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving at a housing target for the Local plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available.</p>	<p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>HEDNA and ‘towards a housing requirement for Melton’ evidence documents to be published as part of consultation on ‘focussed changes’</p>
Helen Hartley, Nexus Planning (on behalf of Richborough Estates)	<p>Richborough Estates considers that Policy SS2 is unsound in so far as it is not positively prepared or justified.</p> <p>Welcome the recognition in the Pre-Submission Draft Plan of the importance of the villages in the Borough and the need to plan for their growth as well as promoting the expansion of Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>Note the work the Council have undertaken in reviewing the Settlement Roles of the rural settlements and welcome the effort to simplify the proposed hierarchy.</p>	<p>Concerned that the approach to identifying the settlement roles and hierarchy is flawed and does not adequately reflect the sustainability of the settlements. We make this comment with particular regard to the identification of Frisby on the Wreake as a Rural Hub. For the reasons set out above, and to ensure consistency with the Council’s own methodology, it is considered that the Local Plan will need to be modified to identify Frisby on the Wreake as a Service Centre.</p> <p>This will help ensure the settlement hierarchy better reflects the sustainability of the rural settlements and will ensure the Local</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>However, there are some concerns that the distinction now being made between ‘Service Centres’ and ‘Rural Hubs’ does not ensure the sustainability credentials of the settlements are adequately reflected in the Plan.</p> <p>The 12 ‘Service Centres’ have been identified as such because they have the four ‘essential services’ of a primary school, a village hall, employment opportunities and broadband access. Frisby on the Wreake (Frisby) is identified in the Pre-Submission Draft Plan as a Rural Hub but it also benefits from a primary school, a village hall, access to employment opportunities and will have broadband access by the end of next year (ie. before the Melton Local Plan is anticipated to be adopted). Frisby will therefore soon, by the Council’s methodology, be categorised as a Service Centre, not a Rural Hub. It is the only one of the seven Rural Hubs that is set to have all four ‘essential services’ – including those other villages that are also due to get broadband in the next few years.</p> <p>In terms of the other criteria in the settlement matrix, Frisby benefits from a direct bus route to neighbouring towns and cities. This is like many (but we note not all) of the Service Centres, whilst Frisby is not within 500 metres of one of the identified ‘Service Centres’ or within 2.5km of Melton Mowbray, it is still closer to Melton Mowbray than all of the identified ‘Service Centres’ with the exception of Asfordby and Scalford. It is also closer to Leicester than almost all of the other Service Centres and Rural Hubs, with the exception of Gaddesby, Great Dalby and Somerby.</p> <p>In summary, it seems the only factor that prevents Frisby from being identified as a Service Centre is the provision of broadband access, which is scheduled to come to the village in December 2017. This exemplifies our concerns that the approach taken to established the Settlement Roles is flawed and unsound in that it is:</p> <p>Not Positively Prepared – in that it will not contribute to meeting needs in a manner which is consistent with</p>	<p>Plan directs development towards the most sustainable locations and therefore better meets the tests of soundness in terms of being a positively prepared and justified strategy.</p>	<p>attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered to be sound and Frisby is correctly identified as a 'rural hub' owing to the presence of all of the key services identified . Service provision and accessibility may change over time but the methodology applies allocations in the same way for Service Centres and it does to Rural Hubs and as such would not impact on the overall allocation and site selection process that follows.</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>achieving sustainable development;</p> <p>Not Justified – in that it does not appear to represent that most appropriate strategy.</p> <p>Following the considerable work undertaken to establish the settlement hierarchy, why is the proposed distribution of new development between the Service Centres and Rural Hubs determined solely by the size/ number of existing dwellings with limited regard to the very different sustainability credentials of these 19 settlements. By taking this approach, the Pre-Submission Draft Plan is not positively prepared or effective in directing growth to the most sustainable settlements.</p> <p>The strategy as draft will result in additional levels of housing being delivered in settlements that might be populated, but services are more limited, meaning the need to travel by car to neighbouring settlements is intensified.</p> <p>Notwithstanding these concerns, support is given to the proposals to redistribute the shortfalls from other settlements and the work the Council have undertaken in assessing and acknowledging the constraints to housing delivery in certain settlements.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Howard Blakebrough	<p>4.2.17 talks about Service centres of differing sizes and needs, but then the allocation of housing is essentially a mathematical exercise which ignores differences.</p> <p>4.2.17 distorts the process. Because no SHLAA sites were put forward in a number of villages then, instead of looking in detail at possibilities, this has been accepted and an increased allocation given to those with identified SHLAA sites. This is wrong.</p> <p>Subsequent to the SHLAA exercise landowners are already submitting applications for SHLAA sites. In Somerby outline applications exist for 62 houses (more than the 25 year need) and more may well follow. How will MBC control this?</p> <p>There is too much concentration on SHLAA sites. Somerby has an allocation of 49 houses by 2036. In the period from 2011 to present 24 have been completed or are in progress. In addition 21 are at outline or full approval stage. That leaves us 4 short with 19 years to go, so we will easily meet the target! Relying on SHLAA sites will inevitably force large developments (30+ houses) on to small villages, completely inappropriate.</p> <p>No attempt has been made to assess the ability of Somerby to cope with the expansion.</p>	<p>Take Somerby out of the Service Centre category.</p> <p>Look again at those settlements which have not put forward SHLAA sites and force them to take their fair share.</p> <p>Take account of recent historical and current housebuilding rates to assess achievability of targets and whether, therefore, SHLAA sites are needed in particular villages.</p> <p>Especially in the south of the Borough, cast the net wider than Somerby. There are villages which want appropriate development but are precluded by the rules. Resolution of this would be a win-win for both Somerby and the currently excluded villages</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. This approach is considered to be sound and Somerby is correctly identified owing to the presence of the key services identified. The 'reallocation' of capacity from villages with no available and suitable sites is not considered to have a significant impact upon the approach to the spatial strategy. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. consultations with key service providers have taken place to address the question of the capacity (in terms of infrastructure) of settlements to accommodate their allocation and oin the case of Somerby none has identified that this will not be possible, though expansion of the primary school is necessary but achievable. The Local Plan is the principal tool by which applications will be determined in future though this does not prevent additional proposals coming forward which will be considered on their merits under Policy SS3, including in settlementds other than Somerby.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>
Ian Jordan	<p>Recognise the ambitions for the growth of Melton, and like North West Leicestershire, concluded that you cannot delay the progression of your plan to wait for the publication of the new HMA-wide Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA). We therefore do not raise any objections to this approach, although you will appreciate that this may carry some risks for you.</p>		Noted	<p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
				documents to be published alongside consultation on 'focussed changes'
Ian Rochester	<p>I am opposed to the proposed increase in housing numbers.</p> <p>As a resident of Bottesford for the last 8 years my main concern lies with the increased risk of flooding with the increase of new housing and the hard impermeable surfaces that come with the buildings and associated infrastructure. Bottesford, my house included, are at risk of being flooded according to the Environment Agency maps – our house might just get away with it – however if more houses were to be built this would increase the runoff to the rivers rather than soaking into the land and I would imagine if building were to be on the land that is most likely to flood this would just change the nature of the problem and flood other houses that were at a low risk or no risk of flooding before. Therefore any increase in housing must properly consider the potential impact to the flooding and appropriate measures should be put in place to mitigate the increased risk of flooding.</p> <p>In addition Bottesford village has a very unique village feel to it whilst having schools and other local businesses, this must also be maintained with a sensible increase in housing numbers – it should be kept as a village and not turn into a sprawling town that is unable to cope. I know I will have to accept a certain degree of growth, but it must be proportionate and Bottesford should not be seen as a dumping ground because it does have some facilities, there are many other villages in the vale that could soak up some of the housing need, thus feeding employment in Melton, Bottesford and surrounding towns and villages and keeping those villages alive and desirable places to live.</p> <p>With regards to schools, Bottesford primary school, where my children attend, is full and you will be aware that they have had to build more classrooms to accommodate the extra pupils. This school in its present form would not be able to stand the increase in numbers proposed. Indeed there are some primary schools in the Vale that are struggling for numbers, so why not allocate some of the</p>		<p>One of the primary objectives of the Local Plan is to meet the area's future needs and in the context of evidence of a growing population and need for housing to accommodate it, and increase in the number of houses is considered necessary. Bottesford's population represents approximately 7% of the Borough's total, and the plan proposes it accommodates just under 7% of the Borough's growth requirements. Bottesford has a wide range of services and good transport links and is regarded as a highly sustainable location for housing development in its own right. evidence within the HEDNA 2017 shows that part of the HMA demand is generated by urban centres on the north and east of the HMA itself and Bottesford has a stronger relationship with such centres than with Melton Mowbray. The Highways Authority has not identified any capacity issues in the road network nor have the major junctions been deemed unsuitable for additional use. The issues of capacity of local services, and their ability to expand, have not been supported by the relevant agencies. The flood issues have not directly informed the spatial strategy set out in Policy SS2 but the site selections carried out to fulfil it have taken full cognisance of the most up to date information available (the SRFA 2015 and the 2016 update) including allowances for climate change, ensuring only those with lesser flood risk are selected and contain specific provision to alleviate their vulnerability and impacts, such that exiting properties will be placed at no increased risk. Housing growth is also proposed in the settlements referred to but at a level proportionate to their existing size and relative sustainability under SS2.</p>	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	housing need in those areas and keep those villages alive and therefore desirable places to live by keeping the primary schools – with schools, families will come, without, the villages will be less desirable?			
Ian Sparrow	The proposals to develop Bottesford are flawed because of the already severely congested village centre , the lack of facilities like drainage, doctors and schools and the risk of flooding .		The issues of capacity of local services, and/or their ability to expand, have not been supported by the relevant agencies. The flood issues have not directly informed the spatial strategy set out in Policy SS2 but the site selections carried out to fulfil it have taken full cognisance of the most up to date information available (the SRFA 2015 and the 2016 update) including allowances for climate change, ensuring only those with lesser flood risk are selected and contain specific provision to alleviate their vulnerability and impacts, such that existing properties will be placed at no increased risk.	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.
JELSON LIMITED	<p>FULL OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEED</p> <p>Policy SS2 – Development Strategy The Borough Council is obliged, in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF, to boost significantly the supply of new housing. Amongst other things, this means using the evidence base to ensure that the Local Plan meets the full objectively assessed needs (FOAN) for market and affordable housing in the housing market area (HMA).</p> <p>The Council must (i) determine what the FOAN is for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, (ii) through co-operation with its HMA partners, assess its own need, (iii) determine the extent to which it is likely to be able to satisfy this need, having regard to the provisions of the NPPF taken as a whole, and (iv) establish a housing requirement for inclusion in its Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council is asserting that its FOAN for housing for the period 2011 to 2036 is 6,125 dwellings (or 245 dwellings per annum). This is a figure that it has taken from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) produced for the Leicestershire authorities by GL Hearn in 2014.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the SHMA does not robustly identify the FOAN for market and affordable housing in either the</p>		The SHMA is recognised as out of date and the most up to date evidence is contained in the HEDNA 2017. The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving at a housing target for the Local plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. It has, as suggested, taken the identified OAN as a 'starting point' to identify its housing requirements and it is the latter to which the Plan responds. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available. is positively prepared and accords with national policy. The Council has a shared approach to accommodating the wider HMA needs and the Plan contains review triggers in policy SS6 should this give rise to a requirement to accommodate unmet need arising from other parts of the HMA beyond that provided for by the housing requirement level upon which the Plan is based.	<p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published alongside consultation on 'focussed changes'</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>housing market area or the Borough. It identifies the key components of need (demographic need, affordable housing need and economic need) and highlights where adjustments should be made to address issues relating to affordability and the delivery of affordable housing, but it does not draw this together in the form of a true FOAN. Instead, and without aggregating the various elements of need, it makes a series of assumptions, particularly about affordable housing, and then presents a FOAN range. For Melton Borough, the FOAN range for the period to 2036 is 195-245 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>The assumptions that GL Hearn has made when calculating the FOAN range are largely unsupported / unevidenced in the local context and are inappropriate. Moreover, by taking the approach that it has, GL Hearn has presented findings which it claims are 'policy-off' but are actually 'policy-on'.</p> <p>The Council is aware that it is widely acknowledged that the existing SHMA is out of date. For example Mr Justice Hickinbottom, in his ruling on the Oadby case ([2015] EWHC 1879 (Admin)), raised very considerable doubts regarding the adequacy of the GL Hearn SHMA for determining housing need.</p> <p>It must also be borne in mind that the identification of the FOAN by the SHMA is only the starting point for establishing the level of housing that should be planned for (i.e. what requirement should be set). The SHMA itself makes it clear that it is for individual LPAs to set their own requirement based on application of local policy objectives. There is no evidence that the Borough Council has done this. It appears simply to have defaulted to the higher end of the range set out in the SHMA. This, again, is not appropriate.</p> <p>The Leicestershire authorities have since commissioned a fresh assessment of their housing and employment development needs but this work has not yet been completed. Accordingly, the authorities do not yet know what their housing and employment development needs are and, in reality, are still some way off having robust data in this regard. As a consequence, whilst the authorities have had a dialogue and have agreed to work</p>		<p>ASFORDBY: The Hoby Road site has been assessed and found to be not suitable for development (permission was refused). It is anticipated that the development of 100 houses for which permission exists will take place in the Plan period and as such its inclusion is warranted (if discounted as an allocation as a 'commitment' this would simply be reflected in the residual requirement for Asfordby being reduced by 100). The Five Year Land Supply and Housing Trajectory Position (Nov 2016) and associated Delivery Trajectory explain that 'frontloading' the under-delivery of development from previous years would be unrealistic given the historic completion rates and sets out an approach to boosting land supply to the level required to meet needs in a realistic manner. This accords with the PPG guidance that refer to recovering past under delivery within the first 5 years of a Plan "where possible" (the uplift in delivery required in order to do so in the first 5 years of the Plan would be unrealistic- -more than double of exiting and recent rates - and therefore not possible). The document sets out that an adequate 5 year land supply is achieved. It includes a full detailed breakdown of the delivery expected to fulfil the identified requirements comprised from exiting sites/permission, those in the Plan and a small allowance for windfall, and will be regularly reviewed and updated.</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>together to determine what the development needs of the HMA are, their work has not informed and is not capable of informing the Melton Local Plan at this juncture. The result is a Local Plan that is not based upon up to date strategic evidence, or a strategy that considers/addresses cross-boundary issues in an appropriate way.</p> <p>The Council's decision to proceed with the preparation of its Plan without first knowing what its and the HMAs housing requirements and economic objectives are, and an agreement being reached with the other local authorities as to how this growth will be accommodated by the districts, gives rise to serious concern about the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>It follows that the figures that the District Council has relied on are not the appropriate FOAN figures to be used for setting the requirement for the amount of housing development it will deliver in its Plan.</p> <p>In the light of the above it is clear that:</p> <p>a) the Local Plan has not been positively prepared – it is not based on a strategy to meet objectively assessed development requirements (the District's requirements have not been objectively assessed);</p> <p>b) the Local Plan does not comprise the most appropriate strategy, the most up to date evidence indicates that the Council should be adopting a significantly higher housing requirement and re-defining its strategy to achieve this;</p> <p>c) the Local Plan is not consistent with National Planning Policy.</p> <p>Jelson has instructed GVA to undertake an independent assessment on the HMAs full objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing and the conclusions of this study will be made available to the Borough Council in due course.</p> <p>SPATIAL STRATEGY – ASFORDBY</p> <p>Policy SS2 proposes a settlement hierarchy whereby a</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>greater amount of development is proposed in the more sustainable locations. It proposes that 65% of the Borough's housing need is located in the Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area, while the other Service Centres (including Asfordby) and Rural Hubs will accommodate 35% of the remaining need.</p> <p>Table 3 suggests that Melton Mowbray requires 3,981 dwellings and Table 4 suggests that Asfordby requires 290 dwellings over the Plan period. General support is given to the strategy to propose a greater proportion of development in the higher order, more sustainable settlements of Melton and Asfordby.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.7 acknowledges the sustainability merits of Asfordby in identifying the settlement as a 'Service Centre'. Table 2 of the Draft Local Plan states that Service Centres are villages that "act as a local focus for services and facilities in the rural area" and "have the essential services and facilities (primary school, access to employment, fast broadband, community building) and regular public transport, as well as a number of other important and desirable services such that they are capable of serving basic day to day needs of the residents living in the village and those living in nearby settlements". This assessment of Asfordby is fully supported.</p> <p>Jelson has significant concerns regarding the overall housing need figure derived from the Leicestershire SHMA. The SHMA has been discredited at the highest level (in the courts) and is acknowledged to be out of date. If the Local Plan continues to rely upon the SHMA figures, it is likely to be found unsound. Jelison has instructed its own independent assessment of the FOAN and would be happy to discuss the results of this assessment with the LPA when available.</p> <p>Jelson supports the overarching strategy to locate the highest proportion of development in the higher order settlements of Melton and Asfordby (amongst others). The NSN is plainly a sustainable location for development and it would be beneficial to extend this area for development to include land to the east of Melton Spinney Road and to increase the overall number of dwellings to be allocated in this location.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Jelson fully agrees that Asfordby is a sustainable location for at least 290 dwellings. We suggest that the two identified Jelison land parcels in the village are considered as one site in accordance with the approved scheme for up to 100 dwellings. As this site has been granted outline planning consent, we expect that the site will be considered a 'commitment' (i.e. a recognised part of the housing land supply) by the LPA. It is expected that development will commence in advance of the Local Plan adoption. On this basis, it may not be necessary to include the land as an allocation. However, we would suggest that it remains in the emerging Plan in the meantime.</p> <p>The land directly to the west of the consented scheme in Asfordby (between Station Lane and Hoby Road) is also available and entirely suitable for development. This site would make a valuable contribution towards the village and District wide need and, accordingly, should be allocated under Policy C1.</p> <p>Finally, we fundamentally disagree with the strategy of backloading the housing supply and the claim that the plan will have a 5 year supply at the point of adoption (using the correct and NPPF compliant 'Sedgefield' approach). National planning guidance is clear that housing shortfall should be addressed within the first five years, rather than across a plan period and, accordingly, the Plan is unlikely to be found sound at Examination.</p>			
Jo Althorpe on behalf of Stephen Lee and the VB Trust	<p>In the case of Easthorpe Policy SS2 Table 7 sets out the development strategy, as 19 dwellings in relation to the "revised requirement to allow for dwelling distribution". The identification of Easthorpe as a 'rural hub' is supported, as set out in separate representations, as is the identification of a specific housing requirement for the settlement.</p> <p>However, for the reasons set out in separate representations made in respect of EAST1 and EAST2, it is considered there is capacity within the allocated sites for Easthorpe to accommodate a larger number of units over the plan period. It is considered that both EAST1 and EAST2 could accommodate "in the region of" 20 dwellings</p>	It is therefore requested that the "revised requirement to allow for redistribution" for Easthorpe is revised from 19 dwellings to 40 to allow for an increased yield on allocated sites EAST1 and EAST2.	<p>Consideration of representations on individual site allocations are addressed in comments responding to Policies C1 and C1A.</p> <p>All sites have been reviewed for deliverability and potential capacity and revised 'estimated capacities' are proposed under Policy C1 and its associated Appendix 1.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p> <p>Review capacities within consultation on focussed change of Policy C1 and associated Appendix 1.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	taking account of the constraints on site and the need to accord with the Framework's requirement for a site's potential to accommodate development to be optimised (paragraph 58 refers).			
John Moore	<p>The Council has based its population figures for Service Centres and Rural Hubs on Super Output Areas developed through the Office for National Statistics. Initially expressed by the Council as numbers of households in each Service Centre or Rural Hub they now appear in the Submission Draft Melton Local Plan (Table 4 on page 32) as population estimates. For example, Great Dalby was assessed in the report to Full Council on 19 September 2016 as having 227 households (4% of the population) which gave a requirement of 72 new dwellings. Table 4 of the Submission Draft also gives a requirement of 72 dwellings.</p> <p>Part of the problem with using Super Output Areas is that "Great Dalby" in the ONS Super Output Area comprises an extensive land area which includes part of the village of Great Dalby, Little Dalby, part of the village of Burton Lazars and extends to Brentingby. Yet when it comes to recording completions or dwellings under construction since 2011 only those in the village of Great Dalby itself are counted. (In this context it should be noted that outline planning permission has been granted subject to conditions and the completion of a S106 agreement for 30 dwellings to be constructed at the Sandy Lane Poultry Farm on land on the outskirts of Burton Lazars. This falls within the ONS Super Output Area.)</p> <p>It is not acceptable that Great Dalby should have a residual allocation of 67 dwellings based on the Super Output Area as Great Dalby is not a rural hub for the populations of Little Dalby and Burton Lazars.</p> <p>There are 183 households in Great Dalby (191 if outlying farms associated with the village are included). This represents 3% not 4% of the 6286 households identified as Service Centres and Rural Hubs in the report to Council on</p>	<p>Either the Great Dalby Super Output Area is retained in which case all completions and dwellings in Great Dalby, Little Dalby and parts of Burton Lazars since 2011 are recorded and count towards "Great Dalby's" residual requirement;</p> <p>Or the residual requirement for Great Dalby is calculated based on the population of Great Dalby and its outlying farms alone, i.e. 50 dwellings.</p>	<p>The use of SOA's as the basis for population calculations is considered the most suitable source of reliable and up to date evidence. Great Dalby did not receive any allocation due to site unavailability but developments coming forward in the village will be considered under Policy SS3. A new site has come forward and a change is proposed to allocate a site.</p>	<p>New allocation at Great Dalby is included in a proposed change to Policy C1 and its reasoned justification.</p> <p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	19 September 2016, and equates to the population-based approach expressed in Table 4 of the Submission Draft. 3% gives a requirement for 55 new dwellings but after taking into account completions and those under construction leaves a residual requirement of 50.			
JOHN RUST	<p>Not effective: Small-scale Unallocated Development .</p> <p>Outside of those sites allocated through the Local Plan, planning permission will be granted for small scale development of up to 10 dwellings in Service Centres.</p> <p>With the latest NPPF rule changes this will allow development of numerous site within a village of 10 dwellings without 106 contributions and affordable housing allocations.</p>	<p>Change to:</p> <p>development of 1 or 2 dwellings infill only for local need.</p>	<p>Applications considered under SS3 will require consideration of their contribution to sustainable development principles which can include housing needs (including affordable housing) and infrastructure impacts. The provisions of CIL Regs. 122 and 123 do not preclude contributions in all circumstances, but precludes 'tariff style' and imposition of affordable housing. It is proposed to amend the specification of numerical limits in order to allow improved responsiveness to local needs which will vary from place to place an develop over time.</p>	<p>Revise Policy SS3 as a focussed change for consultation with references to size of development deleted</p>
John Scutter	<p>Leicester and Leicestershire Employment Land Study, figure 4.13 shows an anticipated fall in full time equivalent jobs of over 2,000 between the years 2011 and 2031. This is based on Office of National Statistics Data/information. Table 2 of Employment Land Study Melton Borough Council shows a change in employment of 0.3%. The difference in the figures provided by these two reports are considerable. Nevertheless they do not indicate any substantial rise whatsoever in employment in the Borough.</p> <p>When these employment figures are measured against the Report for Housing Needs Study Prepared for Melton Borough Council, that is a projected population increase of 22% paragraph 1.28, and figure 1.5, the population growth and increase and the number of households from 21,490 (fig 2.12 page 29) by 6,125 is not sustainable development.</p> <p>Melton Borough Council Housing Needs Study. Provides a figure of 1,029 houses either built or deliverable supply. I have not checked the figures but I have been advised that since 2011 3,300 houses have either been built in the Borough or planning permission granted.</p>	<p>I would appreciate a clear statement in respect of houses built or permission granted.</p>	<p>A clear statement of the amount of houses built and permissions granted is available in the Five Year Land Supply and Housing Trajectory Position (2nd November 2016) and its July 2017 update. The most up to date evidence regarding economic needs and associated housing growth is contained within the HEDNA 2017 and associated Housing Requirements report and concludes that there will be significant job growth anticipated during the Plan period to an extent that it will 'outstrip' natural population growth by a significant margin. National Planning policy requires that strategies for housing growth and economic development are integrated and the Council consider it necessary and desirable to meet economic led needs as a key element of the Plan's vision, objectives and priorities.</p>	<p>Publish the revised Housing Land Supply Document (July 2017) as evidence alongside the Focussed Changes.</p> <p>HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published alongside consultation on 'focussed changes'</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Joseph Steele	<p>Gaddesby appears to have been upgraded to a rural hub. Two of the criteria relating to this upgrade the village doesn't meet.</p> <p>Access to employment opportunities - the suggestion that the 100 bus service could be relied upon to travel to work out of the village is ridiculous. The service has recently had a significant reduction to it's service due to being unsustainable, with a continued risk of the service being reduced further when reviewed in 2017. Residents without access to a car would be very isolated living in the village with no amenities such as a shop, post office etc.</p> <p>Superfast broadband - the actual delivered speed at the time of writing is 20mps or 40% of the advertised maximum 56mbps download speed. Given this failure to perform under the existing load of the village and surrounding areas, any additional load is likely to make the service deteriorate further. Many existing residents have not yet upgraded to fibre broadband, which means that when they do this would increase the load further thereby reducing the actual speed delivered even more. Presently areas of the village remain unable to get a mobile phone signal!</p> <p>Therefore the village of Gaddesby clearly doesn't meet the criteria to be classed as a rural hub and should be identified as a rural settlement. The surrounding highways are also of concern. The Plan states that the site to the northern edge of the village (Pasture Lane) is accessed via either of two 'well connected roads'. The roads in question being Rotherby Lane and Pasture Lane. As the name suggests, these roads are in fact lanes and are both unsuitable for more than the occasional vehicle. Rotherby Lane is single lane only for majority of it's length with several bends which blocks the view of any oncoming traffic - resulting in traffic at best only able to pass by using the grass verge. There have been fatalities on this lane in recent years. Both these lanes are very popular routes for dog walkers and with no footpaths and increase in traffic would only increase the risk of further casualties.</p>		<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered to be sound and Gaddesby is correctly identified as a rural hub owing to the presence of 3 of the key services identified .The proposed housing in Gaddesby and other villages represents the proposed approach to the provision and supply of the Borough's housing requirements overall.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>There is a weight limit on Ashby Road of 7.5 tonnes which demonstrates how minor the road is into the village from the A607. The proposed building site to the south of the village is proposed opposite the village hall and Gaddesby Primary School. At school drop off and collection times, cars are parked nose to tail along the school side of Ashby Road, making the road all but impassible and impossible for those that would be trying to emerge from the site. The village hall is occupied every weekday by a playgroup which is frequented by on average 25-30 children at any one time who are also dropped off and collected. In addition at certain other regular times cars are parked nose to tail on Ashby Road opposite the site. All this traffic makes the road dangerous to both motorists and pedestrians. Ashby Road is a busy road, which is narrow and has a sharp bend adjacent to the site which will make it impossible to see traffic coming around the bend for vehicles existing the site. Ashby Road is clearly totally unsuitable to service the existing traffic let alone the increased traffic that the proposed developments would generate. The highways issues have not been assessed when considering the sites proposed.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Julie Steele	<p>Gaddesby appears to have been upgraded to a rural hub. Two of the criteria relating to this upgrade the village doesn't meet.</p> <p>Access to employment opportunities - the suggestion that the 100 bus service could be relied upon to travel to work out of the village is ridiculous. The service has recently had a significant reduction to it's service due to being unsustainable, with a continued risk of the service being reduced further when reviewed in 2017. Residents without access to a car would be very isolated living in the village with no amenities such as a shop, post office etc. Superfast broadband - the actual delivered speed at the time of writing is 20mps or 40% of the advertised maximum 56mbps download speed. Given this failure to perform under the existing load of the village and surrounding areas, any additional load is likely to make the service deteriorate further. Many existing residents have not yet upgraded to fibre broadband, which means that when they do this would increase the load further thereby reducing the actual speed delivered even more. Presently areas of the village remain unable to get a mobile phone signal!</p> <p>Therefore the village of Gaddesby clearly doesn't meet the criteria to be classed as a rural hub and should be identified as a rural settlement. The surrounding highways are also of concern. The Plan states that the site to the northern edge of the village (Pasture Lane) is accessed via either of two 'well connected roads'. The roads in question being Rotherby Lane and Pasture Lane. As the name suggests, these roads are in fact lanes and are both unsuitable for more than the occasional vehicle. Rotherby Lane is single lane only for majority of it's length with several bends which blocks the view of any oncoming traffic - resulting in traffic at best only able to pass by using the grass verge. There have been fatalities on this lane in recent years. Both these lanes are very popular routes for dog walkers and with no footpaths and increase in traffic would only increase the risk of further casualties.</p> <p>There is a weight limit on Ashby Road of 7.5 tonnes which demonstrates how minor the road is into the village from the A607. The proposed building site to the south of the village is proposed opposite the village hall and Gaddesby</p>		<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st Septemer 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered to be sound and Gaddesby is correctly identified as a rural hub owing to the presence of 3 of the key services identified .The proposed housing in Gaddesby and other villages represents the proposed approach to the provision and supply of the Borough's housing requirements overall.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Primary School. At school drop off and collection times, cars are parked nose to tail along the school side of Ashby Road, making the road all but impassible and impossible for those that would be trying to emerge from the site. The village hall is occupied every weekday by a playgroup which is frequented by on average 25-30 children at any one time who are also dropped off and collected. In addition at certain other regular times cars are parked nose to tail on Ashby Road opposite the site. All this traffic makes the road dangerous to both motorists and pedestrians. Ashby Road is a busy road, which is narrow and has a sharp bend adjacent to the site which will make it impossible to see traffic coming around the bend for vehicles existing the site. Ashby Road is clearly totally unsuitable to service the existing traffic let alone the increased traffic that the proposed developments would generate. The highways issues have not been assessed when considering the sites proposed.</p>			
K Lynne Camplejohn	<p>The classification of service centres rural hubs and rural settlements in the south of the borough is not justified using the criteria the local plan has identified.</p>	<p>Review criteria for identifying service centres, rural hubs and rural settlements in the south of the borough.</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st Septemer 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered the most appropriate.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Karen Medhurst	<p>Service Centre:</p> <p>MBC is in error in classing Somerby as a service centre capable of absorbing a number of new large scale developments. The majority of services are at least 7 miles away from Somerby, only reached by households having cars given the limited public transport facilities available.</p>		<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered to be sound and Somerby is correctly identified as a serviced centre owing to the presence of all of the key services identified .The proposed housing in Somerby and other villages represents the proposed approach to the provision and supply of the Borough's housing requirements overall. consultations with key service providers have taken place to address the question of the capacity (in terms of infrastructure) of settlements to accommodate their allocation and in the case of Somerby none has identified that this will not be possible, though expansion of the primary school is necessary but achievable.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>
Lance Wiggins on behalf of Bottesford PC	<p>Bottesford Parish Council object to Policy SS2 in respect of the allocation of 447 new homes to Bottesford Parish (428 to Bottesford and 19 to Easthorpe). Such a level of development at Bottesford, would, if houses built since 2011 and an element of windfall construction are taken into account, increase the size of the Parish by 33%. From extensive consultation carried out as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process, it is clear that this is also unacceptable to the majority of the Parish residents, who have overwhelmingly supported the view that Bottesford should 'remain a village'. A recent survey circulated to all homes in the Bottesford village by a local resident has reinforced this position; 96.5% of 339 responses (Note that the names and addresses of all respondents are recorded) agreed with the statement: "I wish Bottesford</p>		<p>The local Plan overall is required to deliver approx. a 27% increase in housing supply to accommodate a population increase of similar magnitude, so growth of the scale proposed for Bottesford is broadly in keeping with the task required of the Local Plan. No evidence has been produced to suggest that Bottesford is anticipated to produce a different (lower) growth scenario that that which applies to the Borough as a whole. The growth proposed in Bottesford is of this order. Bottesford's population represents approximately 7% of the Borough's total, and the plan proposes it accommodates just under 7% of the Borough's growth</p>	<p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites, which results in a lower allocation for Bottesford.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>to remain a village, I understand that we must have some growth to meet requirements but strongly disagree with the 428 houses Melton Borough have allocated and they should reconsider these numbers". The 300 homes proposed for Bottesford in the Emerging Options (Draft Plan) document of January 2016 represents the maximum provision that can be accommodated without significant environmental harm to the character of the village as it would allow the village to evolve organically as it has done over earlier decades. This figure is still substantially higher than the number allocated to any settlement outside Melton Mowbray. Note that to reallocate the 147 additional homes proposed for Bottesford, an increase of 50%, to Melton Mowbray Town would result in an increase of less than 4% of the latter's allocation. It is recognised that it is in the interest of Melton Borough Council and all Parish Councils in the Borough that a Local Plan should be adopted, as failure to do so could result in unrestricted development, or government takeover of the Borough's planning activities. Nevertheless, for Bottesford Parish Council to support the adoption of the Melton Local Plan at inspection, it would be necessary for the Village's allocation to be reduced from the 447 in the Draft Plan to, as a maximum, the 300 in the Emerging Options (Draft Plan). The following response to the Draft Plan is therefore focused entirely on the proposed allocation of houses that are planned for Bottesford. Bottesford Parish Council has other concerns within the Plan but dwelling numbers and the increase of development sites required are the issues that cause the greatest anxiety. Other issues have been addressed in the Council's responses to Emerging Options, which remain valid and are not repeated here. The increased allocation has effectively invalidated much of the work carried out over the last two years on the Bottesford Parish Neighbourhood Plan. This work is now in abeyance, and will only be resumed when the allocation to Bottesford is reduced. Also of concern is a slide shown at the plan launch meeting on 8th November which identified Bottesford as an option for large scale development in the event of a shortfall in the planned delivery of housing in the Borough. This could mean up to 1500 additional homes. It does not appear in the printed plan (policy SS6 p49) but has not been explicitly ruled out by MBC. It is also not clear why reserve sites identified in the Draft Plan could not be used to</p>		<p>requirements. Bottesford has a wide range of services and good transport links and is regarded as a highly sustainable location for housing development in its own right. Bottesford is proposed to receive the second highest allocation reflecting the fact that it is the Borough second largest settlement and the second after Melton Mowbray in terms of service provision/availability. Evidence within the HEDNA 2017 shows that part of the HMA demand is generated by urban centres on the north and east of the HMA itself and Bottesford has a stronger relationship with such centres than with Melton Mowbray. It is considered that 'migrating' greater proportion of development to Melton would be less sustainable in terms of meeting this aspect of overall need. The 'Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015' assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough's housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance. This evidence is considered to remain valid. There is no rationale or evidence provided to explain that the level of growth proposed for Bottesford would result in it becoming a town rather than a village. Policy SS6 lists a range of alternative approaches that will be considered if there is a need to conduct a review of the Plan. The list is not exhaustive and those listed are examples, it is open minded about the range of options that may be available, including recognition that options may come forward that are not currently known. The policy proposes to evaluate the options if and when that time arises in order to identify the most</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>remedy any shortfall. Bottesford Parish Council's objection to the plan is based on four elements:</p> <p>1. Inadequacy of Consultation (Legal Compliance and Soundness) 2. Methodology for Allocation of Housing to Villages (Soundness) 3. Service Inadequacy in Bottesford (Soundness and Duty to Cooperate) 4. Constraints on Development in Bottesford (Soundness) Inadequacy of Consultation The process of consultation during the development of the Draft Plan was lacking or inadequate in the ways listed below. a) Through the stages of Issues and Options and Emerging Options the number of houses required to be built in Bottesford and Easthorpe increased from 250 to 300 by January 2016, and was then stable. When the Draft Plan was published this number was increased to 447 without any consultation. For over 2 years, Bottesford Parish Council, through the Bottesford Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, has been cooperating and sharing all their ongoing thoughts and plans with Melton Borough Council. However, when Bottesford Draft Neighbourhood Plan, which was based on the 300 figure, was sent to MBC Planning Department for comment shortly before the Draft Plan was published, none of the feedback received suggested that a sudden and substantial increase in the number of houses was under consideration. This demonstrates non-cooperation with significant consultees, and does not accord with 1.9.3 of the Draft Plan, which states 'MBC is working with Neighbourhood Plan communities to align ...aspirations' b) The Draft Plan also allows for 15% windfall developments, that is, building on sites which were not identified in the SHLAA and are not included in the site assessments in the plan. This could result in even more homes being built in Bottesford. c) Despite Bottesford having been allocated the largest number of houses of any village in Melton Borough, no public consultation meeting on the Draft Plan is scheduled for the village during the consultation period. An argument was given that an earlier consultation meeting was poorly attended, but, given the serious concern over the large increase in housing allocation, that would not be the case now. The lack of a further meeting undermines the consultation process. d) Given that Reference Groups met in Melton Melton Mowbray, it was easier for town residents to be involved in them; there is therefore no guarantee that rural areas of the Borough were adequately represented. e) At later meetings of the</p>		<p>appropriate approach and has not prejudiced this exercise by ruling in or ruling out any option at this stage. Addressing the specific points: 1. The Pre submission local plan was advertised and consulted upon in accordance with Regulation 19 and additional consultation measures were carried out in supplement. The criticisms listed are not requirements of the legislation and as such do not render the non compliant Plan. 2: The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) determined the approach to apportionment to villages taking into account their relative sustainability and size. The 'Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015' assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough's housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance. This evidence is considered to remain valid. 3. Consultations have been carried out with all significant providers of infrastructure and services and non has advised that facilities cannot accommodate the level of growth proposed and/or be expanded to do so. The Council has met in full its Duty to Co-Operate obligations with the named bodies, as set out in the DUTY TO COOPERATE STATEMENT (November 2016) and continues to do so. 4. Site selection process have taken into account all relevant constraints. See also 3 above in relation to Duty to Co-Operate which includes key service and infrastructure providers and 1 above regarding consultation requirements.</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Reference Groups, representatives of commercial concerns were not required either to identify themselves and/or to declare any financial interest. This is not within the bounds what is now considered to be good conduct, and is unacceptable. The influence of builder and developer interests was unclear and possibly excessive. f) The two Bottesford Ward Councillors, one as Chair of the Melton Plan Working Group and the other as Mayor, were unable to represent the views and interests of their constituents. The Working Group chairman has openly expressed her desire for more housing in Bottesford, contradicting the views of residents as expressed in responses to the November 2015 Survey/Questionnaire carried out by Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. g) The consultation process was essentially one way, MBC informing residents of their intentions. There is little indication that comments on the Issues and Options and Emerging Options documents made by the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, Bottesford Forum and individual residents have been taken into account during preparation the Draft Plan. h) There has been no consultation of local residents prior to including matters in Plan documentation. For example, an erroneous statement on a site in Bottesford based on a comment from Historic England could easily have been avoided. i) Paragraph 2.2.3 of the Draft Plan states that, for housing, Bottesford relates more closely to Nottingham and Grantham than Melton and Leicestershire. The Leicestershire and Leicester Strategic Housing Market Assessment in the Evidence Base for the Plan goes further placing Bottesford explicitly in the Nottingham Strategic Housing Market Area. Local Planning Authorities are required under the National Planning Policy Framework Duty to Co-operate to consult with neighbouring authorities and other public bodies throughout the plan-making process for strategic and cross-boundary issues. Appendix 2 of the Draft Duty to Cooperate Statement November 2016, also in the Evidence Base, shows no contact with South Kesteven Council, and minimal consultation with Rushcliffe Council. The fact that large scale housing development is taking place or planned for these two boroughs should alleviate the need for so many homes in Bottesford, and the lack of active consultation with the District Councils means that Plan is unsound and not legally compliant. j) Although paragraph 1.9.3 states</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>'MBC is working with Neighbourhood Plan communities to align ...aspirations', there is no mention in the Draft Plan of the evidence-based and consultative process and findings drawn together by the residents of Bottesford Parish in developing their emerging Neighbourhood Plan. MBC have been involved throughout this process and are aware of this evidence. There is no mention of this evidence within the Pre-Submission document, rendering parts of it unsound. k) In particular, there is no mention of the Bottesford Housing Needs Survey carried out by Midlands Rural Housing (with the assistance of local volunteers) on behalf of Melton Borough Council. The salient points of this survey were a need for more 2 bedroom homes, more bungalows, and more affordables. The need for affordables was shown to amount to 42% of all homes, in excess of the blanket 37% applied in the Draft Plan. This provides an example of how Melton Borough Council failed to consider the needs of individual communities, and ignored available evidence to support these needs. l) There is no mention of the Bottesford Forum, a large group of concerned local parishioners who invited MBC to a village event in April 2016. At the event they explained the rationale behind their concerns for such large growth in the Parish, and showed a large body of local evidence. Again there has been no mention of this evidence within the Pre-Submission document. Methodology for Allocation of Housing to Villages m) The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment, June 2014 table 85 p186 showed a range of possible housing needs for Melton Borough of between 195 and 245 homes per year (4875 and 6125 respectively over the Plan period). The Plan, in 4.2.1, claims that the higher build rate was 'objectively assessed' to cover maximum growth. This decision was at a time when adequate land for building at this rate and meeting the 5 year land supply target was not available and indeed this is still the case today. The higher build rate could have been phased in or subject to a review at year 5 of the Plan. n) The allocation of 35% of housing to rural areas appears to be arbitrary, in that no evidence is presented as to why this is the appropriate proportion. In the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group response to Emerging Options, it was suggested that at least 70% of housing development should be in Melton Mowbray town. o) The allocation of new homes to each village is mechanistic and</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>again largely arbitrary.o) Villages are classified into service centres, rural hubs and rural settlements on the basis of the simple existence of services regardless of their adequacy. Housing is allocated to the first two of these classes purely on the basis of existing population. This mechanistic methodology illustrates a lack of any strategy for rural areas and a failure to consider the needs of individual communities. Services and constraints were identified, but did not significantly affect allocations. In particular, all sites subject to flooding constraints should have been eliminated from consideration before allocating development to individual communities on the basis of the remaining available sites. p) The adequacy of services to meet the needs of existing and increased population is scarcely addressed. The need for certain communities to grow to maintain services, for example, to prevent the loss of a village school is not considered. In effect, the methodology prevents the emergence of new sustainable communities. It must be more nuanced and include a recognition that some communities are already near to their optimum size and others could grow more in order to attract more services and facilities. Similarly, the increased sustainability of villages close to Melton town is not reflected in the allocations. Development in these villages would reduce the need the need for travel to access employment, services and leisure, and would enhance the economy of Melton town. Some villages close to Melton have reserve sites which could be used.</p> <p>q) In addition, Bottesford is remote from Melton Mowbray, and contributes little to the Borough's economy.</p> <p>r) The Plan only covers sites offered by landowners in connection with the SHLAA process, and, as a result, it is likely that the most appropriate sites in some villages are not even considered. This contrasts with the situation in Melton Town where the North and South Sustainable Neighbourhoods are not comprised of SHLAA sites, and the willingness or otherwise of owners to sell for development is unknown. In rural areas, a similar pro-active approach should have been taken, with the Council taking a lead role in the planning of settlements by identifying the best land options and approaching the owners to see if they would be prepared to use the land for building. s) In the initial allocation based on population it was discovered that 5 villages did not have enough sites</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>identified in the SHLAA to deliver their allocation. The deficit of 162 homes was reassigned to other villages, again on the basis of population. Following this, two villages, Bottesford and Wymondham did not have enough sites to support their revised allocations. Consistent application of this methodology would require that these deficits also be reallocated to other villages.</p> <p>s) A major factor in the increased allocation of homes to Bottesford is an inexplicable increase in its stated population from 2993 in Emerging Options (P37) to 3525 in the Draft Plan. No such change appears for any other village identified in Emerging Options. The 2011 census figure for the Population of Bottesford is 3587, but this covers the whole parish. The presumed explanation for the change, then, is that the latter figure includes the populations of Normanton, Muston and Easthorpe whereas the former does not. As these three hamlets are regarded as independent settlements in both Emerging Options (Figure 5, p32) and the Draft Plan (Figure 6, p24 and Appendix 3), they should NOT have been included in the population for Bottesford village. The effect of this has been to increase both the initial allocation and the numbers of houses reassigned from other villages by almost 18%. Furthermore, as Easthorpe has its own independent allocation, its population has been double counted, firstly to calculate its own allocation and secondly to contribute to Bottesford's. These errors must be rectified and the housing allocation for Bottesford reduced accordingly.</p> <p>t) In Emerging Options, allocations were permitted for, and SHLAA sites were identified in rural supporter settlements, but this is no longer the case. Many people may prefer to live in small settlements, and there is no reason to suggest that they are not sustainable. In addition, the permitted size of windfall developments in many of these areas has been reduced from 5 to 3.</p> <p>u) Many SHLAA sites in Bottesford rejected as unsuitable in Emerging Options as a result of the application of objective criteria have resurfaced in the Draft Plan. This suggests some manipulation of criteria to achieve mechanistically determined allocations in unsuitable areas. As an example, sites located in Areas of Separation between Bottesford and Easthorpe and Bottesford and Normanton have been approved for development in the Draft Plan. This would be environmentally harmful and</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>unacceptable to Bottesford residents. Service Inadequacy in Bottesford. The availability of school, retail, post office, doctor's surgery, employment opportunities, public transport and leisure/community services and facilities has been used to identify Bottesford as a Rural Service Centre. However, with the exception of schools, no attempt has been made to determine whether or not the services and facilities are adequate to meet the needs of an increased population, nor are there any plans to ensure that this is the case. This was an issue even with the earlier allocation of 300 homes, and the subsequent 50% increase in the allocation makes it yet more unprofessional. This is in contrast to the situation in Melton Mowbray, where the need for such provision in the sustainable neighbourhoods has been recognised.</p> <p>v) Schooling provision seems to be adequate: the need for an extension to Belvoir High School has been recognised (8.4.4), although with a reduced allocation this may not be required.</p> <p>w) The two doctor's surgeries believe that they would not be able meet demand arising from a higher population</p> <p>x) Bottesford is predominantly a commuter village, and a significant part of the workforce of existing businesses does not live in the village. To grow the village without provision of employment opportunities which match the level of skills and education of the population will result in more people travelling to work. This is not consistent with the sustainability objectives of the Plan.</p> <p>y) The train service for Bottesford is inadequate at present, and would not support the level of growth being proposed, being two-hourly for much of the day and non-existent in late evening. Other Local Authorities on the Grantham to Nottingham line, which are also required to provide additional homes in their local plans, are in discussion with the rail franchise holder, East Midlands Trains, on improving their service. There is no indication that Melton Borough Council has undertaken similar discussions. The danger is that other communities on the line will get an improved service at the expense of Bottesford, where fewer trains may stop.</p> <p>z) Bus services are also deficient and would not support the level of growth being proposed; the route to Melton is tortuous and takes so long that it would not be preferred to the car option. Former routes to Bingham, Nottingham and Newark are now in abeyance; they are virtually non-</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>existent. The bus service to Grantham is reasonable, but is limited in the evening and does not run on Sundays. aa) The Draft Plan only considers the allocation of land for housing, and does not make site provision for new health facilities, employment opportunities (only existing sites are protected) or an improved retail offer. bb)At the public meeting organised by Bottesford Forum in April 2016, MBC stated that constraints and service issues, absent in Emerging Options, would be considered before, and included in the Draft Plan. This has not occurred. Constraints on Development in Bottesford.</p> <p>cc) Flooding is a constraint to development in Bottesford, much of the village being in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3. There was a major flood in 2001 and an Environment Agency flood alert in 2012. Flooding when it occurs affects the centre of Bottesford, and has a serious effect on village services. The Environment Agency informally recognises that Bottesford has the highest flood risk in the East Midlands, and discussions are ongoing to revise the EA flood maps. Paragraph 7.22.3.of the Draft Plan states: “sites at risk of flooding can only be allocated for development if there is insufficient land available in areas with lesser or no flood risk”. There many other sites in Melton Borough with lower flood risk than Bottesford.</p> <p>dd) The possibility of expanding health, retail and other services in the centre of Bottesford is severely restricted by land availability, the historic street pattern and, in particular, the Conservation Area. Meeting the needs of an increased population is not feasible in the village centre. ee)Traffic congestion is a problem in Bottesford, particularly at the start and finish of the school day. This can only get worse with the proposed increase in population, and no measures are included in the Draft Plan to alleviate it. Local Opinion Survey The following is a facsimile of the questionnaire distributed to all homes in Bottesford by a local resident. The total number of respondents agreeing with each statement is shown in the relevant box [Supporting Documents: No 61].</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Laura and Sarah Fitzpatrick	<p>Seek to increase the percentage level of growth intended for the Service Centres/Rural Hubs, re-classify the largest four Service Centres to recognise their importance in the Borough, and re-evaluate the distribution of development between centres.</p> <p>General Level of Growth and Policy SS2</p> <p>The overall level of housing and employment growth to be planned for within Melton Borough to 2036 is under review as part of the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment for Leicester and Leicestershire. Until the results of this exercise are published, and the Councils (particularly Leicester City) have demonstrated and agreed to accommodate their needs within their administrative area, it is not possible to comment on whether the 6,125 homes proposed for the plan period is robust.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Policy SS2 identifies that provision will be made for at least 6,125 homes between 2011 and 2036, and also references that at least 3,980 of these homes are to be built in the Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area (MMUA). However, this flexible approach is not reflected throughout the policy with reference to a proposed rigid percentage of growth to be allocated to MMUA (65%) and the Service Centres and Rural Hubs (SCRHs) (35%) and the reference to “remaining need (1,822) on a proportionate basis” in relation to the specific allocation for SCRHs.</p> <p>With reference to paragraph 182 of the NPPF, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) should be demonstrating synergy between each aspect of the policy approach and, above all, consistency with the overarching presumption in favour of sustainable development identified in Policy SS1 and the NPPF. To propose such a rigid percentage breakdown and remaining need figure of 1,822 for the SCRHs is contradictory to the flexibility provided in the phrase “at least” when referring to the overall provision of homes and the number that will be directed to the MMUA. This is not in accordance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF and such inflexibility in their approach to development in the SCRHs does not provide the “sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change”.</p>	<p>he the four largest SCRHs should be acknowledged for their high levels of sustainability and should be set above other SCRHs as higher order centres in the settlement hierarchy as previously proposed in the emerging Local Plan. They should in turn be allocated more development where it can be demonstrated that they have the capacity to do so.</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing and includes their prospect for future homeworking (i.e the presence of high speed broadband). The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. Service centres are distinguished from Rural Hubs and the lower order settlements, 'rural settlements' in this exercise based upon their range of facilities and sustainability in absolute and relative terms. The approach is based on allocating housing growth to the settlements which contain the factors considered most important to support sustainable growth and all service centres receiving an allocation have this in common. The ‘Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015’ assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough’s housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance to achieve the objectives of the Plan and improve sustainability and travel patterns etc. This evidence is considered to remain valid and the quantum allocated to Melton Mowbray the most appropriate approach. The SHMA is recognised as out of date and the most up to</p>	<p>The word 'approximately' to be inserted into Policy SS2 prior to the citation of "65%" and "35%"</p> <p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>HEDNA and ‘towards a housing requirement for Melton’ evidence documents to be published alongside consultation on ‘focussed changes’</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Rather, the LPA should provide more flexibility for development to be delivered across the Borough if required. It is not disputed that most development should be directed to the MMUA using phraseology such as “at least” but this approach also needs to be reflected throughout the policy. “At least” should also be noted for the housing target for the SCRHS and the references to percentage growth should equally reflect this approach by stating “circa 65% and 35%” rather than a definitive split.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, it is submitted that the SCRHS should be allocated more growth in any event. The NPPF states, that “to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities” (paragraph 55). The Planning Practice Guidance provides further guidance on this issue, stating:</p> <p>“A thriving rural community in a living, working countryside depends, in part, on retaining local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of these local facilities” (Rural Housing: Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20140306)</p> <p>Rural housing is therefore best directed to settlements where it can help sustain and enhance facilities and services. That is not to say that development in the lower order settlements should be completely restricted (also in line with national guidance), but the Council should consider redirecting rural growth to the more sustainable rural settlements, where it can be demonstrated that growth can be sustainably accommodated.</p> <p>Moreover, there are various references in section 2.3 of the PSD to the importance of supporting business development in rural areas. Specifically paragraphs 2.3.1 and 2.3.3 highlight the importance of business start ups in rural parts of the Borough where there is a growing trend for home working. It is also importantly acknowledged in paragraph 4.2.3 that a positive approach will be taken the rural economy and states that,</p> <p>“Plan policies should support the long term sustainability</p>		<p>date evidence is contained in the HEDNA 2017. The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving as a housing target for the Local Plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. It has taken the identified OAN as a 'starting point' to identify its housing requirements and it is the latter to which the Plan responds. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available. is positively prepared and accords with national policy. The Council has a shared approach to accommodating the wider HMA needs and the Plan contains review triggers in policy SS6 should this give rise to a requirement to accommodate unmet need arising from other parts of the HMA beyond that provided for by the housing requirement level upon which the Plan is based.</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>of the Boroughs villages, building on and furthering the attractiveness of the Borough for homeworking and small business start-ups...”</p> <p>Providing a higher proportion of homes in the SCRHS will provide the support needed to allow this sector to further expand and secure the long term sustainability of these businesses</p> <p>The SCRHS, and especially Long Clawson should be allocated a larger proportion of dwellings in order to support business development in the rural areas. This would wholly accord with the strategic housing objective of the PSD in developing a housing stock to provide for the future aspirations for the local economy.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.3.5 of the PSD identifies that aside from Melton Mowbray, Long Clawson is one of the most sustainable SCRHS and acts as a local service centre alongside other villages such as Asfordby, Bottesford, and Waltham on the Wolds. In addition, Map 1 of the Settlement Roles and Relationship Study 2015 shows how the settlement roles are spread across the Borough. The Study concludes that generally settlements to the north of the Borough perform better than those to the south in terms of sustainability. Map 3 of the Study shows the average service score for each community aggregated by Parish Area. The areas on the Map shaded purple, of which Long Clawson is included, show locations where access to services and employment are highest highlighting the north and west as the better served parts of the Borough.</p> <p>Long Clawson is considered to be a highly sustainable location for new development due to the availability of those local facilities and services which reduce the need to travel. The settlement is well served by public transport to enable journeys to higher order centres to be undertaken as an alternative to the motor car. Consequently, it therefore performs a key role in the Borough and as such it is considered that the settlement is an appropriate location to which a higher level of growth should be directed.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>The Proportionate Approach to Distribution of Housing</p> <p>Parallel to the above point, it is noted that, whilst Bottesford and Asfordby have been allocated higher levels of development than other villages (23% and 16% respectively), this is not reflected in the approach to Long Clawson and Waltham on the Wolds. We acknowledge that this is because the approach to development has been based on settlement size and population numbers rather than on sustainability credentials and land availability. It is submitted that the current approach is flawed as does not allow for higher levels of development in the most appropriate and sustainable locations.</p> <p>Allocation of development should be made on the capacity of settlements and existing infrastructure and services to accommodate additional development. The distribution of housing should be allocated based on levels of sustainability and the capacity of SCRHS to accommodate further development. A key soundness test of Local Plans is that they must be justified (NPPF, paragraph 182), meaning they must be based upon appropriate and proportionate evidence.</p> <p>In this respect, a review of the Settlement Roles and Responsibilities Report (SRRR) identifies that some villages are substantially less sustainable than others, yet they have been allocated relatively high numbers of dwellings due to higher population levels. This is especially evident in SCRHS such as Wymondham, Croxton Kerrial and Asfordby Hill which are to receive 6.1%, 5.1% and 5.7% of proposed development respectively but only fulfil 6, 7 and 8 of the 43 categories of the SRRR respectively when assessing the sustainability of each village. Appreciate and fully endorse that the allocation of 10.2% of the proposed development for Long Clawson is wholly appropriate given it fulfils 16 of 43 criteria of the SRRR, it is noted that it has only been given a higher level of development as it has a higher population than other settlements. As already stated, this approach is flawed and does not reflect the true sustainability of a settlement and the infrastructure or capacity of a settlement to accommodate anticipated levels of development.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>In relation to capacity to accommodate further development, it is noted that the tables at Policy C1 (A) of the PSD identify a capacity of 405 dwellings in Bottesford but it is proposed to allocate 427 dwellings at this location. Again, in the case of Wymondham there is capacity for 63 dwellings but it is proposed to allocate 68 dwellings to this village. Whilst settlements such Long Clawson have a capacity to accommodate 141 dwellings but it is proposed to allocate a mere 127 dwellings to this centre.</p> <p>This approach to the distribution of housing is clearly flawed and could lead to the plan being found unsound. Local Plans also need to be effective in order to meet the soundness tests at paragraph 182 of the NPPF. This means that Plans should be deliverable over the plan period, and in accordance with NPPF paragraph 47, need to identify a supply of deliverable and developable sites for housing. Overestimating housing number and deliverable or developable sites means the Local Plan is in danger of being considered unsound. Fundamentally, this approach will lead to issues when dwellings are delivered as villages could become akin to housing estates with unsustainable patterns of travel to other villages for services and facilities rather than being self sufficient villages in their own right. In addition, allocating more development to villages with less land capacity could lead to a shortfall in development, especially if developers seek to provide low density schemes on those allocated sites to assimilate with the character of surroundings.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
LCC (Highways, Education, Early Years, Waste, Property Assets, LLFA, Libraries & Culture, LRERC)	<p>Strategic Assets</p> <p>In relation to the County Council's role as landowner the key comments are:</p> <p>The Council supports the rationale for the distribution of housing (65 per cent Melton Town/ 35 per cent rural); however it notes the need for flexibility to ensure sustainable sites can be brought forward in lower tiers of the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>The Council's approach to the calculation of Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) and Employment Land Requirements is seen as sound and the headline housing numbers and employment land assessment are broadly accepted. However, the plan needs to demonstrate that it robustly addresses the duty to co-operate and that due account has been taken of any potential housing shortfalls within neighbouring Strategic Housing Market Area's (SHMA) or Local Housing Market Area's (LHMA). In order to be the OAN calculation to comply with the requirements of paragraph 47 of the NPPF account should be taken of the housing and employment needs detailed in the emerging HEDNA. Accordingly, both needs assessments should be considered as the minimum requirements of the Borough for the period to 2036.</p> <p>Policy SS2 – Development Strategy</p> <p>The rationale behind Policy SS2 which outlines the distribution of housing throughout the Borough with a minimum of 65% of housing concentrated in Melton Mowbray is entirely logical. This policy facilitates the delivery of necessary infrastructure through larger scale developments in Melton Mowbray whilst recognising the importance of supporting a prosperous rural economy, as detailed at paragraph 28 of the NPPF, enabling key rural settlements throughout the Borough to remain sustainable. Further, it recognises the positive role of Service Centres, Rural Hubs and other smaller settlements in contributing to the delivery of housing numbers. However, the distribution of housing throughout the lower tiers of the settlement hierarchy needs to have the</p>		<p>The SHMA is recognised as out of date and the most up to date evidence is contained in the HEDNA 2017. The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving as a housing target for the Local Plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. It has taken the identified OAN as a 'starting point' to identify its housing requirements and it is the latter to which the Plan responds. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available. is positively prepared and accords with national policy. The Council has a shared approach to accommodating the wider HMA needs and the Plan contains review triggers in policy SS6 should this give rise to a requirement to accommodate unmet need arising from other parts of the HMA beyond that provided for by the housing requirement level upon which the Plan is based. The 'Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015' assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough's housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance. This evidence is considered to remain valid</p>	<p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published alongside consultation on 'focussed changes'</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>flexibility to enable sustainable sites to be brought forward on an opportunity basis in order to maximise the delivery of housing where supported by existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Economic Growth and Town Centre</p> <p>Support the intent of the overarching strategy to provide for growth through a spatial distribution which seeks to strengthen the role of Melton Mowbray town further by directing approximately 65 per cent of the requirement towards the town and 35 per cent towards the villages.</p> <p>Work by Melton Borough Council following the withdrawal of the previous local plan (Melton Core Strategy) on a ‘Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015’ is noted. It is understood this has informed the urban rural balance in the Melton Local Plan Pre Submission Draft alongside assessment of three potential locations for new villages and associated sustainability appraisals. It is also understood that Melton Borough Council concluded that an increased focus of development on Melton Mowbray, delivered through two new sustainable neighbourhoods would have the greatest potential to realise the Vision for the Borough, but that it should not be at the expense of allowing some of the Borough’s villages to grow to become more sustainable and add to housing choice and delivery.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Leicester City Council	<p>'Section 4.2 – Policy SS2 'Development Strategy':</p> <p>This sets out the approach to objectively assessed housing need across the Housing Market Area (HMA), through the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2014. Policy SS2 sets out a housing requirement based on the agreed SHMA and this approach is supported by the City Council.</p> <p>The City Council also supports the statement at paragraph 4.7.6 which confirms that Melton Borough Council are 'committed to working collaboratively with other Authorities, including those within the Leicester & Leicestershire Housing Market Area, to update objectively the level of long term growth'.</p> <p>We note that the housing requirement set out in the plan seeks to address issues in respect of economic growth for the borough. If the housing requirement is above the emerging Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) objectively assessed need for the borough, this also will be expected to count towards addressing any unmet need which may arise in the HMA.</p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of a commitment to review the plan should the HEDNA and associated work to establish the scale and distribution of housing and economic land, including the emerging Strategic Growth Plan, lead to additional need to be accommodated within the Borough (paras 4.7.6-4.7.8). This is in line with a HMA wide agreement on local plan trigger mechanisms.</p> <p>SS2 also notes that :</p> <p>'Development will be expected to contribute positively to the provision of key infrastructure, including traffic relief within the town, to support its growing population and economy.'</p> <p>It should be highlighted that development will also be expected to contribute to the provision of key infrastructure where adverse impacts are identified from robust transport modelling on the wider highway network.</p>		Noted	<p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published alongside consultation on 'focussed changes'</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	<p>Fully support the recognition that the development requirements outlined in Policy SS2: Development Strategy are a minimum, and the flexibility that this part of the policy enables. Furthermore, we support the identification of Ab Kettleby as a Rural Hub, which alongside Service Centres, are to take 35% of the total residential requirement across the Borough. As we have stated above, we consider Ab Kettleby to be a sustainable settlement with good access to local services and facilities and therefore we agree that it is a suitable location to accommodate proportion of residential development. We are concerned that not all of the relevant issues have been taken into account when determining the amount of residential development that is required. Paragraph 158 of the NPPF states that ‘each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental prospects of the area’. The Councils of Leicester and Leicestershire are currently working on producing their Housing and Employment Development Needs Assessment [HEDNA] report and this is anticipated to be published in January 2017. The updated Objectively Assessed Housing Needs [OAHN] contained within this document are likely to have a significant impact on the residential requirements for the borough, and as such the current anticipated housing requirements are likely to require revising prior to the Local Plan’s submission in order for it to pass the tests of soundness.</p>	<p>With the publication of the HEDNA report anticipated for January 2017, we would suggest that it may be beneficial to delay submission and adoption of the new Local Plan until the Council has had an adequate opportunity to review its housing requirements, to reflect the updated OAHN included within this report. Furthermore, we consider it necessary for the Local Plan to remove the proposed limits on the amount of development allowed on an unallocated site, as the current policy would restrict the likelihood of affordable housing being delivered in rural areas.</p>	<p>The SHMA is recognised as out of date and the most up to date evidence is contained in the HEDNA 2017. The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving as a housing target for the Local Plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. It has taken the identified OAN as a 'starting point' to identify its housing requirements and it is the latter to which the Plan responds. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available. It is positively prepared and accords with national policy. It is proposed to delete the specified limitation ion Policy SS3 in order to allow for greater responsiveness, It does not prevent applications coming forward for affordable housing and there is also provision for 'exception sites'</p>	<p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>HEDNA and ‘towards a housing requirement for Melton’ evidence documents to be published alongside consultation on ‘focussed changes’</p> <p>Revise Policy SS3 as a focussed change for consultation with references to size of development deleted</p>
Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance,	<p>We fully support the recognition that the development requirements outlined in Policy SS2: Development Strategy are a minimum, and the flexibility that this part of the policy enables. Furthermore, we support the identification of Harby as a Service Centre, which alongside Rural Hubs, are to take 35% of the total residential requirement across the Borough. As we have stated above, we consider Harby to be a sustainable settlement with comparatively good access to local services and facilities and therefore we agree that it is suitable for a proportion of residential development.</p> <p>However, we are concerned that not all of the relevant issues have been taken into account when determining the amount of residential development that is required. Paragraph 158 of the NPPF states that ‘each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on</p>		<p>The SHMA is recognised as out of date and the most up to date evidence is contained in the HEDNA 2017. The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving as a t a housing target for the Local Plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. It has taken the identified OAN as a 'starting point' to identify its housing requirements and it is the latter to which the Plan responds. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available. is postively prepared and accords with national policy.</p>	<p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental prospects of the area'. The Councils of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area are currently working on producing their Housing and Employment Development Needs Assessment [HEDNA] report and this is anticipated to be published in January 2017. The updated Objectively Assessed Housing Needs [OAHN] contained within this document are likely to have a significant impact on the residential requirements for the borough, and as such the current anticipated housing requirements are likely to require revising prior to the Local Plan's submission in order for it to pass the tests of soundness.			
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	<p>Policy SS2 – Development Strategy</p> <p>Broadly support the balance of development envisaged in the policy, with the majority located around the main urban area, due to the capacity to accommodate the level of expansion required, and a greater opportunity to accommodate and integrate components/elements of the historic environment, e.g. landscape features within green infrastructure, the existing built environment, etc..</p> <p>Notable in this respect are the two northern and southern sustainable neighbourhoods, and the tiered development options outlined in SS2.</p>		Broad support is noted	None.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Leigh Higgins	<p>In the Southern Rural Area (SRA) SS2 and SS3 will not be effective for the Somerby Ward or the wider geographical area. It onnerously restricts growth in some villages which can, and need to, grow to support local amenities, encourage communities to stay together over the lifetime of the Plan.</p> <p>Gaddesby and Somerby are a significant distance apart and are only the two villages set for allocated growth in Southern Rural Area (SRA).</p> <p>South of the Somerby Ward are various hamlets in the Harborough District (Owston, Lowedsby, Marefield). These therefore are not likely to grow and add further pressure on the amenties to survive in the SRA.</p> <p>Land values in the SRA are higher than anywhere else in the Borough. The land resource should be considered in this context that it can drive higher CIL/Affordable/Starter Contributions.</p>	<p>Consider a policy for the Rural Northern Area and Rural Southern Area (similar to Melton North and South).</p> <p>Strongly Consider Villages as Clusters, operating with and alongside each other (Burrough on the Hill Appeal).</p> <p>Consider the relationship of Pickwell and Somerby closer.</p> <p>Consider the relationship of Twyford and John O'Gaunt closer. Yes SS3 works for John O'Gaunt SS3 probably does not for the larger settlement.</p> <p>Consider the access to facilities Thorpe Satchville, Twyford, Burrough on the Hill have with schools - Great Dalby, Gaddesby and Somerby.</p> <p>Consider, within SS2 and SS3, increasing the 10 housing to 11 in order to extract s106 on unallocated development.</p> <p>Consider the "premium" (9 for Somerby) allocated to be shared to other villages that have amenities albeit not a primary school.</p> <p>Some allocated land should/could come online later in the Plan's life, this should be open to be reviewed as the settlement grows or does not grow.</p> <p>Land values in the SRA are higher than anywhere else in the Borough. The land resource should be considered in this context that it can drive higher CIL/Affordable/Starter Contributions.</p> <p>Consider Public Houses as part of a village sustainability criteria.</p>	<p>The approach chosen is to direct the apportionment of growth in the rural area to the most sustainable villages. However read in conjunction with SS3 it does not preclude development in villages where no allocation is made provide they can positively contribute to sustainability. This would include applications configured to meet specific very local housing needs. It is recognised that needs will vary over time and from place to place and is therefore prosed to amend Policy SS3 so as to delete the strict application of size limits of 3, 5 and and 10 and allow the appropriateness of scale of proposals to be a matter of judgement based on the location concerned.</p> <p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing. However whilst considered, pubs were not identified as a key feature for this purpose. It is considered that extension of this approach to villages that did not 'qualify' as Service Centres or Rural Hubs would be harmful to the sustainable distribution of development that the Plan intends. There is an element of the approach of 'clustering' in the approach to 'rural hubs' in that Thorpe Arnold and Easthorpe have been included owing to their close proximity to Melton Mowbray and Bottesford respectively. however the locations suggested are no in such close proximity and the 'higher order' locations to which they may relate are themselves quite limited in sustainability terms.</p>	<p>Revise Policy SS3 as a focussed change for consultation with references to size of development deleted</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Lilian Coulson	<p>Support the Plan providing for a minimum of 6125 homes and some 51 hectares of employment land between 2011 and 2036 in Melton Borough. As a minimum this provides some flexibility if further need is identified or allows suitable sites that accord with policy to be additionally brought forward in due course. It states that 65% should be provided in the main town of Melton Mowbray and 35% in the Service Centres and Rural Hubs on a proportionate basis. This is again supported to provide for the longer term needs and sustainability and economic viability of these medium and smaller settlements, with proportionate distribution allowing for the needs of each settlement's population to be met . In particular, the allocation of enough land in the Service Centres will allow each to fulfil its designated role in the longer term.</p> <p>Furthermore, support the pragmatic and positive spirit of the policy which will permit additional windfall small sites to come forward by allowing Small Scale Unallocated Development of the size specified in the policy. This will again help retain viability and life in the smaller settlements on suitable sites and accords with the spirit and guidance contained in the NPPF for sustainable development. It is suggested that some flexibility be built in should a nominal increase in numbers be proposed (eg a site may be suitable for 12 rather than 10 houses in a Service Centre, for example) and it is suggested that the word 'around' be added, as this would tie in with the flexibility already shown by allocating the provision of a minimum of 6125 homes in the first place.</p>	Please see proposed minor amendment in Q3 above.	The approach chosen is to direct the apportionment of growth in the rural area to the most sustainable villages. However read in conjunction with SS3 it does not preclude development in villages where no allocation is made provide they can positively contribute to sustainability. This would include applications configured to meet specific very local housing needs. It is recognised that needs will vary over time and from place to place and is therefore prosed to amend Policy SS3 so as to delete the strict application of size limits of 3, 5 and and 10 and allow the appropriateness of scale of proposals to be a matter of judgement based on the location concerned.	Revise Policy SS3 as a focussed change for consultation with references to size of development deleted
Martin Lusty	Regarding Windfall sites we are proposing a limit of 3 dwellings per site in our emerging Neighbourhood Plan. This is on the grounds of suitable site availability in Waltham and Thorpe Arnold. This limit was proposed and generally supported at the recent public consultation sessions (reference report '16-11 WOTWATA Consultation Report ' to be emailed separately).	Request that the Local Plan choices reflect the views of local people as expressed in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Allow a limit of 3 dwellings per windfall site in Waltham on the Wolds and Thorpe Arnold.	Support noted. The NP has yet to be published nor has consultation been carried out to establish local resident's views. There is no evidence as to why 3 would be suitable limit in the villages listed, particularly Waltham which has strong sustainability based on its facilities and transport links.	The approach chosen is to direct the apportionment of growth in the rural area to the most sustainable villages. However read in conjunction with SS3 it does not preclude development in villages where no allocation is made provide they can positively contribute to sustainability. This would include applications configured to meet specific very local housing needs. It is recognised that needs will vary over time and from place to place and is therefore prosed to amend

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
				Policy SS3 so as to delete the strict application of size limits of 3, 5 and and 10 and allow the appropriateness of scale of proposals to be a matter of judgement based on the location concerned.
Martin S Herbert (Brown & Co) on behalf of M Hill, P Hill, Mrs M Hyde & Mrs P Pickup	<p>Firstly, whilst we feel that additional growth of both housing and employment land would have been sensible, we support the opening paragraph which says that the development must be at least 6,125 homes and some 51 hectares of employment land. This would help facilitate additional much needed sites to facilitate the provision of the growth needed in Melton Mowbray and the infrastructure required. However, in paragraph 3 we feel that in view of changing circumstances and indeed National Planning Policy, only 65% of the growth in Melton Mowbray is questionable. The number in the Service Centres should remain but there should be a refocusing of attention on Melton Mowbray and we are of an opinion the town should carry not less than 70% of the Borough's housing need. We disagree with the Policy on small scale unallocated development. When specifically numbers have been distributed in a special strategy, this could lead to further unwarranted growth restricting the sites available in Melton Mowbray. We would support the view that in Service Centres unallocated sites of, say, between 5–10 dwellings would be appropriate but in less sustainable locations, such as the Rural Hubs and Rural Settlements, the Policy should be reworded to remove that element of growth which is inconsistent with the Plan development strategy. Two maps are supplied in the representation and are in the supporting document section.</p>	<p>This would be achieved by redistributing the growth through the Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>Also we would suggest the deletion of the word “some” before 57 hectares. For example, by reducing the 35% figure to 25% would mean that there would be 1,300 houses to be allocated to the Service Centres which means that there would be then a net increase of 500 houses in the Melton area. This could be accommodated on site MBC/049/13 and would go a long way to help providing land for the EDR and much needed growth to help facilitate the infrastructure proposed.</p> <p>Delete reference to Rural Hubs and Rural Settlements</p>	<p>The ‘Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015’ assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough's housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance to need the Borough's needs and the Plan's priorities and objectives. This evidence is considered to remain valid.</p> <p>However read in conjunction with SS3 it does not preclude development in villages where no allocation is made provide they can positively contribute to sustainability. This would include applications configured to meet specific very local housing needs. It is recognised that needs will vary over time and from place to place and is therefore prosed to amend Policy SS3 so as to delete the strict application of size limits of 3, 5 and and 10 and allow the appropriateness of scale of proposals to be a matter of judgement based on the location concerned.</p>	Policy SS3 so as to delete the strict application of size limits of 3, 5 and and 10 and allow the appropriateness of scale of proposals to be a matter of judgement based on the location concerned.
Maurice Fairhurst	<p>Policy SS2 is too prescriptive and could prevent acceptable sustainable development in some settlements.</p> <p>More detailed comments are set out later.</p>	Remove reference to groups of 10, 5 and 3 dwellings	It is recognised that needs will vary over time and from place to place and is therefore prosed to amend Policy SS3 so as to delete the strict application of size limits of 3, 5 and and 10 and allow the appropriateness of scale of proposals to be a matter of judgement based on the location concerned.	Policy SS3 so as to delete the strict application of size limits of 3, 5 and and 10 and allow the appropriateness of scale of proposals to be a matter of judgement based on the location concerned.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
May Hall	<p>Gaddesby appears to have been upgraded to a rural hub. Two of the criteria relating to this upgrade the village doesn't meet.</p> <p>Access to employment opportunities - the suggestion that the 100 bus service could be relied upon to travel to work out of the village is ridiculous. The service has recently had a significant reduction to it's service due to being unsustainable, with a continued risk of the service being reduced further when reviewed in 2017. Residents without access to a car would be very isolated living in the village with no amenities such as a shop, post office etc. Superfast broadband - the actual delivered speed at the time of writing is 20mps or 40% of the advertised maximum 56mbps download speed. Given this failure to perform under the existing load of the village and surrounding areas, any additional load is likely to make the service deteriorate further. Many existing residents have not yet upgraded to fibre broadband, which means that when they do this would increase the load further thereby reducing the actual speed delivered even more. Presently areas of the village remain unable to get a mobile phone signal!</p> <p>Therefore the village of Gaddesby clearly doesn't meet the criteria to be classed as a rural hub and should be identified as a rural settlement. The surrounding highways are also of concern. The Plan states that the site to the northern edge of the village (Pasture Lane) is accessed via either of two 'well connected roads'. The roads in question being Rotherby Lane and Pasture Lane. As the name suggests, these roads are in fact lanes and are both unsuitable for more than the occasional vehicle. Rotherby Lane is single lane only for majority of it's length with several bends which blocks the view of any oncoming traffic - resulting in traffic at best only able to pass by using the grass verge. There have been fatalities on this lane in recent years. Both these lanes are very popular routes for dog walkers and with no footpaths and increase in traffic would only increase the risk of further casualties.</p>		<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered the most appropriate.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>There is a weight limit on Ashby Road of 7.5 tonnes which demonstrates how minor the road is into the village from the A607. The proposed building site to the south of the village is proposed opposite the village hall and Gaddesby Primary School. At school drop off and collection times, cars are parked nose to tail along the school side of Ashby Road, making the road all but impassible and impossible for those that would be trying to emerge from the site. The village hall is occupied every weekday by a playgroup which is frequented by on average 25-30 children at any one time who are also dropped off and collected. In addition at certain other regular times cars are parked nose to tail on Ashby Road opposite the site. All this traffic makes the road dangerous to both motorists and pedestrians. Ashby Road is a busy road, which is narrow and has a sharp bend adjacent to the site which will make it impossible to see traffic coming around the bend for vehicles existing the site. Ashby Road is clearly totally unsuitable to service the existing traffic let alone the increased traffic that the proposed developments would generate. The highways issues have not been assessed when considering the sites proposed.</p>			
Melanie Steadman	<p>If Melton is to take 65% of housing allocation, this means that Melton will grow by 8%. If Clawson is to take its allocation of 127 houses + windfall sites, then Clawson will grow by 15%. This is disproportionate. In addition, there is talk of developing all the sites in Clawson in "one hit" so that section 106 contributions can provide the school places necessary for these developments. Long Clawson school is currently over-subscribe, and is projected to be so until at least 2021. This is not sustainable. This is not well thought through and a "sticking plaster" approach has been taken towards our village infrastructure problems for a long time. This level of development will certainly not "enhance the level of sustainability" for Clawson.</p>	<p>Re-visit the Sustainability Appraisal and do more than a tick box exercise on it.</p>	<p>65% equates to approx 4000 houses for Melton Mowbray which is a level of growth approaching 40%, significantly more than 8%. The local Plan overall is required to deliver approx. a 27% increase in housing supply to accommodate a population increase of similar magnitude, so growth of the scale proposed for Long Clawson is broadly in keeping with the task required of the Local Plan. The LP makes not provision for phasing and developments amy come forward at various stages. the LEA has identified that the school can be expanded to a scale sufficient to accommodate the demand generated by the amount of development proposed in the Plan. Development in Long Clawson will ennhave sustainability by supportitng growth, co-ordinating developments with infrastructure provision, providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations and suppotng local services. the sustianbility</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation to Long Clawson.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
			appraisal was a detailed analysis of all polices measured against the applicable sustainability criteria , undertaken by expert consultants in this field. No evidence has been submitted to indicate that it is flawed.	
Melton North Action Group MNAG	<p>4.2.3 The Local Plan provides for 10ha of employment land to be added to Asfordby Business Park but the Distributor Road (comprising an improved St. Bartholomew's Way) will not provide any link to the south of the town i.e. the Leicester Road other than the existing on through the town creating even more congestion as a road to nowhere.</p> <p>4.2.4 Regarding the "essential criteria" to determine the role of a village, point 2 "access to employment opportunities" is not realistic given the rural nature of the borough. The only credible access can be by car as public transport is unreliable and in parts non-existent, and the roads in the town and borough are totally unsuited to cycling due to their narrowness.</p> <p>This is also true of the town. The idea that the Council should turn down planning applications in the borough just because residents cannot cycle or walk to work is ridiculous and unrealistic when considering the fact that the Borough is rural. As a result this part of the Local Plan is unsound due to lack of justification.</p>		<p>The Transport Strategy (including Distributor Road) will provide direct linkages to arterial roads leading to main transport routes and will alleviate traffic congestion in the town centre for the remaining traffic needing to traverse it. The completion of the Eastern Distributor Rd will allow connectivity between Asfordby Business Park and all arterial roads by routes other than the town centre. The inclusion of 'access to employment', along with other key criteria for the selection of villages attracting significant quantities of housing through site allocations addresses the NPPF requirement to seek to develop patterns of growth that facilitates improved opportunities for access by walking and public transport. It is not proposed to alleviate the need for use of a car but will assist in reducing the frequency of such use and the travel distances involved. More sustainable travel patterns are an objective of the NPPF and the relationship between housing, employment centres and transport links is one component of this.</p>	None proposed.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Michelle Galloway, Pegasus Group (on behalf of K & A Watchorn & Sons)	<p>Pegasus Group act on behalf of K & A Watchorn & Sons as the owner of land to the east of Melton Road, Waltham on the Wolds. The site is identified in Policy C1 (A) Housing Allocations as WAL2, capable of delivering 106 dwellings. It is also identified under Policy WAL2 Land East of Melton Road in Appendix 1 'Site Allocations and Policies' of the Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan. The northern part of the site has outline planning permission for up to 45 new homes (planning application reference 15/01011/OUT). The proposals include for access, landscaping, open space and affordable housing. The remainder of the site is subject to a recently submitted planning application for up to 60 new homes (application reference 16/00847/OUT). The application was submitted on behalf of K & A Watchorn & Sons in November 2016 and is yet to be determined.</p> <p>Policy SS2- Development Strategy sets out the Council's approach to the distribution of development across the Borough. As not all of the settlements have sufficient allocations with the capacity to meet their residual requirement, the 162 dwelling shortfall has been redistributed amongst the remaining Service Centres and Rural Hubs on a proportionate basis. For Waltham on the Wolds this has resulted in an increase in the housing requirement from 78 dwellings to 91 dwellings. This approach to distribution of housing to Waltham on the Wolds is supported. The site can deliver up to 105 dwellings, which together with the consented site for 26 dwellings off High Street provides a total of 131 new dwellings. Whilst this is an overprovision when considered against the residual requirement of 91, it is not a significant increase in numbers and the combined proposals do not present any technical issues that cannot be overcome.</p>		Noted	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p> <p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>
Miss Elizabeth Johnson	<p>Policy SS2 proposed the need for 245 dwellings per annum (6125 over the 25 year plan period). This is based on the SMHA 2014 document (OAN conclusions, 2011-36) in which Table 85 shows a range of between 195 and 245 dwellings per annum. The local authority has chosen the upper figure for this Local Plan.</p> <p>Reference is made in paragraphs 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 to the</p>		The housing requirement is selected as that Proportionate to Economic Growth in the evidence in order to realise the Plan's strategic priorities and objectives and integrate economic and housing development strategies. However, the SHMA is recognised as out of date and the most up to date evidence is contained in the HEDNA	Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Melton Employment Land Study 2015 and appears to indicate that the reasoning for the higher figure relates to Economic Growth predicted in the borough.</p> <p>However, the Melton Employment Land Study 2015 paragraph 2.45 states that "the Leicester and Leicestershire (HMA) Land Study forecast a very low level of employment growth for Melton, a 300 jobs net increase over 2010-2031, a 1.3 percent change on 2010. In part this reflects a drop in employment from 2012, which is not fully reversed until 2031...An employment decrease of this severity and duration is not forecast for any of the other local authority areas of Leicetser and Leciestershire."</p> <p>NPPF requires local authorities to ensure viability and deliverability.</p> <p>Paragraph 173 "Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened."</p> <p>Paragraph 154 states that "Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic" and the needs for plans to be objectively assessed is repeated in paragraphs 14, 47 and 182.</p> <p>Policy SS2 7th paragraph: Open Countryside: Outside the settlements identified as Primary and Secondary Rural Centres and villages identified as Rural Supporter and Rural Settlements new development will be restricted to that which is necessary and appropriate in the open countryside.</p> <p>The phrase "necessary and appropriate" is not clear and is open to interpretation.</p>		<p>2017. The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving at aq housing target for the Local Plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. It has taken the identified OAN as a 'starting point' to identify its housing requirements and it is the latter to which the Plan responds. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available. is positively prepared and accords with national policy.. The Plan has been the subject of viability assessment that demonstrates the infrastructure request are acheivabel, subject to am flexible approach to affordable houing and CIL.. The wording ion SS2 is socnsidered appropriate and in close compliance with para.55 of the NPPF whilst allowing responsiveness to a wide rang of proposals that may come forward over the plan period.</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Mr and Mrs C Richardson	<p>The population of Bottesford has increased by 92% over the last 40 years , whilst Melton’s has only increased by 36%.</p> <p>Over the next 25 years the projected development would be an additional 48% for Bottesford and only 33% for Melton</p> <p>This is unjustified. Bottesford is a rural village, and its residents have no wish for it to become a town. It is the very fact that it is a village that has attracted people to it.</p>		<p>The proposed development for Bottesford is some way less than stated. The local Plan overall is required to deliver approx. a 27% increase in housing supply to accommodate a population increase of similar magnitude, so growth of the scale proposed for Bottesford is broadly in keeping with the task required of the Local Plan. No evidence has been produced to suggest that Bottesford is anticipated to produce a different (lower) growth scenario that that which applies to the Borough as a whole. The growth proposed in Bottesford is of this order. Bottesford’s population represents approximately 7% of the Borough’s total, and the plan proposes it accommodates just under 7% of the Borough’s growth requirements. Bottesford has a wide range of services and good transport links and is regarded as a highly sustainable location for housing development in its own right. There is no evidence that the scale of growth proposed would undermine the village status.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation to Bottesford.</p>
Mr Don Pritchett	<p>Ref: Bottesford: Nationally with the exception of identified growth 'villages' with multi-authority support, such as the opening of stations to assist London connections, crudely, from my sample research, the extent of population growth at 2.3 persons per planned domestic home is about 9% to 18%.The population growth over 20 years at 427 homes for Bottesford with a current population of 3,500 is 28%.</p> <p>Bottesford is the work horse of the area and rightly marked for some development. I support minimal growth for the hamlets in the parish and smaller neighbouring villages. I will need to see traffic modelling, calming plans and related funding before I could support a further 427 houses for the (Bottesford) Parish. Also, it is likely that Bottseford falls short of current guidance on the safe movement of children around the community and availability of play areas. I would wish to see the latest guidance applied.</p>		<p>The local Plan overall is required to deliver approx. a 27% increase in housing supply to accommodate a population increase of similar magnitude, so growth of the scale proposed for Bottesford is broadly in keeping with the task required of the Local Plan. Consultations with service and infrastructure providers have not identified shortfalls in provision that cannot be rectified. However requirements associated with individual schemes will be examined through the application process.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation to Bottesford.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Mr M Brown	<p>The Spatial Strategy set out within Chapter 4 has been amended since the Emerging Draft Local Plan of January 2016 – this earlier version indicated a greater number of categories within the Settlement Hierarchy, with Bottesford, Asfordby, Waltham-on-the-Wolds and Long Clawson being identified as Primary Rural Service Centres, which were considered to offer the most sustainable locations to accommodate growth (after Melton Mowbray itself). The next tier of settlements, which incorporated Asfordby Hill, Croxton Kerrial, Frisby on the Wreake, Somerby, Stathern and Wymondham, were termed Secondary Rural Service Centres. Below this, fell the Rural Supporter villages, followed by the Rural Settlements.</p> <p>The Revised Settlement Hierarchy contained within the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan has entirely revisited this Settlement Hierarchy and now includes only two categories of ‘Service Centres’ and ‘Rural Hubs’. This re-categorisation now sees settlements which were previously classed as Rural Supporter villages – such as Hose and Harby – being considered as Service Centres. It also now classifies Frisby on the Wreake as a ‘Rural Hub’.</p> <p>This re-appraisal appears to be based on a very ‘broad brush’ approach, with little detail given as to how the settlements have been categorised. In addition, the reduction in the number of settlement tiers within the hierarchy gives little opportunity for important distinctions to be made between the villages. So, for example, we would argue that Frisby should be within a higher tier of the settlement hierarchy, owing to its superior facilities when compared to the other villages and primarily owing to its high level of accessibility to larger towns – Melton Mowbray and (in the case of Frisby) Leicester and Loughborough. Indeed, when comparing Frisby with other settlements, we would stress that Frisby scores well with a local shop/store, Primary School, Church, Public Transport provision (bus stops), Village Hall, Bell Inn Public House, etc</p> <p>The categorisation of Frisby should equate to an increased level of housing than that originally envisaged but the locations of this level of new development should again be reviewed.</p>		<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. This is summarised in paras. 4.2.4 and 4.2.5 of the Plan. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered the most appropriate and Frisby appropriately identified in this exercise and policies applied accordingly, including site allocation. The Council consider that there is little to distinguish many of the villages in terms of service provision and accessibility as illustrated by this evidence, and as such it is appropriate that they are addressed similarly by the Plan and its policies. The approach recognises the proximity of some settlements to Melton and other service centres and resulted in the inclusion of Thorpe Arnold and Easthorpe as a direct result. Reclassification of Frisby to a higher 'category' (service centre) would not affect its allocation under this approach which are based on their population size.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Policy SS2, which sets out the Development Strategy for the delivery of new homes, is supported in principle. In particular, the objective to deliver at least 6,125 new homes across Melton Borough between 2011 and 2036, thereby meeting the housing needs of all communities, is supported by our client. The NPPF seeks to "boost significantly the supply of housing" (paragraph 47) and it is considered therefore that this overall target for new homes should be seen as a minimum.</p> <p>However, the supporting paragraphs to Policy SS2 do not make clear how this housing target has taken into account the backlog of housing need across the area (as demonstrated through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, 2015, which indicated a housing land supply of just 1.9 - 2.5 years). Whilst it is recognised that this position has recently been updated through the Five Year Housing Land Supply Assessment of November 2016, we have serious questions about the robustness of this assessment and resultant calculation of housing land supply. The Local Plan should therefore provide a full assessment of how this backlog has been factored in to housing targets looking forward. In addition, in order to provide maximum flexibility to changing economic and social circumstances, it should be made clear that the housing target is not a ceiling to housing delivery and should be considered a minimum target for new housing provision.</p> <p>Whilst it is clear that growth is expected to be focused at the main Borough Town of Melton Mowbray, Policy SS2 does indicate that the villages are not to be left behind, with an appropriate scale of development being permitted to ensure they remain sustainable, thriving local communities. This approach is welcomed. However, the specific distribution of development between the various settlements within the hierarchy is questioned. Currently, the following distribution is envisaged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Melton Mowbray Urban Area – 65% - 3,980 homes - Rural Service Centres and Rural Hubs – 35% - 1,822 homes (on a proportionate basis.) <p>The following supporting Paragraphs 4.2.16 – 4.2.22,</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>including Tables 4 – 7, then set out a more detailed breakdown of how this housing requirement for the villages is to be proportionally divided between the various settlements. These paragraphs also appear to make clear however, that the overall requirement for each settlement is partially based upon the current availability of Sites – for example, the Service Centre of Scalford is shown (within Table 7) as not being required to provide any new housing throughout the entire plan period, with no allocations being advanced for this settlement, owing to the current lack of any available or suitable Sites.</p> <p>We believe therefore that this approach is somewhat flawed and that the Local Plan should not seek to be so prescriptive in terms of the overall housing numbers allocated to each settlement, but instead, should seek to provide percentage guidelines for growth over the plan period, thereby allowing sites to come forward throughout the plan period, which perhaps have not yet been advanced by landowners. This approach should not however, seek to place a ceiling on the number of dwellings to be provided in each settlement (as Table 7 currently appears to indicate), particularly if suitable, deliverable, developable and sustainably located Sites emerge during the plan period.</p> <p>Based upon a revised Settlement Hierarchy, as described above in Paragraphs 3 – 6, which places Frisby as a ‘rural hub’, we believe that our clients land should allocated along with land to the East which is now subject to a planning application for 48 units (LPA Ref: 16/00704/OUT). These targets for growth should not, it is emphasised be utilised to place an absolute ceiling to development however, should development proposals come forward throughout the plan period which offer the opportunity to provide sustainable development, whilst contributing towards the ongoing housing needs of the Borough.</p> <p>Therefore urge a reassessment of the housing ‘allocations’ in Frisby and ask Melton (and in due course a Planning Inspector) to assess if the land subject of an application currently which adjoins our clients land could actually be ‘connected’ thereby potentially resulting in other sites in Frisby being omitted.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Mr Richard Ling on Behalf of the Bottesford Forum	<p>The Forum considers that there is some confusion in the Pre-Submission Draft as to what constitutes Bottesford as well as the settlements of Easthorpe and Normanton. The Parish of Bottesford includes Bottesford, as well as the settlements of Easthorpe and Muston and it is this area which is referred to as Bottesford in chapter 1 of the Draft and depicted in the Figure showing the area of the Neighbourhood Plan. In the Spatial Strategy Chapter, Bottesford is defined as a Service Centre, Easthorpe a rural hub and Muston as a rural settlement. The Draft should be clear as to what it means when it is referring to particular places. This is important as development at Easthorpe will impact the services and facilities of in the settlement of Bottesford. The Forum would wish the final plan to be crystal clear as to what is meant by 'Bottesford'.</p> <p>Both Bottesford and Easthorpe are allocated housing sites in the Draft. This is presumably because the settlements are identified as being respectively a service centre and a rural hub. The village of Bottesford is a village and not a p town. Its service function outside the village is confined mainly to the Parish of Bottesford and would include the smaller settlements of Easthorpe and Muston. Surprisingly Easthorpe is designated as a Rural Hub, despite the fact that it is so close to the 'Service Centre' of Bottesford. Easthorpe has no services/facilities in contrast to Muston which formerly was a separate Parish and retains its own Parish Church, a communal building (the former village school) and is on a bus route to Bottesford and Grantham. The Forum considers that the Pre-Submission Draft is unsound in its classification as a rural hub. No proper evidence has been identified to justify this classification.</p> <p>The identification of Bottesford as a service centre should be properly addressed in that its service function does not extend to other rural settlements in the Borough Outside the Parish of Bottesford. Indeed, at a planning appeal inquiry in February 2012, regarding the Council's refusing of planning concept on one of the housing sites now being proposed in the Pre-Submission Draft - The Old Claypits Site - The Council stated (as reported in the 28th Feb 2012, issue of the Melton Times) that "Bottesford is a poor location for large scale housing as residents have to travel long distances for work, shopping and leisure - conflicting</p>		<p>The Plan identifies Bottesford, Easthorpe Muston and Normanton as separate settlements and they are subject to different policy approaches accordingly. This is clearly set out in Appendix 3.</p> <p>The inclusion of Easthorpe reflects its close proximity to Bottesford whilst Muston and Normanton are more distant and in the case of Muston 'severed' by the A52. Since th decision cited the NPPF has taken effect which requires a new approach to housing with the emphasis on delivery and an objective to "boost housing supply".</p> <p>Flood risk has been taken into account for each site and several are affected, but it is not considered Bottesford is so vulnerable as a whole to indicate no housing growth should be allowed – many sites are free from flooding or can be mitigated. Details of how such isseus are addressed to individual sites are included in responses to Policies C1 and C1A and the associated evidence and site assessments.</p> <p>Service providers have bene consulted and have not identified that services have either no spare capacity or the ability to expand to meet increased demand. The Highways Authority has not objected to the level of housing proposed or the individual sites .</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation to Bottesford and Easthorpe.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>with national policies aiming to reduce car use". The Forum agrees with this statement and considers that nothing has happened in the intervening period to change this assessment. The identification of major housing sites in and around the settlement by the Council is contrary to their views and assessment in 2012 and appears to be generated mechanistically because of the label of "service centre" applied to Bottesford and the proportionality approach in the Pre-Submission Draft set out in paragraphs 4.2.14 and 4.2.15 and Policy SS2. The Forum considers that the Pre-Submission Draft is unsound in the manner in which the function 'label' for the village has been used to generate a wholly unacceptable quantity of housing.</p> <p>The Pre-Submission Draft indicates six housing sites in Bottesford and two in Easthorpe. Policy C1 (A) identifies a capacity of 405 houses for the identified sites in Bottesford (with a settlement requirement of 427) and 22 in Easthorpe. This is a significant increase in the amount of housing identified in the draft plan of Jan 2016 which had a figure of 300 houses for Bottesford. The Forum objected to the scale of this figure and raised issues of flooding, road safety and traffic issues (both directly resulting from the location of development sites and indirectly from the additional traffic using road to the school and in the village centre) and stress on existing services along with specific issues regarding certain sites.</p> <p>On flooding and flood risk, the Pre-Submission Draft states in paragraph 7.22.3 that 'Local Plans are required to follow a 'sequential approach' to development whereby sites at risk of flooding can only be allocated for development if there is insufficient land available in areas with lesser or no flood risk'. It would be reasonable to assume the Council has followed this very sound national planning advice in its identification and allocation of development sites. This is not the case. Bottesford has a significant number of properties within it identified as being in flood zone 3 (413 or just under 30% of all properties) and ranks as one of the highest flood risk villages for flooding in the East Midlands let alone the Borough. Easthorpe is also similarly affected. In contrast there are many potential development sites elsewhere in the Borough which have a lower or nil flood risk. In particular, the identified Rectory</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Farm and Grantham Road Clay Pit housing development sites and their adjacent areas are subject to flooding and in part categorised as being in floodzone 3b (designed to flood as an alleviation method). Consequently any built development on these sites will increase the likelihood of flooding elsewhere in the village as a whole.</p> <p>The Melton Stratific Flood Risk Assessment of 2015 states that 22% of suggested development sites in Bottesford are in Flood Zones with the largest site - Rectory Farm - having just under half of its area in these floodzones. That report continues to identify Bottesford as being at risk from flooding from the river and the canal as well as from impermeable surface draining problems. In the last twenty years there has been a significant increase in the incidences of one in a hundred year flood events with two major flooding events in 1999 and 2001 the latter causing severe damage to buildings - so that the frequency classification for Bottesford has been changed to once in 75 years. the Entec Report of 2004 states that there are no flood alleviation options that can be implemented and that climate change over the coming years is expected to increase flood levels within Bottesford by 39cm.</p> <p>The consequences of flood risk analysis for Bottesford and Easthorpe is that before development sites are identified in these settlements, the appropriate flood risk assessments are undertaken and wider flood alleviation and drainage works identified and put in place prior to any development locations being implemented. The Forum considers that the lack of information of flood risk regarding the eight identified sites in Bottesford and Easthorpe means that the Pre-Submission Draft is unsound and is not compliant with National Planning Policy.</p> <p>Turning to road safety and traffic, it is expected that the additional housing proposed for the settlements of Bottesford and Easthorpe will create in excess of 3000 extra vehichular movements per day through the Local settlemntns. There is an existing lack of parking (on and off street) in the village centre which has been flagged up as a major issue so that an additional 450 houses in the two settlements will exacerbate this problem. There is therefor</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>the risk that the village residents will shop outside Bottesford adding longer distance car-journeys and undermining the Councils argument that the Draft will lead to sustainable development. A recent study identified that at school opening time on Barkerstone Lane, there are currently in excess of 500 vehicular movements which causes problems at the present. An additional 450 dwellings in the two settlements will compound this issue. At the Draft Plan stage in January 2016, the Forum raised specific road safety concerns if the Rectory Farm site was developed. These concerns have not been taken up or addressed by the Council but are still live issues. Finally there is a health issue caused by the increased traffic flow within the village but in particular around the centre of Bottesford with its sharp bends and limited parking spaces around the schools and health centre.</p> <p>With regard to stress on existing services, if the ratio of children to the number of existing houses is applied the proposed housing development in the two settlements, over 250 school-aged children would be generated. Depending upon when the development is implemented, this could cause an adverse impact of class sizes at the schools. It is well known that Local Doctors are overstretched and that proposed development could well add over 1000 people to the lists at a time when merging of village surgeries is likely to occur in 2017. Bus services are limited and unlike the stations at Bingham and Radcliffe in Rushcliffe Borough, Bottesford station is not receiving assistance to increase the number of stopping trains. Finally, both rain water run off and foul sewers in the settlement are coming under increasing pressure with gardens being under water on a regular basis in inclement weather, and sewers breaching.</p> <p>In summary with regard to the whole issue of housing land allocations in the two settlements, the forum considers that the Pre-Submission Draft is unsound in that the plan appears to be allocating development to Bottesford and Easthorpe because they have been identified as a service centre and a rural hub respectively, but that due attention has not been paid to the issues of flooding and flood risk,</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>road safety and traffic and that the stress on village services which exist at the present and will be compounded by the scale of development being proposed. The Forum objects to all the housing sites identified in the two settlements on the basis that insufficient attention has been paid to the major issues described above, no attempt has been made to redress existing issues before considering additional development and the Council has not addressed any of the comments made by the Forum and other local people at the Draft Plan stage of 2016, Council officers told the meeting that more work would be done to see if development sites had flood risk or highway/road safety problems as this analysis had not been undertaken. The Forum cannot see any publicly available information on the Councils website or in the Plan itself which addressed these concerns. These additional areas of work were if not promised Council expected by local people to be undertaken by the Council. The Forum questions the commitment of the Council to effective and pro-active public involvement and consultation in the plan making process. In this respect the Forum considers the Pre-Submission Draft to be not compliant with national planning policy and procedures with regard to public consultation and involvement.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Mr T and Mrs A Woollard	<p>A) UNSOUND:</p> <p>1) At no point in the Issues and Option and Emerging options literature was there any mention of the possibility of 427 homes in Bottesford plus 22 in Easthorpe. This huge late increase in numbers has only just been put forward (Policy C1 {a} on Pages 53 - 55) without any consultation with the residents and must therefore be classed as unsound.</p> <p>This increase in numbers now takes in sites which were previously rejected as they did not meet the Emerging Options criteria. What methodology and justification has been used in order to enable them to be acceptable now?</p> <p>2) It has been rumoured that another 1500 dwellings could be allocated to Bottesford if there is a shortfall elsewhere. Is this true and if so – WHY? Recently a Borough Councillor stated that this proposal had been rejected – but then so had so many others which have now been included so how can we believe this site would be any different?</p> <p>3) From the Plan it is clear that the village of Bottesford has been allocated far more houses than any of the other villages yet no Public Consultation event has been scheduled for Bottesford. How can this failure to provide the residents with an opportunity to ask questions/raise concerns and be listened to be classed as being open, transparent or sound?</p> <p>4) Allocation has apparently been calculated using existing populations – but this is flawed as no consideration has been given to the efficacy of current local services. Bottesford is already overstretched – the conservation area is being ruined by traffic and parked cars. More dwellings on the scale proposed will seriously exacerbate</p>		<p>The Plan differs from 'Issues and Options' having taken into account the responses received and evidence arising. It was consulted upon as Pre Submission Draft in November - Dec 2016 for 6 weeks in accordance with Regulation 19. The approach to site assessment leading to selection is provided in the individual site assessments where it can be seen that the same criteria has been applied to every site proposed. The proposed allocations on Bottesford are the only proposed and there is no 'reserve site' available. However, all options including sites at Bottesford would be considered if there was a review of the plan for any of the circumstances set out in Policy SS6.</p> <p>Bottesford is proposed to receive the second highest allocation reflecting the fact that it is the Borough second largest settlement and the second after Melton Mowbray in terms of service provision/availability. The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered the most appropriate. With the exception of Melton Mowbray, Bottesford has by far the widest provision of services (see Appendix B Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report, MBC, May 2016). The flood issues have not directly informed the spatial strategy set out in Policy SS2 but the</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation to Bottesford.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>the problem. The previous figure of a little over 300 could probably be accommodated reasonably near to the centre which would negate the use of more cars (there are already severe traffic control problems in the village centre). Some of the smaller villages nearer to Melton are more capable of absorbing a greater number of dwellings than those allocated to them irrespective of current population. In some instances smaller villages would benefit from more development in order to sustain what few services they have. So-called “unsustainable villages” could well die if more dwellings are not permitted – many villages are in particular need of smaller dwellings for those who wish to downsize in later life. Increasing the numbers in the villages closer to Melton would reduce the need to travel distances by car and would help the economy of Melton.</p> <p>5) Para 9 on Page 20 (Accessibility and Transport Objectives) advocates a reduction in the need to travel by car but without decent services this cannot happen. Services have not been studied in any detail. The fact that there are bus stops in Bottesford does not mean the village has a decent bus service!!! Currently the services to Newark, Bingham and Nottingham are a combination of non-existent and practically non-existent. Furthermore, there is only a limited day time service to Grantham. Were the operators consulted at all in order to ascertain the true facts? The train service too is limited – mainly 2-hourly and over the years local residents have been putting pressure onto the rail company to ensure that at least some of the trains using the line do in fact stop at Bottesford!</p> <p>6) Flooding – Bottesford has one of the highest flood risks (if not the highest) in the East Midlands and it would therefore be much more prudent to allocate more dwellings in villages with lower/negligible/no flood risks. To deliberately allocate sites with such high risks cannot be classed as justified or sound.</p> <p>B) NON-COMPLIANT WITH A DUTY TO CO-OPERATE (Inadequacy of Consultation):</p> <p>1) The Duty to Co-operate relates to neighbouring authorities, and the plan should consider the effect the</p>		<p>site selections carried out to fulfil it have taken full cognisance of the most up to date information available (the SRFA 2015 and the 2016 update) including allowances for climate change, ensuring only those with lesser flood risk are selected and contain specific provision to alleviate their vulnerability and impacts. No evidence has been submitted to support the view that congestion is 'severe'</p> <p>Duty to Cooperate has been undertaken with all neighbouring areas and none have emerged from South Kesteven or Newark and Sherwood. Within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA the publishing of HEDNA raises concerns regarding the future provision of unmet need and the Council has subscribed to a Memorandum of Understanding that these will be addressed through the strategic Growth plan. This needs to be considered adjacent o Policy SS6 which makes provision for review if the SGP presents a change in circumstances which is not catered for by the Plan.</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Melton plans will have on those authorities – and just as pertinently, the effects of their plans on Melton. Bottesford has already become a commuter village and because of the serious lack of public transport the majority of people travel to work by car. On Page 13 Para 2.4.2 it states that in Melton there are “severe delays to journey times when crossing the town of in excess of 5 minutes”, but it takes a similar time to pass through Bottesford village centre and get onto the very busy A52 even without any further housing. A rush hour trip to Nottingham can take 2 hours – we left home at 7:30a.m recently for a 9:30a.m hospital appointment and made it with just 5 minutes to spare! There is a very large scale development already under construction alongside the A52 at West Bridgford which will only make matters worse, as will any others in the pipeline planned by Rushcliffe BC and SKDC. If as claimed, Bottesford relates to Nottingham/Grantham rather than Melton, then surely dwellings built by all authorities nearer to these towns would help to reduce car travel. If serious consultation has not taken place with these authorities, then again this would also leave the plan unsound.</p>			
Mrs Elaine Exton	<p>Able to deliver sustainable development in accordance with NPPF - [See Supporting Documents - No 56] (Village categories). The Parish of Buckminster (inlcuding Sewstern) has been categorised as a "rural supporter". This is correct the villages have sustainable amenities and infrastrucuture see attatchments [See Supporting Documents - No 56] (List of amenities with photographs of signs and Letter from Anglian Water RE Sewers/Drains.</p>		Noted.	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.
Mrs G A Bradley	<p>I am writing to object to the Melton Local Plan. You are destroying Bottesford as a village and the infrastructure cannot cope. As a council you have destroyed the peace of my home by allowing a public footpath to be destroyed and my view of the church spire obliterated. I always thought that public footpaths were sacrosanct - you have destroyed that.</p>		Consultations with service providers have not supported the view that services in Bottesford cannot support growth and/or cannot be expanded to do so.	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation to Bottesford.
MRS NICOLA MORLEY	<p>The proposed developments are not driven by the policy and do not take the local surroundings needs into account</p>		The ‘spatial strategy’ sets out the approach to distribution and should be read in conjunction with the aims and objectives of the Plan as set out in Chapter 3 of the Plan	None Proposed

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Mrs Sarah Grey	<p>Housing Provision</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that the Local Plan should be based on adequate, up to date and relevant evidence (para 158) in terms of housing this is a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (para 159). The Local Plan should be based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing (OAHN) (para 182) based on evidence (para 47) with emphasis on joint working on cross boundary issues especially when housing needs cannot be wholly met within individual Local Planning Authority (LPA) areas (para 178 – 181). The 2014 SHMA is out of date which means that there is no clear evidence on an up to date OAHN, where housing needs will be met, if unmet needs arise or the role of individual LPAs in meeting any unmet needs. As the Melton Local Plan is based on these uncertainties it must be unsound because it cannot be positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy. Whilst there are benefits for development management purposes of having an adopted Plan these benefits should not outweigh the requirements for a sound Plan based on up to date evidence.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that the Leicester & Leicestershire HMA authorities seem unable to co-ordinate the production of supporting evidence and Local Plan preparation in a timely manner. The up to date Housing & Employment Needs Assessment (HEDNA) remains unpublished even though it is believed that this work has been completed. As a commissioning authority of the new HENDNA the Council must know the OAHN figures set out in the yet to be published report and whether the figure for Melton is above or below the proposed housing requirement of 6,125 dwellings for the period 2011-2036 set out in Policy SS2.</p> <p>Memorandum of Understanding</p> <p>All the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities have signed up to a Memorandum of Understanding which endorses figures for OAN covering 2011 to 2028 to correspond with the period covered by the Core Strategy. These are derived from the annual figures for 2011 to 2031 set out in the 2014 SHMA. Based on Strategic Housing Land</p>	<p>The housing land requirements calculations on which Policy SS2 is based should be modified to reflect the up to date Housing and Employment Needs Assessment (HEDNA) being prepared by the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA authorities and an updated Memorandum of Understanding between the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities.</p> <p>There should be no allowance for windfall sites. Instead a supply of specific, deliverable/developable sites to meet the full, objectively assessed needs should be identified.</p> <p>As part of our submissions on behalf of Mrs Grey we have identified an opportunity to provide for additional sustainable housing development that the Council should consider as an extension to an existing allocation.</p> <p>Please</p>	<p>The SHMA is recognised as out of date and the most up to date evidence is contained in the HEDNA 2017. The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving at a housing target for the Local plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available. The allocations within the local plan fulfill the OAN requirements and provide a large margin of flexibility. It is recognised that needs will vary over time and from place to place and is therefore proposed to amend Policy SS3 so as to delete the strict application of size limits of 3, 5 and 10 and allow the appropriateness of scale of proposals to be a matter of judgement based on the location concerned.</p> <p>The HMA authorities have agreed a revised Joint Statement of Co-operation Relating to Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (January 2017) which sets out its shared approach to the redistribution of any unmet need arising from the OAN identified in HEDNA via the Strategic Growth Plan process whilst also recognising that individual LPA's will need to proceed in advance of this with the production of their respective Local Plans. The provisions within the Melton LP provide flexibility to accommodate a significant amount of unmet need but in addition. Policy SS6 provided trigger points for review if there is more arising, setting out the process by which it will consider options to accommodate it. The 'windfall' allowance is informed on past trends which the Council consider will be achievable, and represent a much lower rate(21 pa) than has been achieved in previous (recent)years (70 pa).</p>	<p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>Policy SS3 so as to delete the strict application of size limits of 3, 5 and 10 and allow the appropriateness of scale of proposals to be a matter of judgement based on the location concerned.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Availability Assessments (SHLAAs), the Memorandum of Understanding also confirms that each authority considers that it can meet the upper figure for identified needs within its own area to 2028. However, the Memorandum of Understanding does not extend to 2036, the plan period for the Melton Local Plan. There is no evidence that housing needs to 2036 can be wholly met within individual Local Planning Authority (LPA) areas and therefore if unmet needs do arise whether Melton Borough should play a role in meeting those unmet needs.</p> <p>Windfall</p> <p>The Local Plan should identify a supply of specific, deliverable/developable sites to meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing. Instead, the Local Plan relies on the delivery of windfall sites throughout the plan period to help meet objectively assessed needs even though there is no compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area nor will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. It is important to note that the National Planning Policy Framework definition of ‘windfall’ states ‘they normally comprise previously-developed sites that have unexpectedly become available’. The ‘windfall’ sites allowed for by the Draft Melton Local Plan are essentially greenfield sites.</p>			
Pegasus obo Davidsons Developments Limited	<p>(precis by VA) Pegasus act for Davidson Developments Ltd who have land interests off Sandpit Lane, Long Clawson. The site is identified as LONG4, for 55 dwellings. Fully support the allocation. Site is currently subject ot an undetermined planning application for 55 dwellings (16/00032/OUT) refers.</p> <p>As not all settlements have sufficient allocations with the capacity to meet thier residual requirement, the 162 dwelling shortfall has been redistributed amongst the remaing rural hubs and service centres on a proportionate basis. For Long Clawson, this has resulted in an increase of housing requirement from 110 to 127 dwellings. This approach to distrubtion of housing to Long Clawson is supported. Whilst this stie, together with others identified oversupplies against this requirment, it is not a significant increase in numbers and the combined proposals do not</p>		Noted	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	present any technical issues that cannot be overcome.			
Peter Bailey	NHS centralisation issues as identified in Chapter 2.	NHS centralisation issues as identified in Chapter 2.	Consultation responses from Health providers have advised that exiting local facilities will meet capacity but that they will need to expand in certain circumstances. This can be incorporated as an element of CIL and/or s106 contributions on a case by case basis.	None Proposed
Philip David Baigent	In the original draft plan Gaddesby was deemed to be a “rural supporter”. A rural supporter is identified by a clear scoring methodology (attached to this representation) in relation to role and functions of a settlement within a spatial strategy. The criteria used in the Melton Local Plan Settlement Roles and Relationships of April 2015 (MLPSRR) were much more extensive and sophisticated than the four used in the latest draft plan and that Gaddesby was very much at the lower end of the rural supporter range of 10 to 20 points with 12. Why the change? Gaddesby has been upgraded and a greater proportion of housing proposed than any other village. Of the four current criteria comments two are agreed, Primary School and Community Building. Access to employment opportunities is not agreed for the reasons in relation to bus services and employment sites. The suggestion that the 100 bus service can be used to get to work is incorrect. The 100 bus service runs very infrequently and does not run at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Gaddesby is the closest settlement in the Borough to Leicester and it is there that most people go to work rather than to Melton. A village meeting discussed the plan and 74 villagers attended and when we asked for a show of hands not one indicated they work in Melton. The only suitable bus to Leicester leaves Gaddesby at 07.49 and the last bus leaves Leicester at 17:10. In other words it is impossible to use the bus to attend work full time in Leicester. Further Leicestershire County Council will review the contract next year (2017) and there is a risk that it will be withdrawn. The suggestion that there is access to employment opportunities is incorrect and requires re-assessment because of the lack of public transport. There is minimal employment within Gaddesby itself. Fast broadband is not accepted because although Gaddesby’s phone exchange has been “upgraded” in 2016 as part of the “super-fast” Leicestershire program, there isn’t a lot of choice of provider. This broadband service is	1. The methodology of selecting which villages should be the subject of development should be revised and if not revised Gaddesby should be reassessed as a rural settlement for the reasons set out in the Gaddesby Community Group Representations. 2. GADD2 should be deleted from the plan as a proposed housing allocation, for the reasons set out in the Gaddesby Community Group Representations. 3. GADD3 should be deleted from the plan as a proposed housing allocation, for the reasons set out in the Gaddesby Community Group Representations.	The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered to be sound and Gaddesby is correctly identified as a rural hub owing to the presence of 3 of the key services identified. The proposed housing in Gaddesby and other villages represents the proposed approach to the provision and supply of the Borough's housing requirements overall. The HA has not objected to the increase in traffic associated with the growth in Gaddesby and information from the LEA indicates capacity will be available in the local Primary School based on current projections.	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation to Gaddesby.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>sold as “up to” 56Mbps download speed, which is more than adequate for an average modern home. The actual delivered speed of writing is 20Mbps or 40% of the advertised maximum, which is the same as the pre-upgrade ADSL offering. Any additional load is likely to make the service deteriorate further. Many existing residents have not yet upgraded to fibre broadband, which means that when they do, this would increase the load further thereby reducing the actual delivered speed further. In the neighbouring village of Queniborough, the broadband speeds can be over double the delivered speed in Gaddesby. Gaddesby does not therefore enjoy the requisite three of the four criteria to qualify as a rural hub and should therefore be classed as a rural settlement. The methodology now proposed is unacceptable as being simplistic and unsound. The criteria should include more day to day facilities in the methodology such as a food shop, GP surgery, library, post office, primary school and pub. Not many rural villages will have employment facilities, those that do should be higher up the hierarchy and receive more development, and that facilities such as a food shop and doctors surgery are just as important as broadband in reducing the need to travel. There should also be more differentiation between the settlements, perhaps a return to the Primary and Secondary Services Centres previously proposed. A housing needs survey has not yet been carried out by Melton Council. Apparently the Council are to carry this out in the New Year (2017). If so how can it be said that there is a need for housing in Gaddesby? The Council have taken into account the 14 permitted dwellings at GADD1 but have not taken into account the 5 houses for which permission has been granted on Ashby Road (12/00530/FUL) and the one further dwelling at The Hall (15/00826/FUL). In reality Gaddesby has already been allocated 6 houses which, when added to the 55 houses allocated in the daft plan, takes the total allocation to 61 new houses. This cannot be sustained or justified for the reasons set out in there representations. Appendix 2 of MLPSSR it will be seen that over the period 1994 to 2014 on average one new house was built in the village every year. On the assumption that this continues and additional 20 houses will be built over the life of the Plan. Paras 4.2.21 and 22 of the draft Plan state that Gaddesby has markedly higher percentage of proposed housing than any of the other villages. There are</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>currently 158 houses in the village itself. An increase of 61 would be a 38.6% increase and would clearly change the nature of the village. When the additional 20 houses likely to be built from “natural growth” are included, this pushes the figure up to an increase of 51.2%. The calculation by estimated population of the villages at 4.2.21 and 4.2.22 of the draft plan is unsound. It is the number of houses which is material. The A607 is already a very busy road as it leads to the Hobby Horse roundabout and the A46. Both these roads are over capacity certainly. It is not unusual to be queuing from Syston/Queniborough/East Goscote all the way to the Hobby Horse. The junction between Gaddesby Lane and the A607 is very dangerous and one sometimes has to wait minutes to join the A607. In addition, Rearsby Lane (which connects Gaddesby Lane to Ashby Road) is a busy, narrow and winding road with is already unsuitable for the existing traffic burden placed on it. If the 61 (or more) houses were built this is likely to add another 120 plus cars to the mix. This impact has not been assessed by the Plan. There is a weight limit throughout Gaddesby of 7.5 tonnes, which demonstrates how minor the roads are into the village. Only in 2014 did the school intake increase to 25 each year from 15. Years 2, 1 and reception are therefore already at capacity. The catchment area for the school includes Barsby, South Croxton, Ashby Folville and almost to Queniborough and attracts pupils from further afield. Within 4 years the school will be at capacity and therefore there is no requirement to fill spaces with new families coming into the village. Having only recently been substantially extended, it is unrealistic to suggest that the school will be capable of further expansion in the short/medium term.</p>			
Priscilla Else	<p>Object to Melton Borough Councils proposal to expand Bottesford. Amenities and services in the village are already overstretched and accommodating a large number of houses will exacerbate all the existing problems and change the character of the village forever. The escalation of traffic and parking is already insufferable.</p> <p>The vale is a special area which deserves to be protected and as a resident of Bottesford, I vehemently oppose the proposed development.</p>	The vale is a special area which deserves to be protected.	Consultations with service providers have not supported the view that services in Bottesford cannot support growth and/or cannot be expanded to do so.	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation to Bottesford.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
R H B Ranns	<p>FIRST REPRESENTATION The arbitrary allocation of 35% of all new housing to be located in rural areas has no sustainable justification and is contrary to Policy IN1.1. If the aim of the Local Plan is to persist with arbitrary allocations, then to define sustainable development as a 3% increase from an achieved 62% in the last 15 years to 65% for Melton Mowbray is insignificant. Arbitrary allocation should aim for a more substantial improvement. Housing allocation in rural areas should be by local need as outlined in the NPPF. The Plan should co-operate with the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan 2016 at 4.19;- "Within the rural areas, we will therefore consider how we can provide land for housing and employment growth, proportionate to the needs of local residents and businesses, together with infrastructure, subject to environmental capacity. " New settlements, identified in 4.2.11 of the Local Plan can take any further housing demand which is expected to be linked to employment opportunities in the West of the Borough, if this cannot be accommodated within Melton Mowbray. The Six Hills proposed development fulfills this role and is close to the existing Borough employment sites identified at Policy EC3 (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vi), (vii), and (viii). Spreading housing development in the rural settlements on a "fair" (4.2.1) basis rather than by sustainable local needs is not correct. There are only three currently classified service centres to the south and west of Melton Mowbray and nine to the north and east, away from identified future growth. Again this is contrary to Policy IN1.1</p> <p>THE SECOND REPRESENTATION (If the first representation is overruled)</p> <p>The definition (and subsequent allocation of housing to) of Service Centres at 4.2.4 identified as having a primary school, access to employment, fast broadband and a community building is incorrect and has not been consulted on since the work on the Emerging Options Local Plan where seven requirements were listed. The Emerging Options Local Plan had only four Primary Rural Service Centres with six Secondary Rural Centres. There was little differentiation between Secondary Rural Centres (often based on outdated information) and the next classification of Rural Supporter. At the reference group consultations it was suggested that the category of Secondary Rural Supporter be abolished and a single category of Rural supporter (now called a Rural Hub) be</p>	<p>THE FIRST REPRESENTATION</p> <p>- Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan 2016 developed by all relevant authorities is sustainable and should be incorporated and, within the rural areas, land for housing and employment growth, proportionate to the needs of local residents and businesses, together with infrastructure, subject to environmental capacity. Development in villages is considered as being based on local need at 6.5.1 and 6.8.1 of the Local Plan and is also a direct consequence of Policy IN1.1 which is incompatible with arbitrary allocation.</p> <p>SS2 Development Strategy</p> <p>Para 4 - rewrite as</p> <p>Rural communities will provide land for housing and employment growth, proportionate to the needs of local residents and businesses, together with infrastructure, subject to environmental capacity. Any shortfall will be considered in new settlements linked to employment opportunities in the West of the County, if this cannot be accommodated within Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>THE SECOND REPRESENTATION</p> <p>- Service centres to be redefined as villages with several retail outlets and local employment opportunities as well as the other criteria set out.</p> <p>THIRD REPRESENTATION</p> <p>- Four the avoidance of doubt Croxton Kerrial should not be classified as a Service Centre.</p> <p>FOURTH REPRESENTATION</p> <p>- Rewrite table 4 to correct the population estimate to 415 with revisions to tables 5, 6 and 7 resulting in a revised figure for Croxton Kerrial of 57 houses.</p>	<p>FIRST REPRESENTATION: The Strategic Growth Plan is yet to be developed. Policies SS6 provide for review of the Local Plan with specific reference to the SGP and any variation to the need requirement arising from it, setting out options to be considered in this eventuality. The 'Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015' assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough's housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance to achieve the objectives of the Plan and improve sustainability and travel patterns etc. Six Hills village and other large sites proposals were considered as part of the Assessing Large Scale Development Site Options (July 2015) against a series of environmental and sustainability criteria but was not selected in favour of other large sites. The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered to be sound and Croxton Kerrial is correctly identified owing to the presence of the key services identified. SECOND REPRESENTATION: The Review of the</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>created. Instead the Pre-Submission Local Plan has upgraded eight settlements to Service Centres, which have no comparison with the original Primary Rural Centres, giving a total of twelve. There has been no consultation on this obvious mismatch. Whereas re-classification of the additional Service Centres as Rural Hubs will not alter the allocation of housing numbers under the current system, which is disputed, it removes these from the application of Policy SS3 for approval of small scale developments of up to ten dwellings. 100% of residents at the 13 Dec 2016 consultation at Croxton Kerrial Village Hall on the Local Plan held the view that a range of retail is necessary for a village to act as a local Service Centre as identified in the Local Plan at page 93; 6.16. By the same margin residents supported that 4.2.4.2 should read "access to Local employment" to make it sustainable.</p> <p>THIRD REPRESENTATION If the definition of Service Centre is retained then Croxton Kerrial has been incorrectly identified as a Service Centre, it does not have access to local employment and the restrictive bus service does not permit residents to access the main areas of employment (Melton/Grantham) at the beginning and end of the working day. It is on a road that leads to both towns but if this is the definition of sustainable then every village in the Borough would be considered sustainable.</p> <p>FOURTH REPRESENTATION</p> <p>The calculation of the population of Croxton Kerrial at 530 is incorrect as it is based on the 2011 Census for the ward of Croxton Kerrial and Branston and assumes all 221 dwellings are in Croxton Kerrial. Elsewhere the Plan has allowed adjustment of ward census results based on housing numbers using a factor of 2.5. The representor has produced a "Households Number" table, divided into detached, semi-detached and terraced households in four time periods from pre 1935 up to 2000+ as reference. This gives a total population of 415 and residents at the 13 Dec 2016 consultation at Croxton Kerrial Village Hall required this figure to be used.</p>		<p>Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing. This methodology is considered to be appropriate. It includes access to employment opportunities but retail availability is not considered to be a key factor in determining sustainability.</p> <p>THIRD REPRESENTATION: see comments above regarding The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016).</p> <p>FOURTH REPRESENTATION: populations for the purposes of the allocation are based on ONS mid term estimates calculated to SOA level which are considered to be the most reliable data sources available.</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Ricahrd Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	<p>Objection to the ‘methodology of allocation of houses’. The total build within the Parish could approach 500 dwellings and increase the size of the Parish by 33%. The location of Bottesford in relation to Melton and the flood risk to the Parish seem to have been largely ignored. The increase to 447 is unacceptable and this reflects the unanimous decision of the Bottesford Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. The Steering Group can also demonstrate from extensive consultation as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process that this is also the view of the majority of the Parish residents. Reducing the number to 300 dwellings to be built in the Plan Period to 2036 would be acceptable and manageable. Bottesford Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group recognise that it is in the interest of Melton Borough Council and all Parish Councils in the Borough that a Local Plan should be adopted and the ramifications should it fail. Despite disagreement with some findings, there are many positive points about the Melton Local Plan and support is indicated on some policies. Bottesford Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group’s objection to the soundness of the plan is based on three elements: 1. Process of Allocating Housing; 2. Inadequacy of Consultation; and 3. Service Inadequacy in Bottesford (Soundness)</p> <p>1. Process of allocating housing. The strategy of allocating houses is not appropriate over a 20 year Plan. The methods used suggest a tactical approach to share out the required number of houses. The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment, June 2014 table 85 p186 showed a range of possible housing needs for Melton Borough of between 195 and 245 homes per year (4875 and 6125 respectively over the Plan period). The Plan, in 4.2.1, claims that the higher build rate was ‘objectively assessed’ to cover maximum growth. The higher build rate could have been phased in or subject to a review at year 5 of the Plan.</p> <p>The numbers split between Melton Mowbray and the rural areas seems arbitrary and without foundation. The numbers allocated to Melton Mowbray are inadequate to complete the infrastructure required and additional housing in the town will not only allow the improvement in facilities but will meet their objectives, and make the town more competitive with surrounding larger towns. In the Bottesford Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group</p>		<p>The Local Plan overall is required to deliver approx. a 27% increase in housing supply, so growth of the scale proposed for Bottesford is broadly in keeping with the task required of the Local Plan. The flood issues have not directly informed the spatial strategy set out in Policy SS2 but the site selections carried out to fulfil it have taken full cognisance of the most up to date information available (the SRFA 2015 and the 2016 update) including allowances for climate change, ensuring only those with lesser flood risk are selected and contain specific provision to alleviate their vulnerability and impacts, such that exiting properties will be placed at no increased risk. 1: MBC consider the figure of 245 per annum (6125) necessary to meet the vision, priority and objectives set out in Chapter 3. The lower options suggested in the SHMA would not facilitate the necessary infrastructure, housing choice or economic (workforce) supply and as such would be misaligned with the economic strategy for the area. It would also undermine 5 year housing land supply requirements if the Sustainable Neighbourhoods were retained in order to provide infrastructure necessary for the Borough to unlock its economic potential and restrict housing choice by creating an over concentration within Melton Mowbray and lesser opportunities elsewhere. No evidence has been submitted to support the view that the allocation to Melton Mowbray is insufficient to support the required infrastructure. This conflicts with the conclusions of the Local Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Study, Cushman & Wakefield, October 2016 and 2017 update. The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation to Bottesford.</p> <p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>HEDNA and ‘towards a housing requirement for Melton’ evidence documents to be published alongside consultation on ‘focussed changes’</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>response to Emerging Options, it was suggested that at least 70% of housing development should be in Melton Mowbray town.</p> <p>The allocation of new homes to each village is mechanistic and again largely arbitrary. Villages are classified into service centres, rural hubs and rural settlements on the basis of the simple existence of services regardless of their adequacy. Housing is allocated to the first two of these classes purely on the basis of existing population. This mechanistic methodology illustrates a lack of any strategy for rural areas and a failure to consider the needs of individual communities. Constraints were identified, but did not significantly affect allocations. All sites across the Borough subject to flooding constraints should have been eliminated from consideration before allocating development to individual communities on the basis of the remaining available sites.</p> <p>In Emerging Options, allocations were permitted for, and SHLAA sites were identified in rural supporter settlements, but this is no longer the case. Many people may prefer to live in small settlements, all part of housing choice. Also, the permitted size of windfall developments in many of these areas has been reduced from 5 to 3.</p> <p>The allocation of housing to only 19 of the 74 villages in the Borough without a thorough investigation of the adequacy or utilisation of the facilities is not in line with sustainable development. Allocating such small numbers to windfall developments will be insufficient to fund any facilities improvements to make those locations more sustainable. They will become more unsustainable and contrary to the statements in the Plan regarding allowing villages to become more sustainable.</p> <p>In the initial allocation based on population it was discovered that 5 villages did not have enough sites identified in the SHLAA to deliver their allocation. The deficit of 162 homes was reassigned to other villages, again on the basis of population. Following this, two villages, Bottesford and Wymondham did not have enough sites to support their revised allocations. While we consider the process flawed, consistent application of this methodology would require that these deficits also be reallocated to other villages.</p> <p>There are reserve sites for over 540 dwellings identified in Policy C1(B) It is unclear why some of these sites should not be used to address any shortfall.</p>		<p>applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered to be sound and Bottesford is correctly identified as a 'service centre' owing to the presence of the key services identified. The limits to development in 'lower order' settlements is considered necessary in order to maintain the spatial strategy devised in the Plan and ensure it is effective in terms of sustainable patterns of development and reducing dependency/travel distances, as required by the NPPF. Whilst it is noted that smaller schemes in such locations may not add to facilities, they can still contribute to sustainable development by supporting local services and assisting to address needs, which is a requirement of the criteria of the applicable Policy SS3. The redistribution of housing on a proportionate basis was similarly selected in order to maintain the central objective of the spatial strategy (use of reserve sites would redirect significant quantities of development to locations that perform less well in sustainability terms in the spatial strategy. However since then sites have become available in all of the relevant settlements and the redistribution exercise can be avoided.</p> <p>2: Publicity and consultation was carried out in accordance with reg. 19 of the Local Plan Regulations and complemented by a series of measures in addition, for example public 'drop in' sessions and social media 'mailshots'.</p> <p>3. Consultation responses from service and infrastructure providers have not supported the view that facilities cannot accommodate the level of growth anticipated for Bottesford in the Local</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>The adequacy of services to meet the needs of existing and increased population is scarcely addressed. The need for certain communities to grow to maintain services, for example, to prevent the loss of a village school is not considered. In effect, the methodology prevents the emergence of new sustainable communities. It must be more refined and include a recognition that some communities are already near to their optimum size and others could grow more in order to attract more services and facilities.</p> <p>There is no strategy to minimise car miles by building at locations closer to Melton Mowbray which is by far the most sustainable location in the Borough. This would also support the plan to provide more employment opportunities in the area where all the business expansion in the Borough is to take place. Some villages close to Melton have reserve sites which could be used. Also, Bottesford is remote from Melton Mowbray, and apart from taxation it contributes little to the Borough's economy. Bottesford residents use Grantham, Bingham, Newark and Nottingham for employment, leisure and retail rather than Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>Bottesford has seen an increase in the allocated housing of almost 50% from 300 dwellings as the residual amount calculated from the Emerging Options document (January 2016) to a figure of 447 in the November 2016 Draft Melton Local Plan. In addition the numbers on the main site at Bottesford were reduced without real justification and contributed to the increase in the number of sites necessary in the Parish by a factor of three.</p> <p>If the 147 additional homes proposed for Bottesford were reallocated to Melton Mowbray Town it would have far less impact on the Borough and would actually help in funding the infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>A major factor in the increased allocation of homes to Bottesford is an inexplicable increase in its stated population from 2993 in Emerging Options (P37) to 3525 in the Draft Plan. No such change appears for any other village identified in Emerging Options. The 2011 census figure for the Population of Bottesford is 3587, but this covers the whole parish. The presumed explanation for the change, then, is that the latter figure includes the populations of Normanton, Muston and Easthorpe whereas the former does not. As these three hamlets are regarded as independent settlements in both Emerging</p>		Plan.	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Options (Figure 5, p32) and the Draft Plan (Figure 6, p24 and Appendix 3), they should NOT have been included in the population for Bottesford village. The effect of this has been to increase both the initial allocation and the numbers of houses reassigned from other villages by almost 18%. Furthermore, as Easthorpe has its own independent allocation, its population has been double counted, firstly to calculate its own allocation and secondly to contribute to Bottesford's. These errors must be rectified and the housing allocation for Bottesford reduced accordingly.</p> <p>Many SHLAA sites in Bottesford rejected as unsuitable in Emerging Options as a result of the application of objective criteria have resurfaced in the Draft Plan. This suggests some manipulation of criteria to achieve mechanistically determined allocations in unsuitable areas. As an example, sites located in Areas of Separation between Bottesford and Easthorpe and Bottesford and Normanton have been approved for development in the Draft Plan. This would be environmentally harmful and unacceptable to Bottesford Parish residents.</p> <p>A slide shown at the plan launch meeting on 8th November identified Bottesford as an option for large scale development in the event of a shortfall in the planned delivery of housing in the Borough. This indicated a development of up to 1500 additional homes. The site appears in the supporting information Assessing Large Scale Sites. Support is given to Melton's view that this is an unsuitable site.</p> <p>While the use of the SHLAA process may be the norm it does not always allow villages to grow in a planned way rather by what land is available and deliverable. When we started to look at development in Bottesford, as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process, we employed Brian Quinn and Professor Colin Haylock of CABE to help us identify the features of the Parish that deserved protecting. We also wanted to identify the best sites on which to build which would add to the village. In a series of Workshops, facilitated by these gentlemen, a set of criteria were produced which in a subsequent survey of Parish residents, produced an agreement rate of at least 80% of those responding. These agreed criteria have been used to score the available sites in addition to the assessment work carried out by Melton Planners.</p> <p>Whilst it is understood that Melton Borough Council does</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>not have to consider incomplete Neighbourhood Plans in their deliberations they have been constantly advised of our survey findings The fact that some of the sites, now proposed, go completely against our criteria and the known wishes of the Parish residents is of concern and demonstrates that these findings from recorded results were not taken into account.</p> <p>The increased allocation has effectively invalidated much of the work carried out over the last two years on the Bottesford Parish Neighbourhood Plan. This work is now in abeyance, and will only be resumed when the allocation to Bottesford is reduced.</p> <p>Service Inadequacy in Bottesford.</p> <p>The availability of a primary school, employment opportunities, broadband and community buildings has been used to identify Bottesford as a Service Centre. However, with the exception of schools, no attempt has been made to determine whether or not these services and other facilities are adequate to meet the needs of an increased population, nor are there any plans to ensure that this is the case. This was an issue even with the earlier allocation of 300 homes, and the subsequent 50% increase in the allocation makes it yet more unsound. This is in contrast to the situation in Melton Mowbray, where the need for such provision in the sustainable neighbourhoods has been recognised.</p> <p>In fact overall the Draft Melton Local Plan is 'Melton Centric', half of the Borough's population live in the villages yet there appears to have been little work to identify what facilities are necessary to ease the proposed increase in housing in each of the rural settlements.</p> <p>Although Bottesford is the second largest settlement in the Borough the sustainability of an enlarged Bottesford is questionable. The possibility of expanding health, retail and other services in the centre of Bottesford is severely restricted by land availability, the historic street pattern and, in particular, the Conservation Area. Meeting the needs of an increased population is not feasible in the village centre. The Draft Plan only considers the allocation of land for housing, and does not make site provision for new health facilities, employment opportunities (only existing sites are protected) or an improved retail offer.</p> <p>Flooding is the major constraint to development in Bottesford, much of the village being in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3. There was a major flood in 2001 and</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>an Environment Agency Flood Alert in 2012. Flooding when it occurs affects the centre of Bottesford, and has a serious effect on village services. The Environment Agency informally recognises that Bottesford has the highest flood risk in the East Midlands, and discussions are ongoing to revise the EA flood maps. Paragraph 7.22.3.of the Draft Plan states: “sites at risk of flooding can only be allocated for development if there is insufficient land available in areas with lesser or no flood risk”. There are many other sites in Melton Borough with lower flood risk than Bottesford.</p> <p>Schooling provision seems to be adequate: the need for an extension to Belvoir High School has been recognised (8.4.4). However, the location of the schools causes congestion at peak times when buses are entering and leaving via the narrow Barkestone Lane corner with the High St at the same time as school children are crossing. This can only get worse with the proposed increase in population, and no measures are included in the Draft Plan to alleviate it.</p> <p>The two Doctors’ Surgeries are confirmed as being at full capacity. Both have outgrown their current premises. One surgery does not offer open appointments, and the other has had to restrict the number that can be seen on an ‘open appointment’.</p> <p>Bottesford is predominantly a commuter village with a high proportion of the residents being employed at locations outside of the Parish. Increased population in the village will result in more people travelling to work. This is not consistent with the sustainability objectives of the Plan.</p> <p>Public transport within the Parish, and connecting the Parish with larger centres, is poor. The train service for Bottesford is inadequate at present, and would not support the level of growth being proposed, being two-hourly for much of the day and non-existent in late evening. Other Local Authorities on the Grantham to Nottingham line, which are also required to provide additional homes in their local plans, are in discussion with the rail franchise holder, East Midlands Trains, on improving their service. There is no indication that Melton Borough Council has undertaken similar discussions to enhance the service for the only station in Leicestershire on this line. The danger is that other communities on the line will get an improved service at the expense of</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Bottesford, where fewer trains may stop. There is already a reluctance of train operators to permit more trains to stop at Bottesford because of timetabling difficulties. Bus services are also deficient and would not support the level of growth being proposed; the route to Melton is tortuous and takes so long that it would not be preferred to the car option. Former routes to Bingham, Nottingham and Newark are virtually non-existent. The bus service to Grantham is reasonable, but is limited in the evening and does not run on Sundays. The situation is unlikely to improve because of the unavailability of additional County Council subsidies for bus services.</p> <p>At the public meeting in April 2016, MBC stated that constraints and service issues, absent in Emerging Options, would be considered before, and included in the Draft Plan. This has not occurred.</p> <p>Easthorpe, Muston and Normanton do not have the retail and other facilities to support sustainable housing development.</p> <p>Local Opinion Survey</p> <p>The following is a facsimile of the questionnaire distributed to all homes in Bottesford by a local resident. The total number of respondents agreeing with each statement is shown in the relevant box. A total of 413 responses were received of which 96.3% agreed with the statement:</p> <p>"I wish Bottesford to remain a village, I understand that we must have some growth to meet requirements but strongly disagree with the 428 houses Melton Borough have allocated and they should reconsider these numbers". Just over a quarter of households in the Parish responded to the questionnaire. (Copy of the questionnaire was embedded in the reponse). Policy SS2 was not supported. The system is not evidenced based and appears to be purely arbitrary. The 65% 35% split of the 6125 houses, to be delivered up to 2036, is discussed in connection with a 70-30 split in 4.2.11 but then appears as 65-35 in Policy SS2.</p> <p>In the response to the Emerging Options document the Bottesford Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group suggested that this should be as a minimum 70-30. The 70-30 ratio would give more funding support to the Melton Mowbray ring road. Also, the additional houses would benefit Melton Mowbray far more than splitting the balance across the rural settlements that are clearly</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>less sustainable than Melton Mowbray. How is the 65-35 split justified, particularly in view that the funding to complete the ring road might be insufficient and Government financial support required?</p> <p>The population of Melton Mowbray is approximately 25000 (25K), making it relatively small compared to surrounding towns and cities, for example, Loughborough (57K), Grantham (41K), Nottingham (306K) and Leicester (330K). Expansion of the town will enable it compete more effectively with these centres and better able to meet the set strategic objectives.</p> <p>The ‘windfall’ site strategy seems equally arbitrary and while the Rural area takes 322 houses there is no limit on the numbers that can be allocated at any given settlement. The numbers of dwellings are given for developments on unallocated sites- Service Centres (10), Rural Hubs(5) and Rural settlements (3)</p> <p>Policy SS3 states...where it has been demonstrated that the proposal enhances the sustainability of the settlement(s) to which it relates and, through repeated application, will not result in a level or distribution of development that is inconsistent with the development strategy.</p> <p>It is difficult to see how, 3, 5 or even 10 dwellings will enhance the sustainability of a settlement and how many times could this be repeated before it failed to be consistent with the strategy.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Richard Simon	<p>The 65% 35% split of the 6125 houses, to be delivered up to 2036, is discussed in connection with a 70-30 split in 4.2.11 but then appears as 65-35 in Policy SS2. The system is not evidenced based and appears to be purely arbitrary.</p> <p>A higher ratio than 65-35 would give more funding support to the Melton Mowbray ring road. In addition the additional houses would benefit Melton Mowbray far more than splitting the balance across the rural settlements that are clearly less sustainable than Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>The population of Melton Mowbray is approximately 25000 (25K), making it relatively small compared to surrounding towns and cities, for example, Loughborough (57K), Grantham (41K), Nottingham (306K) and Leicester (330K). Expansion of the town will enable it compete more effectively with these centres and better able to meet the set strategic objectives.</p> <p>The 'windfall' site strategy seems equally arbitrary and while the Rural area takes 322 houses there is no limit on the numbers that can be allocated at any given settlement. The numbers of dwellings are given for developments on unallocated sites- Service Centres (10), Rural Hubs(5) and Rural settlements (3)</p> <p>Policy SS3 states...where it has been demonstrated that the proposal enhances the sustainability of the settlement(s) to which it relates and, through repeated application, will not result in a level or distribution of development that is inconsistent with the development strategy.</p> <p>How will 3, 5 or even 10 dwellings enhance the sustainability of a settlement and how many times could this be repeated before it failed to be consistent with the strategy?</p>		<p>The 'Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015' assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough's housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance to achieve the objectives of the Plan and improve sustainability and travel patterns etc whilst maintaining supply and housing choice. The 'windfall' allowance is informed on past trends which the Council consider will be achievable, and represent a much lower rate (21 pa) than has been achieved in previous (recent)years (70 pa). Assessment of the contribution of individual proposals to the sustainability of a settlement will be carried out on a case by case basis, determined by the content of a proposal and the location concerned. The pattern of development will be monitored regularly through the AMR process and through this it will be established the extent to which permitted development are adhering from the spatial strategy.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation to Bottesford.</p> <p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published alongside consultation on 'focussed changes'</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Rob Steele	<p>Gaddesby appears to have been upgraded to a rural hub but should be identified as a rural settlement as the village does not meet two of the criteria as set out in the methodology.</p> <p>'Access to employment opportunities' - the suggestion that the 100 bus service could be relied upon to travel to work out of the village is ridiculous. The service has recently had a significant reduction to it's service due to being unsustainable, with a continued risk of the service being reduced further when reviewed in 2017. Residents without access to a car would be very isolated living in the village with no amenities such as a shop, post office etc. Superfast broadband - the actual delivered speed at the time of writing is 20mps or 40% of the advertised maximum 56mbps download speed. Given this failure to perform under the existing load of the village and surrounding areas, any additional load is likely to make the service deteriorate further. Many existing residents have not yet upgraded to fibre broadband, which means that when they do this would increase the load further thereby reducing the actual speed delivered even more. Presently areas of the village remain unable to get a mobile phone signal!</p> <p>The 'highways issues' are of concern as they have not been assessed when considering the proposed development sites. The Plan states that the site to the northern edge of the village (Pasture Lane) is accessed via either of two 'well connected roads'. The roads in question being Rotherby Lane and Pasture Lane. As the name suggests, these roads are in fact lanes and are both unsuitable for more than the occasional vehicle. Rotherby Lane is single lane only for majority of it's length with several bends which blocks the view of any oncoming traffic - resulting in traffic at best only able to pass by using the grass verge. There have been fatalities on this lane in recent years. Both these lanes are very popular routes for dog walkers and with no footpaths and increase in traffic would only increase the risk of further casualties.</p> <p>There is a weight limit on Ashby Road of 7.5 tonnes which demonstrates how minor the road is into the village from the A607. The proposed building site to the south of the village is proposed opposite the village hall and Gaddesby</p>		<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered to be sound and Gaddesby is correctly identified as a rural hub owing to the presence of 3 of the key services identified .The proposed housing in Gaddesby and other villages represents the proposed approach to the provision and supply of the Borough's housing requirements overall. The HA has not objected to the increase in traffic associated with the growth in Gaddesby.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation to Gaddesby.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Primary School. At school drop off and collection times, cars are parked nose to tail along the school side of Ashby Road, making the road all but impassible and impossible for those that would be trying to emerge from the site. The village hall is occupied every weekday by a playgroup which is frequented by on average 25-30 children at any one time who are also dropped off and collected. In addition at certain other regular times cars are parked nose to tail on Ashby Road opposite the site. All this traffic makes the road dangerous to both motorists and pedestrians. Ashby Road is a busy road, which is narrow and has a sharp bend adjacent to the site which will make it impossible to see traffic coming around the bend for vehicles existing the site. Ashby Road is clearly totally unsuitable to service the existing traffic let alone the increased traffic that the proposed developments would generate.</p>			
Robert Galij BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI, Planning Director - Barratt David Wilson Homes North Midlands	<p>Insufficient provision is being made for future housing in the context of the most up to date evidence of housing need (OAHN). The strategic housing requirement for Melton Borough is therefore not being met.</p> <p>The proposed distribution of housing does not represent an appropriate 'urban-rural' split with too little being directed towards "Service Centres" and, in particular, Bottesford.</p>	<p>The overall scale of housing should be increased from (minimum) 6125 dwellings over the plan period to reflect the very latest OAHN.</p> <p>The proportion of housing directed towards "Service Centres" should be increased from "35%" to '40%' with at least '600 dwellings' being allocated in Bottesford reflecting its sustainability credentials.</p>	<p>MBC consider the figure of 245 per annum (6125) necessary to meet the vision, priority and objectives set out in Chapter 3. The Council has received the HEDNA 2017 and has taken into account its content in arriving at a housing target for the Local plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available. The 'Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015' assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough's housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance to achieve the objectives of the Plan and improve sustainability and travel patterns etc whilst maintaining supply and housing choice. The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report</p>	<p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation to Bottesford.</p> <p>HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published alongside consultation on 'focussed changes'</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
			(May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st Septemer 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered to be sound and Bottesford is correctly identified as a service centre owing to the presence of the key services identified.	
Robert Hughes (on behalf of Nigel Grifitths, First Provincial Properties Ltd)	<p>Background</p> <p>The representations made below are on behalf of First Provincial Properties Ltd, having regard to their interest as a land owner in Harby.</p> <p>Response</p> <p>Policy SS2 is unsound in setting out the housing requirement and spatial strategy for the delivery of housing across the Borough between 2011 and 2036, therefore failing to achieve sustainable development through its spatial strategy and, is not consistent with the NPPF. It is noted that the policy sets out provision for 'at least' 6,125 homes to be delivered (built) over the Plan Period and the inclusion of the term 'at least' is supported insofar as it does not preclude more homes coming forward. 65% of the Borough's housing need is proposed to be located in the Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area and 35% in Services Centres and Rural Hubs. Whilst this overall balance is supported, priority should be given to the delivery of housing in Service Centres before Rural</p>	<p>The spatial strategy should be amended to ensure that the most sustainable Service Centres</p> <p>have greater housing provision allocated than currently proposed.</p>	<p>Service Centres are inherently prioritised above Rural hubs with allocations totalling approximately 4 times that of Rural Hubs. The reallocation of allocations arising from lack of site suitability/availability reinforces this with approx. 4 times more houses redistributed to Service Centres than rural hubs. However, since the consultation sites have now become available in all relevant locations such that redistribution can now be avoided.</p> <p>The Council consider this a sustainable approach being in mind the narrow margins found between some of the villages concerned in terms of service availability and their size, and the need to support services arguable greater where population sizes are smaller.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p> <p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published alongside consultation on 'focussed changes'</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Hubs for the reason that they constitute more sustainable locations for housing given the greater availability of services and facilities in these settlements.</p> <p>Also, revealed in Table 4 (Housing allocations based on population) is that allocating housing growth on a proportionate basis relating to population size does not result in the most sustainable spatial strategy. For example, the Rural Hubs of Asfordby Hill, Frisby on the Wreake and Gaddesby are currently identified for the delivery of 70 houses, 78 houses and 50 houses respectively. This is despite the fact that they are less sustainable locations for housing growth. Conversely, the more sustainable settlement of Harby, for example, with a greater range of services and facilities is only identified for 98 homes.</p> <p>For the same reasons as above, the redistributed housing from settlements with insufficient allocations to meet the identified housing growth should only be distributed amongst the Service Centres and not the Rural Hubs.</p>			
Robert Widdowson	<p>The village description of facilities/services for Frisby on the Wreake should be amended to reflect a true picture of Frisby and its amenities - the description of Frisby is a far cry from the reality of living in Frisby and is not recognised by residents.</p> <p>Frisby's services are basic and NOT "well served" and include a small Post Office (PO). The PO stocks a limited range of basic grocery products and can also provide hot drinks on request with 4 chairs. It cannot by any measure be properly described as a convenience store or a tea room. In a single room with approximately 10ft x 12 ft of floor space there is a limit on what it can sell or provide.</p> <p>The sports facilities referred to is in fact a cricket field.</p> <p>There is a decent bus service throughout the day but no mention is made of the fact that there are no buses to Melton beyond 20.05 or Leicester after 19.30. The bus service is available at some distance from the village centre and incurs a steep hill for those seeking to use this facility. With an aging population it is not an option for many.</p>		<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered to be sound and Frisby is correctly identified as a rural hub owing to the presence of 3 of the key services identified. The specific services referred to were not material to the identification of Frisby as a Rural Hub.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation for Frisby.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Roger Pacey	Above all Bottesford and Easthorpe should remain in their own right with a small amount of development as detailed under this representation at Chapter 8. Small developments should be distributed in our neighbouring villages to enable them to retain their own community viability i.e. keep the pubs and shops going. The Local Plan should be reconsidered on this basis.		The Plan follows the approach described and addresses the villages in Bottesford and the surrounding area differently , reflecting their differing roles and relationships with Bottesford itself, ie. Bottesford as a service centre. Easthorpe as a Rural Hub as a result of its proximity and accessibility to Bottesford and its services and Muston, Normanton etc and Rural Settlments as a result of their lesser provision, accessibility and transport links. This is reflected in the policies applies through SS2 relating to specific site allocations and the scale and contribution to sustainable development of unallocated development opportunities.. Policy SS3 allows for small scale developments in smaller villages.	Proposed to amend Policy SS3 as a 'focussed change' so as to delete references to 3, 5 and 10 and allow greater flexibility as needs and circumstances change over time. Control over scale would be managed by reference to compatibility with the settlement concerned.
Ros Freeman	<p>Somerby is wrongly categorised as a service centre</p> <p>The Settlements Roles and Relationships approach is flawed; it does not consider the sustainability with respect to transport and the already overloaded facilities (school, doctors, parking, roads etc) in Somerby or the impacts of construction on heritage and flooding. Classification of Somerby in the same group as Waltham and Asfordby is ridiculous and using the population size to allocate housing numbers is flawed. The size of a population does not mean that the village is more able than others to take even more houses.</p> <p>Development should be concentrated in Melton Mowbray or large villages such as Bottesford and Asfordby that have good road connection, by-passes, good public transport infrastructure to places of work and sufficient facilities (shops, schools, libraries etc) to support growth.</p> <p>The housing allocation for the rural areas should be spread more evenly between all the villages taking account of aspects such as the number of school places available and the need to keep those communities vibrant and sustainable. Large-scale developments of greater than 10 houses should not be considered in the villages to maintain their rural identities.</p> <p>The Council have tried to address this by changing the</p>	Reclassify Somerby as a Rural hub	The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. Somerby is correctly identified as a service centre owing ot the presence of all of the key services identified This is not dependant upon the services mentioned) . Under the approach adopted to the apportionment of housing allocations, re-designation as a rural hub would not have any material impact on housing quantities.	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation for Somerby.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	categorisation of villages and lumping Primary and secondary together in one group with the only differential being population size. This is an attempt at a quick fix that does not consider properly the impact on the smaller villages in the service centre category and does not address those things that the Plan says it will protect-village character, heritage, landscape.			
Susan E Green	<p>The housing requirement set out in SS2 is based on an OAHN for Melton as set out in the Leicester & Leicestershire SMHA Report 2014 by G L Hearn. This calculation comprised of 2011 SNPP data, 5 year migration trends, inclusion of UPC, adjustment of HFR to 2008 based tracking / mid-point to compensate for past housing undersupply and an Experian economic forecast re-distributed on current jobs distribution. Previously at the Charnwood Local Plan Examination the HBF and other parties were critical of this calculation of OAHN for the following reasons :-</p> <p>2012 SNHP should be the demographic starting point for the calculation of OAHN subject to sensitivity testing ;</p> <p>1)Any uplifts applied for worsening market signals were overly modest ;</p> <p>2)Economic growth was not aligned with the Leicestershire LEP SEP ;</p> <p>3) No consideration of increasing housing requirements to help deliver affordable housing to meet significant affordable housing needs. These previous criticisms are not repeated in detail because the SHMA 2014 is now considered out of date indeed the HMA authorities have commissioned up dated evidence in the form of the HEDNA 2016. Moreover since the original SHMA was undertaken there have been a number of significant changes :-</p> <p>a)the 2014 SNPP & SNHP are now available which indicate household growth in the HMA over 10% higher than the unadjusted demographic starting point of the original 2014 SHMA ;</p> <p>b) in January 2016 the East Midlands Gateway Rail Freight Interchange (EMGRFI) was granted planning consent which will positively impact on future economic growth across the HMA; and</p> <p>c) market signals continue to worsen with the ONS House Price Index identifying house price increases in Melton of 6.7% in the period between September 2015</p>		<p>The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving at a housing target for the Local plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available. The HEDNA incorporates all of the inputs referred to. The calculation of the achievement of the housing in Melton Mowbray comprises 3200 in the Sustainable Neighbourhoods with the remainder comprised of 12 specific site allocations and a small allowance (200) for 'windfall'. The HMA authorities have agreed a revised Joint Statement of Co-operation Relating to Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (January 2017) which sets out its shared approach to the redistribution of any unmet need arising from the OAN identified in HEDNA via the Strategic Growth Plan process whilst also recognising that individual LPA's will need to proceed in advance of this with the production of their respective Local Plans. The provisions within the Melton LP provide flexibility to accommodate a significant amount of unmet need but in addition. Policy SS6 provided trigger points for review if there is more arising, setting out the process by which it will consider options to accommodate it.</p>	<p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published alongside consultation on 'focussed changes'</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>– September 2016.</p> <p>Unfortunately the HEDNA 2016 Report is not yet published even though it is believed to have been completed. However it is contended that as a commissioning authority of the new HENDA the Council must know the OAHN figures set out in the yet to be published report and whether or not the figure for Melton is above or below the 2014 SHMA calculation and therefore if the proposed housing requirement of 245 dwellings per annum is justified. The Council must also know the likelihood and extent of any unmet housing needs arising in the HMA which would necessitate a revision of the Memorandum of Understanding. It is suggested that the Council should provide further clarification concerning OAHN before submission of the Local Plan for Examination.</p> <p>Housing Land Supply (HLS) : Under Policy SS2 the housing requirement is distributed as :-</p> <p>* In Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area at least 3,980 dwellings representing 65% of the overall housing need of which 2,000 dwellings (1,700 dwellings in the plan period) (30%) are proposed on the Melton Mowbray South Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) in Policy SS4 and 1,700 dwellings (25%) are proposed on Melton Mowbray North SUE under Policy SS5. So it is assumed that the remaining 10% (398 dwellings) are proposed on other sites situated within the Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area ;</p> <p>*The remaining 35% (1,822 dwellings) are proposed in Service Centres and Rural Hubs.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Susan Love	<p>Growth strategy for the whole Borough is short-sighted. It encourages one centre, (flood prone Bottesford) to grow to the detriment of other areas , e.g. Waltham on the Wolds, which is nearer to Melton (so likely to contribute to Melton's economy), has no flood problems, and a reserve site which would take 168 houses. Other areas also have small reserve sites.</p> <p>4.2.6 encourages 'communities to improve their sustainability'. Growth in some currently smaller centres could achieve this.</p> <p>I fully support the rejection of all the rejected SHLAA sites in Bottesford, in particular the rejection of further development on the Belvoir Rd site for the reasons outlined earlier relating to water courses, land levels and flooding.</p>	<p>4.2.21 chart - revise the allocation to Bottesford significantly downwards.</p> <p>Use the reserve site at Waltham on the Wolds and consider further development of Waltham to enable it to become more sustainable and maintain more services.</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. The approach does not allocate sites in one location 'at the expense' of another and - in terms of contrasting Bottesford and Waltham - allocates to both in recognition that they are both regarded as sustainable locations for housing development. no evidence has been provided to support the view that there is particular need to support services in Waltham. HEDNA 2017 shows that part of the HMA demand is generated by urban centres on the north and east of the HMA itself and Bottesford has a stronger relationship with such centres than with Melton Mowbray and is better located to meet this aspect of needs. Support regarding the site selection process is noted. Policy SS3 allows development in smaller villages and it is proposed to delte the size limits within this policy.</p>	<p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation for Bottesford</p> <p>Proposed to amend Policy SS3 as a 'focussed change' so as to delete references to 3, 5 and 10 and allow greater flexibility as needs and circumstances change over time. Control over scale would be managed by reference to compatibility with the settlement concerned.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Tata Steel (UK) Ltd	<p>Whilst we have not undertaken a detailed assessment of the methodology for determining the split of housing between Melton and the Service Centres and Rural Hubs, we do consider that the principle of planning for the largest volume of housing in Melton and then focusing the remainder on villages with services within them is appropriate and accords with national guidance.</p> <p>The dispersal approach advocated is also in line with national guidance, which seeks to secure choice and competition in the allocations provided in order to secure delivery and meet the needs of all aspects of the population.</p> <p>We also support Asfordby Hill as a location for providing additional housing from settlements that have insufficient land available to meet their capacity. Not only is Asfordby Hill a Rural Hub, but it is in the unique position of having a strategic employment site in the village and being a much shorter distance to Melton Mowbray and all the services and facilities it has to offer than the vast majority of rural settlements.</p>		<p>Providing housing choice and multiple opportunities for delivery is one of the factors taken into account in pursuing the 'dispersed' model. Asfordby Hill is identified as a Rural Hub due to the presence of it's service provision in accordance with the methodology devised in the he Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016).These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation for Bottesford</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Terence Joyce	<p>The designation of Somerby as a Service Centre is a total exaggeration and is not sound for reasons set out below:-</p> <p>1: This village is equestrian and tourist orientated.</p> <p>2: The public transport is erratic and very expensive , example 2 x Adults and 2 x fare paying children for return journey to Melton costs best part of £20,also could not rely on this service if required to get to work on time etc.</p> <p>3: The school along with its limited space already contributes to high street traffic chaos</p> <p>4: The local shop/post office offers typical rural service and far too limited and expensive to do family shop, residents have to travel by car to nearest super market and or use online shopping both contribute to traffic problems on high street, also village shop has no off street parking hence causes bottle jam in its vicinity.</p> <p>5: Surgery is located on the very edge of the South side of village, although handy for SOM1, SOM 2/3 residents would more than likely use car to visit, again putting more pressure on already clogged up high street.</p> <p>6. Any suggestion to build bypass would have maximum negative effect on rural environment</p>	<p>To satisfy SOUNDNESS:</p> <p>Discount Somerby as service centre spread build across southern borough - some villagers back a need for social housing.</p> <p>According to the Midlands Rural Housing Survey April 2016 ;</p> <p>THERE IS AN IDENTIFIED NEED FOR 5 OPEN MARKET HOMES AND 14 AFFORDABLE HOMES IN SOMERBY PARISH FOR THOSE WITH A LOCAL CONNECTION .</p> <p>Limit residential build to SOM1, (27 UNITS) for the following reasons</p> <p>1: Access to Melton, Oakham (bypass to A1), Leicester. Therefore less pressure on high street.</p> <p>2 It is reasonable to assume that some residents of social housing have health related problems, therefore very close to surgery.</p> <p>Also to pre-empt any drainage problems related to SOM1 can be sorted with the will and money.</p> <p>Note in the centre of Somerby 12 units have been submitted for planning at Church Lane and 3 units are currently being constructed at Manor Lane. There are already 42 potential units in the village on SOM2 and SOM3 which could destroy the equestrian rural status of village.</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. Somerby is correctly identified as a service centre owing to the presence of key services identified (this is not dependant upon all of the services mentioned) . The LEA have advised that the school is capable of expansion to accommodate levels of demand arising from the scale of development proposed in the Plan. Comments regarding the capacity of the local road networks are not supported by the highways Authority. Policy SS3 allows for development in smaller villages and the limits are proposed to be dleted to allow greater responsiveness. The comments relating to the specific sites are addressed in comments relating to Chapter 5 (policies C1 and C1A)</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation for Somerby</p> <p>Proposed to amend Policy SS3 as a 'focussed change' so as to delete references to 3, 5 and 10 and allow greater flexibility as needs and circumstances change over time. Control over scale would be managed by reference to compatibility with the settlement concerned.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
The Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	<p>Fully support the recognition that the development requirements outlined in Policy SS2 are a minimum, and enables flexibility. Also support the identification of Asfordby Hill as a Rural Hub, which alongside Service Centres, are to take 35% of the total residential requirement across the Borough. Asfordby Hill is a sustainable settlement, with good access to local services and facilities and is suitable for a proportion of residential development.</p> <p>However, we are concerned that not all of the relevant issues have been taken into account when determining the amount of residential development that is required. Paragraph 158 of the NPPF states that 'each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental prospects of the area'. The Councils of Leicester and Leicestershire are currently working on producing their Housing and Employment Development Needs Assessment [HEDNA] report and this is anticipated to be published in January 2017. The updated Objectively Assessed Housing Needs [OAHN] contained within this document are likely to have a significant impact on the residential requirements for the borough, and as such the current anticipated housing requirements are likely to require revising prior to the Local Plan's Submission in order for it to pass the tests of soundness.</p>	<p>With the publication of the HEDNA report anticipated for January 2017, we would suggest that it may be beneficial to delay the submission and adoption of the new Local Plan until</p> <p>the Council has had an adequate opportunity to review its housing requirements, to reflect the updated OAHN included within this report.</p>	<p>The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving at a housing target for the Local plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available. The HEDNA incorporates all of the inputs referred to. The calculation of the achievement of the housing in Melton Mowbray comprises 3200 in the Sustainable Neighbourhoods with the remainder comprised of 12 specific site allocations and a small allowance (200) for 'windfall'. The HMA authorities have agreed a revised Joint Statement of Co-operation Relating to Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (January 2017) which sets out its shared approach to the redistribution of any unmet need arising from the OAN identified in HEDNA via the Strategic Growth Plan process whilst also recognising that individual LPA's will need to proceed in advance of this with the production of their respective Local Plans. The provisions within the Melton LP provide flexibility to accommodate a significant amount of unmet need but in addition. Policy SS6 provided trigger points for review if there is more arising, setting out the process by which it will consider options to accommodate it.</p>	<p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>HEDNA and 'towards a housing requirement for Melton' evidence documents to be published alongside consultation on 'focussed changes'</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Tom Parry	<p>The settlement hierarchy differentiates the sustainable Services Centres/Rural Hubs from the unsustainable Rural Settlements (see 4.2.4 and 4.2.5). Development in Rural Settlements would not normally be in accordance with the NPPF, which carries a presumption in favour of sustainable development. There may be exceptional circumstances where development in Rural Settlements could enhance the sustainability of those settlements.</p> <p>The Policy does not make it clear however that development in Rural Settlements, to be consistent with the NPPF, will be in exceptional cases.</p> <p>The policy is not clearly written in paragraph four. The remaining need, as shown in 4.2.13, is 2144 homes. 1822 is 85% of the remaining need, not 35%.</p> <p>The Policy does not also make it clear that the 322 "windfall" homes will be spread across Service Centres, Rural Hubs and Rural Settlements. Paragraph 6 could be read to suggest that all 322 homes will be in rural settlements, which is clearly not the intention of the Plan.</p> <p>The Policy repeats parts of SS3.</p>	<p>In paragraph 4 it could read "of the remaining need of 2144 homes, 85% (1822) will be accommodated by Service Centres and Rural Hubs. This will be delivered by planning.....etc" This wording would be consistent with the rest of the plan.</p> <p>Paragraph 6 could read "The remaining 15% of the homes in the Rural Area (322) will be accommodated by all settlements (Service Centres, Rural Hubs and Rural Settlements) in the Rural Area, through planning positively for new homes as "windfall" sites. In Rural Settlements proposals for new development will only be supported where they are small and enhance the sustainability of the settlement in accordance with clause 7 of Policy SS3 [see our comments on Policy SS3]" This wording would clarify the position and be consistent with the NPPF.</p>	Comments noted and suggested wording accepted.	<p>Amend paragraph 4 to read "of the remaining need of 2144 homes, 85% (1822) will be accommodated by Service Centres and Rural Hubs. This will be delivered by planning.....etc"</p> <p>Amend para. 6 to read "The remaining 15% of the homes in the Rural Area (322) will be accommodated by all settlements (Service Centres, Rural Hubs and Rural Settlements) in the Rural Area, through planning positively for new homes as "windfall" sites. In Rural Settlements proposals for new development will only be supported where they are small and enhance the sustainability of the settlement in accordance with clause 7 of Policy SS3.</p>
Tom Reynolds	<p>The prospect of thousands of new homes in Melton without adequate infrastructure being built first is appalling.</p> <p>MMBC should take a stand against any government pressure to comply with building targets – something that you have woefully failed to do for decades.</p>		Whilst Policy SS2 sets out the general approach, the details regarding the growth in Melton Mowbray is found in Policies SS4 and SS5 and sets out that infrastructure will be required alongside, and as part of , the housing growth.	None proposed
Trevor Norman	<p>Fully object to SS2 in respect of Gaddesby. The limited amenities of Gaddesby will not support the proposed housing for the village. The proposed housing will ruin a beautiful village. The idea for growth in the village is not understood.</p> <p>There are already houses being built that should be taken into account; the drainage and sewers are a concern and the increase in people just means the existing school cannot adequately cater for anymore (there is nowhere to park now); there is no real public transport (see report given by the Gaddesby Community Group); and it is clear that this village is being treated unfairly without explanation.</p> <p>No doubt the people that are likely to sell their land (not</p>		The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation for Gaddesby

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>residents of Gaddesby) for possible house building are in for a quick profit and are not residents of the village (possibly neighbouring villages- and maybe these villages should take an increased quota of new houses).</p> <p>My family were brought up in Gaddesby over a 25 year period and one of my children has now returned to live in Gaddesby.</p> <p>Please do not ruin the village.</p>		assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered to be sound and Gaddesby is correctly identified as a rural hub owing to the presence of 3 of the key services identified .The proposed housing in Gaddesby and other villages represents the proposed approach to the provision and supply of the Borough's housing requirements overall. The HA has not objected to the increase in traffic associated with the growth in Gaddesby and information from the LEA indicates capacity will be available in the local Primary School based on current projections.	
Trudy Toon - Clerk	<p>In the original draft plan Gaddesby was deemed to be a “rural supporter”. A rural supporter is identified by a clear scoring methodology (attached to this representation) in relation to role and functions of a settlement within a spatial strategy. This was evidenced by Melton Local Plan Settlement Roles and Relationships of April 2015 (MLPSRR). It will be seen that the criteria used were much more extensive and sophisticated than the four used in the latest draft plan and that Gaddesby was very much at the lower end of the rural supporter range of 10 to 20 points with 12. Why the change? Gaddesby has been upgraded and a greater proportion of housing proposed than any other village. Of the four current criteria comments two are agreed, Primary School and Community Building. Access to employment opportunities is not agreed for the reasons in relation to bus services and employment sites. The suggestion that the 100 bus service can be used to get to work is incorrect. The 100 bus service runs very infrequently and does not run at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Gaddesby is the closest settlement in the Borough to Leicester and it is there that most people go to work rather than to Melton. A village meeting discussed the plan and 74 villagers attended and when we asked for a show of hands not one indicated they work in Melton. The only suitable bus to Leicester leaves Gaddesby at 07.49 and the last bus leaves Leicester at 17:10. In other words it is impossible to use the bus to attend work full time in Leicester. Further Leicestershire County Council will review the contract next year (2017) and there is a risk that it will be withdrawn.</p>	<p>1. The methodology of selecting which villages should be the subject of development should be revised and if not revised Gaddesby should be re-assessed as a rural settlement for the reasons set out in the Gaddesby Community Group Representations.</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered to be sound and Gaddesby is correctly identified as a rural hub owing ot the presence of 3 of the key services identified .The proposed housing in Gaddesby and other villages represents the proposed approach to the provision and supply of the Borough's housing requirements overall. The HA has not objected to the increase in traffic associated with the growth in Gaddesby and information from the LEA indicates capacity will be available in the local Primary School based on current projections.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation for Gaddesby.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>The suggestion that there is access to employment opportunities is incorrect and requires re-assessment because of the lack of public transport. There is minimal employment within Gaddesby itself. Fast broadband is not accepted because although Gaddesby's phone exchange has been "upgraded" in 2016 as part of the "super-fast" Leicestershire program (It has added support for Fibre to the Cabinet broadband), there isn't a lot of choice of provider (the majority of residents are using BT). This broadband service is sold as "up to" 56Mbps download speed, which is more than adequate for an average modern home. The actual delivered speed of writing is 20Mbps or 40% of the advertised maximum, which is the same as the pre-upgrade ADSL offering. Given this failure to perform under the existing load of the village and surrounding areas, any additional load is likely to make the service deteriorate further. Many existing residents have not yet upgraded to fibre broadband, which means that when they do, this would increase the load further thereby reducing the actual delivered speed further. In the neighbouring village of Queniborough, the broadband speeds can be over double the delivered speed in Gaddesby. Gaddesby does not therefore enjoy the requisite three of the four criteria to qualify as a rural hub and should therefore be classed as a rural settlement. The methodology now proposed is unacceptable as being simplistic and unsound. The criteria should include more day to day facilities in the methodology such as a food shop, GP surgery, library, post office, primary school and pub. Not many rural villages will have employment facilities, those that do should be higher up the hierarchy and receive more development, and that facilities such as a food shop and doctors surgery are just as important as broadband in reducing the need to travel. There should also be more differentiation between the settlements, perhaps a return to the Primary and Secondary Services Centres previously proposed. A housing needs survey has not yet been carried out by Melton Council. Apparently the Council are to carry this out in the New Year (2017). If so how can it be said that there is a need for housing in Gaddesby? The Council have taken into account the 14 permitted dwellings at GADD1 but have not taken into account the 5 houses for which permission has been granted on Ashby Road (12/00530/FUL) and the one further dwelling at The Hall (15/00826/FUL). Accordingly,</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>in reality Gaddesby has already been allocated 6 houses which, when added to the 55 houses allocated in the daft plan, takes the total allocation to 61 new houses. This cannot be sustained or justified for the reasons set out in there representations. Appendix 2 of MLPSSR shows that over the period 1994 to 2014 on average one new house was built in the village every year. On the assumption that this continues and additional 20 houses will be built over the life of the Plan. Paras 4.2.21 and 22 of the draft Plan state that Gaddesby has markedly higher percentage of proposed housing than any of the other villages. There are currently 158 houses in the village itself. An increase of 61 would be a 38.6% increase and would clearly change the nature of the village. When the additional 20 houses likely to be built from “natural growth” are included, this pushes the figure up to an increase of 51.2%. The calculation by estimated population of the villages at 4.2.21 and 4.2.22 of the draft plan is unsound. It is the number of houses which is material. The A607 is already a very busy road as it leads to the Hobby Horse roundabout and the A46. Both these roads are over capacity certainly. It is not unusual to be queuing from Syston/Queniborough/East Goscote all the way to the Hobby Horse. The junction between Gaddesby Lane and the A607 is very dangerous and one sometimes has to wait minutes to join the A607. In addition, Rearsby Lane (which connects Gaddesby Lane to Ashby Road) is a busy, narrow and winding road with is already unsuitable for the existing traffic burden placed on it. If the 61 (or more) houses were built this is likely to add another 120 plus cars to the mix. This impact has not been assessed by the Plan. There is a weight limit throughout Gaddesby of 7.5 tonnes, which demonstrates how minor the roads are into the village. Only in 2014 did the school intake increase to 25 each year from 15. Years 2, 1 and reception are therefore already at capacity. The catchment area for the school includes Barsby, South Croxton, Ashby Folville and almost to Queniborough and attracts pupils from further afield. Within 4 years the school will be at capacity and therefore there is no requirement to fill spaces with new families coming into the village. Having only recently been substantially extended, it is unrealistic to suggest that the school will be capable of further expansion in the short/medium term.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Richard Crossthwaite (Gladman Developments)	<p>The requirements (at least 6125 dwellings and some 51 ha of employment land between 2011 and 2036) contained in Policy SS2 are based on out-of-date evidence and should therefore be updated, under Regulation 22, prior to the submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State. Broad support is given to the proposed distribution of housing being directed towards Melton (65%) and the Service Centres and Rural Hubs (35%). However, Gladman has set out in other representations the proposal for a new Garden Village at Six Hills. This is situated on the very westernmost edge of Melton, adjacent to the A46 on the Boundary with Charnwood. The site is strategically located between Melton Mowbray, Leicester, Loughborough and Nottingham and the proposal is specifically identified as a deliverable new settlement to address housing needs arising in the HMA and specifically those from Leicester. It is considered that this development opportunity is best addressed through a dedicated allocation and policy and therefore, this would necessitate an increase in the housing requirement of the Plan. The site has been promoted for some time and it is in the process of a detailed planning exercise to support this. A FPCR plan has been enclosed with this representation (Appendix 1, reference 7456-L-01 rev C) provides the most recent update to previous masterplans, highlighting a site which could develop up to 2,526 dwellings at 30 dwellings per hectare (up to 2,947 if an average density of 35 dph is applied), with 11.4 hectares of employment, a community centre, school facilities and significant areas of green space. Amendments are therefore proposed to Policy SS2.</p>	<p>Policy SS2 should be amended to state: “Provision will be made for the development of at least 8,651 homes and some 62 hectares of employment land between 2011 and 2036 in Melton Borough. Development will be distributed across the Borough in accordance with the spatial strategy set out below: Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area is the priority location for growth and will accommodate 65% of the Borough’s housing need. The role and sustainability of Melton Mowbray will be significantly enhanced through the delivery of at least 3,980 homes and up to 31 hectares of additional employment land by 2036. Development will be expected to contribute positively to the provision of key infrastructure, including traffic relief within the town, to support its growing population and economy. A new garden village at Six Hills will accommodate a minimum of 2,526 dwellings and 11 hectares of employment land to address unmet housing needs arising within the HMA. The development will be expected to include facilities to provide for a range of day-to-day needs of the new community. Service Centres and Rural Hubs will accommodate Service Centres and Rural Hubs will accommodate 35% of the remaining need (a minimum of 1822 dwellings)...” Despite support for the general approach taken in the plan, we do have some concerns with the remainder of the policy wording of SS2, as it could serve to unnecessarily restrict sustainable opportunities for growth in settlements that have been identified as being Service Centres, Rural Hubs or Rural Settlements. Whilst the broad commitment to grant planning permission for unallocated sites is generally welcomed, the policy should not arbitrarily limit the scale of development that can then come forward in those settlements. The introduction of artificial caps on development size cannot be justified and should as such be deleted or re-drafted to provide greater flexibility. In its current form, policy SS2 could be used to restrict schemes from progressing that are demonstrably sustainable. The Plan should provide flexibility to ensure that the sustainability credentials of all development opportunities that have not yet been identified can be assessed on their individual merits using criteria based development management policies. Further weight is added to the above point through the Plan’s recognition that it is unable to meet its own defined development requirements within several of the rural settlements (set out at paragraph 2.2.21 of the Plan). This adds to the case that policy SS2 is overly restrictive and would</p>	<p>The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving at a housing target for the Local Plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available. The HEDNA incorporates all of the inputs referred to. The Plan positively provides for the quantum of growth proposed (6125 dwellings) and allows 'headroom'. flexibility and consideration of new sites that represent sustainable development through policy SS3 (the approach of which is contained in SS2). The limit to 10, 5 and 3 dwellings is considered necessary to adhere to the principles of the spatial strategy, which is to direct development in the greater proportions to the most sustainable locations. Their removal would allow for this to be eroded by encouraging larger scale development in the locations that the evidence has found to be less sustainable based on the evidence contained within the The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016). The HMA authorities have agreed a revised Joint Statement of Co-operation Relating to Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (January 2017) which sets out its shared approach to the redistribution of any unmet need arising from the OAN identified in HEDNA via the Strategic Growth Plan process whilst also recognising that individual LPA's will need to proceed in advance of this with the production of their respective Local Plans. The provisions within the Melton LP provide flexibility to accommodate a significant amount of unmet need. Policy SS6</p>	<p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>HEDNA and ‘towards a housing requirement for Melton’ evidence documents to be published alongside consultation on ‘focussed changes’</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
		<p>prevent the consideration of sustainable development opportunities on land that becomes available in those locations during the plan period. In order to enhance the positivity of the Plan and provide flexibility, we would recommend the inclusion of wording within policy SS2 to indicate that:</p> <p>“...Service Centres and Rural Hubs will accommodate Service Centres and Rural Hubs will accommodate 35% of the remaining need (a minimum of 1822 dwellings). This will be delivered by planning positively for the development of sites allocated within and adjoining the Service Centres and Rural Hubs by 2036, and by encouraging small scale development of 10 dwellings or less outside of the allocations in and adjoining Service Centres, or 5 dwellings or less for the and rural hubs, where they enhance the sustainability of the community in accordance with policy SS3 – Sustainable communities.”</p> <p>The section within SS2 entitled “Small Scale Unallocated Development” should be deleted in its entirety, as it repeats spatial strategy issues that are already set out in the preceding paragraphs within the policy. Further detail on unallocated development is also provided through Policy SS3 “Sustainable Communities (Unallocated Sites).” Please also note that specific comments on Policy SS3 are covered separately.</p> <p>If Six Hills is not allocated within the plan, the Spatial Strategy should still seek to be inclusive of the Plan’s ambitions to consider the delivery of a new settlement. As such, we recommend that the following paragraph is amended within the final part of Policy SS2 to reduce conflict with other policies within the Plan:</p> <p>“Open Countryside: Outside the Development that is not well related to settlements identified as Service Centres, and those villages identified as Rural Hubs and Rural Settlements, or as part of a sustainable new village proposal identified within the Local Plan, new development will be restricted to that which is necessary and appropriate in the countryside”</p> <p>[Please view supporting statement to view amendments as suggested by Gladman including formatting]</p>	<p>provided trigger points for review if there is more arising, setting out the process by which it will consider options to accommodate it. The Plan provides substantial flexibility to accommodate unmet needs arising because it plans for a scale of development above OAN identified in HEDNA and Council does not consider it appropriate to make additional provision for such a scale of unmet need, from Leicester or elsewhere, until it is understood what the quantum of such needs are, when in the Plan period they may arise and following the SGP process to determine the optimum location from options available. Allocating such a provision would prejudice these processes and may give rise to a solution (to unmet need) that is not the most sustainable or appropriate. In addition it is considered that inclusion of a New Settlement would compete with the provisions for housing delivery which are closely related to the Strategic aims and objectives of the plan in relation to existing communities and may undermine the achievement of these outcomes.</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
(GADDESBY MASTER) Robert Appleyard Aila Marjatta Bennett Amanda Jane Jeyes Amber Lily Goddard Amrit Minhas Andlus Geeson Angela Murphy Ann Mary Norman Anne Christian Anthony John Carter Barbara Chantrill Bernard Hugh Murphy Bradley Pick Bryan Leslie Garley Caroline Batchelor Caroline Louise Stuart	<p>1. Rural hub or settlement? In the original draft plan Gaddesby was deemed to be a “rural supporter”. A rural supporter is identified by a clear scoring methodology. Attached is a copy of the scoring methodology, role and function of settlements, roles and spatial analysis together with the scores themselves taken from the Melton Local Plan Settlement Roles and Relationships of April 2015 (MLPSRR).</p> <p>It will be seen that the criteria used were much more extensive and sophisticated than the four used in the latest draft plan and that Gaddesby was very much at the lower end of the rural supporter range of 10 to 20 points with 12. Why the change?</p> <p>Not only therefore has Gaddesby been “upgraded” but also it is proposed to assign to Gaddesby a greater proportionate increase in housing than any other village (see 4 below).</p> <p>Of the four current criteria comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary school – agreed • Access to employment opportunities – not agreed for the reasons set out in 8 and 9 below • Fast broadband – not accepted – see 10 below • Community building – agreed <p>Therefore Gaddesby does not enjoy the requisite three of the four criteria to qualify as a rural hub and should therefore be classed as a rural settlement. The methodology now proposed is unacceptable as being simplistic and unsound.</p> <p>The criteria should include more day to day facilities in the methodology such as a food shop, GP surgery, library, post office, primary school and pub. Not many rural villages will have employment facilities, those that do should be higher up the hierarchy and receive more development, and that</p>	<p>1. The methodology of selecting which villages should be the subject of development should be revised and if not revised Gaddesby should be reassessed as a rural settlement for the reasons set out in the Gaddesby Community Group Representations.</p> <p>2. GADD2 should be deleted from the plan as a proposed housing allocation, for the reasons set out in the Gaddesby Community Group Representations.</p> <p>3. GADD3 should be deleted from the plan as a proposed housing allocation, for the reasons set out in the Gaddesby Community Group Representations.</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered to be sound and Gaddesby is correctly identified as a rural hub owing to the presence of 3 of the key services identified. The proposed housing in Gaddesby and other villages represents the proposed approach to the provision and supply of the Borough's housing requirements overall and is not derived from Gaddesby's local need in isolation. The plan uses a 'baseline' of permissions and completions as at 31/3/2016 reflecting that the Plan period is 2011-2016. Subsequent permissions are regarded as 'windfall'. The Plan seeks to deliver a boost in housing supply as required by the NPPF in a more sustainable pattern that has been achieved in the past. The increased quantity compared to previous decades is derivative of both of these factors and it is not considered that past rates of building are an appropriate guide for future provision. The measurement of the growth of the village in %age terms is not considered to be a suitable method by which to identify/limit the scope for growth for the reasons stated above (boosting housing supply and sustainable patterns) It is not considered that it is a measure for the impact on character, which will be a function of the specific sites developed, 'sensitivity' (e.g. heritage assets,</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation for Gaddesby.</p> <p>See also site selection issues addressed under policies C1 and C1A</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Chambers Cheryl Pick Chloe Beth Theobald Christine Warom Christopher David Shatford Claire Rudkin Claire Warrington Colin Nigel Rose Daphne A Tucker Darren James Goddard David Benjamin Maguire David Gary Theobald David John Batchelor David Rogers David Ronald Holdsworth David Whait Debbie Jane Perkins	<p>facilities such as a food shop and doctors surgery are just as important as broadband in reducing the need to travel. There should also be more differentiation between the settlements, perhaps a return to the Primary and Secondary Services Centres previously proposed.</p> <p>2. Housing needs survey : A housing needs survey has not yet been carried out by Melton Council. Apparently the Council are to carry this out in the New Year (2017). If so how can it be said that there is a need for housing in Gaddesby?</p> <p>3. Existing permissions currently un-built : The Council have taken into account the 14 permitted dwellings at GADD1 but have not taken into account the 5 houses for which permission has been granted on Ashby Road (12/00530/FUL) and the one further dwelling at The Hall (15/00826/FUL). Accordingly, in reality Gaddesby has already been allocated 6 houses which, when added to the 55 houses allocated in the daft plan, takes the total allocation to 61 new houses. This cannot be sustained or justified for the reasons set out in there representations.</p> <p>4. Natural growth : At Appendix 2 of MLPSSR it will be seen that over the period 1994 to 2014 on average one new house was built in the village every year. On the assumption that this continues and additional 20 houses will be built over the life of the Plan.</p> <p>5. Percentages : If one looks at paras 4.2.21 and 22 of the draft Plan it will be seen that Gaddesby has markedly higher percentage of proposed housing than any of the other villages. There are currently 158 houses in the village itself. An increase of 61 would be a 38.6% increase and would clearly change the nature of the village. When the additional 20 houses likely to be built from “natural growth” are included, this pushes the figure up to an increase of 51.2%. The calculation by estimated population of the villages at 4.2.21 and 4.2.22 of the draft plan is unsound. It is the number of houses</p>		<p>landscape character etc) and design. The bus service is relatively frequent and provides opportunities for access to employment, but Gaddesby satisfies 3 of the criteria of a 'rural hub' under the methodology. The HA has not objected to the increase in traffic associated with the growth in Gaddesby and information from the LEA indicates capacity will be available in the local Primary School based on current projections.</p> <p>Policy SS3 will allow for additional development arising from local needs if these are not catered for by allocated sites.</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Diane Elizabeth Pritchard	which is material.			
Elaine Hawkrigg	6. Highways			
Faye Walker	: The A607 is already a very busy road as it leads to the Hobby Horse roundabout and the A46. Both these roads are over capacity certainly. It is not unusual to be queuing from Syston/Queniborough/East Goscote all the way to the Hobby Horse. The junction between Gaddesby Lane and the A607 is very dangerous and one sometimes has to wait minutes to join the A607.			
Gary Pick				
Gavin Walker				
Genevieve Rose	In addition, Rearsby Lane (which connects Gaddesby Lane to Ashby Road) is a busy, narrow and winding road with is already unsuitable for the existing traffic burden placed on it. If the 61 (or more) houses were built this is likely to add another 120 plus cars to the mix. This impact has not been assessed by the Plan.			
Gillian Frost				
Glyn Tucker				
Graham Bradshaw				
Hannah Toon	7. Weight limit			
Hardeep Singh Minha	: There is a weight limit throughout Gaddesby of 7.5 tonnes, which demonstrates how minor the roads are into the village.			
Isabelle Toon	8. Buses			
Jacinda Butterworth	: The suggestion that the 100 bus service can be used to get to work is incorrect. The 100 bus service runs very infrequently and does not run at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Gaddesby is the closest settlement in the Borough to Leicester and it is there that most people go to work rather than to Melton. We called a village meeting to discuss the plan and 74 villagers attended, when we asked for a show of hands not one indicated they work in Melton. The only suitable bus to Leicester leaves Gaddesby at 07.49 and the last bus leaves Leicester at 17:10. In other words it is impossible to use the bus to attend work full time in Leicester. Further Leicestershire County Council will review the contract next year (2017) and there is a risk that it will be withdrawn.			
Jack Neville Theobald				
James Rudkin				
James Toon				
Jane Bakewell				
Jane Cowan				
Jane Freer				
Janet Elizabeth	9. Employment			
	: The suggestion that there is access to employment			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Garley Janette Gadd Jason Peter Hamilton Jeyes Jennifer Ingham Jessica Francis Hart Jessica Milward Jessica Warrington Joanna Watson John Warner Joyce Holdsworth Julie Hayton Justine Hunt K Lynne Camplejohn Kamaljit Manhas Karen Wale Keeley Sarah- Ann Baigent Keith Trevor Wilby Kenneth Ronald Longbottom Kevin John	<p>opportunities is incorrect and requires re-assessment because of the lack of public transport. There is minimal employment within Gaddesby itself.</p> <p>10. Broadband : Gaddesby’s phone exchange has been “upgraded” in 2016 as part of the “super-fast” Leicestershire program. It has added support for Fibre to the Cabinet broadband. There isn’t a lot of choice of provider; the majority of residents are using BT.</p> <p>This broadband service is sold as “up to” 56Mbps download speed, which is more than adequate for an average modern home. The actual delivered speed of writing is 20Mbps or 40% of the advertised maximum, which is the same as the pre-upgrade ADSL offering. Given this failure to perform under the existing load of the village and surrounding areas, any additional load is likely to make the service deteriorate further. Many existing residents have not yet upgraded to fibre broadband, which means that when they do, this would increase the load further thereby reducing the actual delivered speed further.</p> <p>In the neighbouring village of Queniborough, the broadband speeds can be over double the delivered speed in Gaddesby.</p> <p>11. The School : Only in 2014 did the school intake increase to 25 each year from 15. Years 2, 1 and reception are therefore already at capacity. The catchment area for the school includes Barsby, South Croxton, Ashby Folville and almost to Queniborough and attracts pupils from further afield. Within 4 years the school will be at capacity and therefore there is no requirement to fill spaces with new families coming into the village. Having only recently been substantially extended, it is unrealistic to suggest that the school will be capable of further expansion in the short/medium term.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Ward				
Kevin Paul Madelin				
Linda Jane Shaw				
Loretta June Smith				
Louis Fairbrother				
Louise Smart				
Malcolm and Gillian McColm				
Martin Burdett				
Martin William Lee				
Mary Burdett				
Matthew Stephen Wright				
Merrill Wheeler				
Miles Warrington				
Molly Hunt				
Monica Geeson				
Mrs J Winterton				
Niall Chantrill				
Nora Beryl Perriam				
Patricia				

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Warrington				
Patricia Whait				
Paul McWilliam				
Paula Simon				
Peter Frost				
Peter Joseph Pritchard				
Peter Martin Hooper				
Peter Richard Howard				
Peter Warrington				
Philip David Baigent				
Philip Wale				
Philippa Godsiff				
Philippa Jane Maffioli				
Rebecca Goddard				
Rebecca Jeyes				
Richard Chantrill				
Richard Cowan				
Richard Gamble				
Richard Toon				

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Richard Wesson				
Richard Wroblewski				
Robert Bullock				
Robert Hunt				
Robert Leonard Woods				
Ronald Vickers				
S Evans				
Samantha Kitson				
Samantha Maguire				
Samantha Rogers				
Samuel Geeson				
Samuel John Burdett				
Sandra Skelland				
Sarah Elisabeth McWilliam				
Sarah Wesson				
Scott Machin				
Sheila Warner				
Shirley Diane Ingham				
Stephen Freer				

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Steven Godsiff				
Susan June Theobald				
Susan Milward				
Sylvia Symonds				
Teresa Gamble				
Tim Milward				
Tom and Melissa Fairbrother				
Tracey Jane Woods				
Trevor John Norman				
Trudy Toon				
Venice Ann Measures				
Victor Smart				
Virginia Tarelli				
Wayne Gadd				
Wendy Ann Lee				

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Dr James Philip Clifford Harding	The term 'sustainable' is frequently glibly applied and misunderstood. It is clearly not 'sustainable' to swamp a flood-prone rural village, lacking in all types of infrastructure and far away from amenities and employment, with unnecessary new housing that will destroy its character forever.	<p>Carry out sound and published investigations into the needs and impact on Bottesford relating to flood risk, traffic, parking, sewerage, schools, health facilities, shopping and leisure. Provide feedback to those Bottesford residents who have heard nothing from MBC in response to their comments on the earlier emerging options and draft plan.</p> <p>Provide clear reasons why a totally disproportionate number of new houses has been proposed for Bottesford rather than other more suitable brownfield sites closer to employment and facilities in the borough.</p>	The sustainability of the draft local plan policies and proposals has been comprehensively assessed through the sustainability appraisal undertaken alongside plan preparation. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and a Sequential Flood Risk and Exceptions Test has been undertaken to ensure that increasing flood risk is avoided. The responses to comments made on the Emerging Options version of the local plan were reported to Councillors in Summer 2016 and published on the website then. Site selection in Bottesford, as elsewhere, has taken full account of flood risk and consultation has been made with the relevant agencies with regard to infrastructure provision of the types listed - none has advised that it has capacity issues that cannot be addressed. There is a significant shortfall in the amount and quality of brownfield land available to meet the housing and employment land needs identified, and as such greenfield land is also required (see relevant evidence HEDNA 2017, Employment land Study 2016 etc). Bottesford represents approx 7% of the population of the Borough and the site allocations comprise approx 6% of the housing provision proposed in the Plan which is not considered disproportionate.	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation for Bottesford.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Howard Blakebrough	<p>The criteria for classification as a Service centre are illogical and arbitrary, being largely designed to meet the SHLAA availability. The four criteria do not include transport, a sustainable public transport service, shops, leisure, access to medical services; a number of which are more important than those chosen. Not only does this therefore include inappropriate settlements, but also precludes others which are perfectly capable of taking developments. The initial consultation identified problems but the revised criteria which then resulted both surprised many and were never subsequently properly debated.</p> <p>However, we do not have a problem with the 70:30 split between Melton and the villages</p>	Take another look at the Settlement criteria and make more objective.	<p>The 'classification' of villages is a separate exercise and did not take account of SHLAA availability. Such availability was applied after the Spatial Strategy ('classification') was devised and sites were selected accordingly. This has resulted in some locations being unable to identify sites to meet its 'apportionment' and resulted in the need for redistribution. However this has now developed and reallocation is no longer required.</p> <p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. This approach is considered to be sound and Somerby is correctly identified. The 'Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015' assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough's housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance.</p>	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation for Somerby.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
James Keith Hamilton	I consider that MBC were flawed in only registering sites for more than 10 houses in each of the villages. This meant that small infill sites were rejected straight away which is contrary to “Good Practice” and has caused an unnecessary amount of spurious housing planning applications and registering of sites on a purely speculative basis.		Windfalls (sites under 10) have been taken into account separately to the draft site allocations. Both are needed to meet the Borough's housing requirement. Table 3 indicates that an allowance of 9% of all new housing has been made for windfalls. Part of Policy SS2 and Policy SS3 set out the conditions under which these sites can come forward.	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation for Somerby.
Dermot Daly	<p>IMPACT FROM FLOODING (see MLP policies EN8 p.114 and EN11 pp.125-127)</p> <p>:</p> <p>Bottesford has 413 (28%+) properties in flood zone 3 and ranks as one of the highest risk villages in the whole of the East Midlands. Paragraph 7.22.3 of the Plan states that “sites at risk of flooding can only be allocated for development if there is insufficient land available in areas with lesser or no flood risk”. There are many other sites in Melton Borough with lower flood risk than Bottesford.</p> <p>The Bottesford SHLAA sites of Rectory Farm, Grantham Road Clay Pit and adjacent area to the Clay Pit are subject to flooding and partially categorised as flood zone 3b (designed to flood as an alleviation method). Any development on these sites will have a knock-on effect on the whole village which will be at higher risk of flooding.</p> <p>The Melton Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2015 states 22% of suggested development sites in Bottesford are in Flood Zones and so is 49% of the Rectory Farm site. The report continues to identify Bottesford as high risk to increased impact of flooding from Grantham Canal and again from impermeable surface drainage such as roads, drives and the houses.</p> <p>The last 20 years have seen a significant increase in the number of 'one in a hundred year' flood events - two major events in 1999, one serious event in 2001 (causing severe building damage) and an increase in less major events more recently. Bottesford is now categorised in 'one in seventy-five year' flood event.</p>	<p>Bottesford should be allowed organic growth, controlled on an annual allocation that can be a defence to excessive development. Furthermore, the authority should conduct the necessary investigation to impact of flooding, traffic, supporting services, public transport and village character.</p> <p>It is not necessarily the general public that should be stating the answers to these challenges. It is the responsibility of the authority to suggest, discuss, consult and change on an iterative basis.</p>	<p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and a Sequential Flood Risk and Exceptions Test has been undertaken to ensure that increasing flood risk is avoided. Site selection has taken account of flood risk to ensure that vulnerable areas can be avoided and/or mitigated without impacting on properties elsewhere. Whilst some land is vulnerable to flooding, Bottesford as a settlement is not intrinsically vulnerable as a location overall. It is considered unlikely that vehicle movements will increase by 100% (double) as a result of the new housing proposed, especially bearing in mind some traffic is associated with children arriving from the wider catchment area. The Local Education Authority has been consulted and has not advised that the school cannot cope, or be expanded, to accommodate the demand arising. Neither the Highways Authority nor the Highways Agency have objected to the proposals within the plan from road safety or capacity perspectives. Other service providers have been consulted and have not objected, advising that some facilities may need expansion. This has informed the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and will be funded from CIL and/or s106 mechanisms. Previous build rate /growth are not considered to be a guide to future provision as the Plan seeks to secure a boost to housing supply in accordance with the NPPF and more sustainable patterns of development in the future. Nor is the quantitative relationship between Bottesford and Melton considered that appropriate</p>	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation for Bottesford.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>The 2004 Entec report states that there are no flood alleviation options that can be implemented and that climate change over coming years is expected to increase flood levels within Bottesford by 39cm (15.5").</p> <p>When viewing the Environment Agency Flood Map the areas of significant risk (Zone 2 and Zone 3) within the Borough of Melton are along the Wreake to the West of Melton Mowbray, a small area to the Northwest of Redmile and the whole area of Bottesford and Easthorpe. Given this, why does the MLP place the most significant rural housing volumes in Bottesford?</p> <p>There appears to have been no credence taken of these points in respect of flooding impact to Bottesford and so the policy SS1 Sustainable Development and the policy SS2 Development Strategy are found to be unsound (and not withstanding the policies EN8 and EN11 do not explicitly state any risk reduction).</p> <p>BOTTESFORD: ROAD SAFETY AND TRAFFIC (see MLP policies C9 pp.71-72, IN1 p.134 and D1 pp.143-144)</p> <p>It is expected that 428+ houses will create in excess of 3,000 extra vehicle movements per day through our villages. A recent local study identified that there are currently in excess of 500 vehicle movements on Barkestone Lane around school start time. Another 428+ houses could potentially double this figure.</p> <p>The lack of parking in the village centre is already an issue. A further 428+ houses in total across the village will mean that current on-street and off-street parking will be unable to cope with the demand.</p> <p>This uplift of traffic flow through the village will increase the pollution factor especially in the centre of the village</p>		<p>measure. The scale of growth in Bottesford stated as 28% is significantly less than that for Melton, arising from these factors (Policy SS2 provides for 65% of growth to be accommodated in Melton Mowbray). Bottesford is considered to be a sustainable location for housing development in its own right and the quantity proposed by the plan reflects this background and its existing size.</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>and around the schools, shops and health centre.</p> <p>The majority of the increase in traffic flows are expected to be channelled through the most highly impacted roads in the centre of Bottesford village as it travels to the key local towns of Grantham, Bingham, Newark and Nottingham, and the major routes of A52, A46 and A1.</p> <p>There appears to have been no analysis of traffic increase or traffic impact carried out on Bottesford by Melton Borough Council even following a promise to do so by the Head of Regulatory Services when addressing a public meeting in Bottesford at the Emerging Options stage. Therefore the policy SS1 Sustainable Development and the policy SS2 Development Strategy are found not to be sound (and notwithstanding the policies C9 pp.71-72, IN1 p.134 and D1 pp.143-144 do not explicitly state any element of risk reduction). Furthermore, the policy SS3 Sustainable Communities is found not to comply with the duty to cooperate.</p> <p>STRESS ON EXISTING SERVICES (see MLP policies C9 pp.71-72, EN12 pp.127-128 and IN1 p.134)</p> <p>Schools: Applying the current ratio of children against the number of houses in the parish, which is on the low side for a modern build, this would expect to generate over 250 children. All levels of school and pre-school in Bottesford are already at or near full capacity therefore a significant increase in housing and population will be unsustainable.</p> <p>Doctors are currently stretched and will be overwhelmed with an estimated additional 1700 new patients from an extra 428+ houses. This is on top of a reduction/merging of village surgeries in 2017. Therefore a significant increase in housing and population will be unsustainable.</p> <p>Drainage: both rain water run-off and foul sewers are coming under increasing pressure, with gardens under</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes												
	<p>water on a regular basis and sewers breaching. This issue will be accentuated by the significant increase in housing being proposed.</p> <p>Bus services are very limited and causing the vast majority of new households to travel by car which will impact on traffic movement in the village and in neighbouring districts (South Kesteven and Rushcliffe).</p> <p>Train services: while neighbouring stations of Bingham and Radcliffe-on-Trent receive assistance to increase the number of trains stopping aligned with increased development, Bottesford is receiving none.</p> <p>Therefore the policy SS1 Sustainable Development and the policy SS2 Development Strategy are found not to be sound (and notwithstanding the policies C9 pp.71-72, EN12 pp.127-128 and IN1 p.134 do not explicitly state any element of risk reduction).</p> <p>ANALYSIS OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT (see MLP policies SS2 pp.29-30, EN1 p.98 and D1 pp.143-144)</p> <p>Historically, housing development in the villages in the Borough has been over allocated when compared to development in Melton itself.</p> <p>The following statistics show how excessive development has consistently been permitted in Bottesford, relative to the town of Melton:</p> <p>Census 1971 2011 2036 % increase % increase</p> <p>population last 40 years vs. next 25 years:</p> <table><tr><td>Melton</td><td>19,930</td><td>27,158</td><td>36,300</td><td>36%</td><td>33%</td></tr><tr><td>Bottesford</td><td>1,868</td><td>3,587</td><td>5,300</td><td>92%</td><td>48%</td></tr></table> <p>LOCATION Vs. SUSTAINABILITY (see MLP policies SS3 p.34, EN11 pp.125-127 and IN1 pp.134-135)</p>	Melton	19,930	27,158	36,300	36%	33%	Bottesford	1,868	3,587	5,300	92%	48%			
Melton	19,930	27,158	36,300	36%	33%											
Bottesford	1,868	3,587	5,300	92%	48%											

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Villages closer to Melton are more sustainable due to proximity of work opportunities, shopping, health services, transport links, etc. Bottesford has so far been identified as the most appropriate location for the majority of the rural allocation of housing. Most residents work, travel and shop in neighbouring Counties.</p> <p>Therefore the policy SS1 Sustainable Development and the policy SS2 Development Strategy are found not to be sound (and not withstanding the policies SS3 p.34, EN11 pp.125-127 and IN1 pp.134-135 do not explicitly state any element of risk reduction).</p>			
Mr P Baigent	<p>In the original draft Local Plan, Gaddesby was classified as a “rural supporter” (in accordance with the criteria set out in the Melton Local Plan Settlement Roles and Relationships of April 2015 (MLPSRR)). The criteria adopted in the MLPSRR was more extensive and sophisticated than the simple “four-prong” test used in the latest draft Local Plan and it is our client’s contention that there is no justification for this change in methodology. In addition, and (where applicable) in the alternative), our client contends that, even if the “four-prong” test is considered sound, then Gaddesby does not meet the requisite three out of four criteria to be classified as a Rural Hub. Gaddesby does not have access to employment opportunities because: a. there are only 2 employers in the village – the Cheney Arms public house and the Primary School both of which have limited opportunities (and not sufficient to service additional population of the numbers proposed); and b. the village has very poor public transport links to Leicester and Melton. It has only one bus service (number 100) which runs infrequently and does not run on Sundays or bank holidays. Due to the location of Gaddesby, the majority of residents work in or towards Leicester (rather than Melton). The only suitable bus service to Leicester on a week day leaves Gaddesby at 07.49 and the last bus back from Leicester leaves at 17.10 meaning, in each case, the bus service is not a viable mode of transport for a resident working full time in Leicester. Gaddesby does not have fast broadband. The current broadband service is sold as “up to” 56Mbps download speed however the actual delivered speed at the time of writing is 20Mbps, or 40% of the advertised maximum, which is the same as the pre-upgrade ADSL offering. Given</p>		As above (GADDESBY MASTER) in response to rep ref. no. BHLF-13H4-7YVV-V	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation for Gaddesby.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	this failure to perform under the existing load of the village and surrounding areas, any additional load is likely to make the service deteriorate further. Many existing residents have not yet upgraded to fibre broadband, which means that, when they do, this would increase the load further thereby reducing the actual delivered speed			
Ros Freeman	<p>Burrough Court is used by individuals needing a workspace and address for their own businesses there are really no opportunities for employment of people here.</p> <p>As this is one of the essential criteria for. Making Somerby a service centre, this is a flawed basis. The distance from Somerby to this place is also prohibitive and there are no work friendly bus services.</p> <p>It would make sense to open up land near this site for housing development being close to amenities at Burrough on the hill and access to Leicester</p>	Somerby does not have the essential criteria to be classed as a service centre and should be a rural hub.	The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. Somerby is correctly identified as a service centre owing to the presence of all of the key services identified This is not dependant upon the services mentioned) . The comments relating to the specific sites are addressed in comments relating to Chapter 5 (policies C1 and C1A). 'Recategorising' to a 'Rural Hub' under this approach would not affect the allocation applied in terms of housing number.	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation for Somerby

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
David Crowther	<p>HOS1,2,3 The description of Hose in the Appendix 1 is incorrect.</p> <p>It says Hose has a limited range of services including.... This implies there are additional services to those you mention - there are not. In fact, you state there is a shop with post office and a newsagent. This is incorrect. There is just one shop in total.</p> <p>You state there is a regular bus service - but fail to mention that it is also very infrequent -the buses may be regular but there are very few of them.</p> <p>You state that any developer will need to contribute to expanding the local primary school. However, there is no space at the school to allow expansion (except maybe make it a four-storey building) - so how will these additional primary school places be achieved?</p> <p>You state that the fringe of Hose has 6 LCZs and only one (LCZ1) is rated medium-high sensitivity with the other 5 being medium to medium low. However according to your interactive map this is incorrect - as LCZ2 and LCZ5 re also shown as medium-high.</p> <p>In particular, the proposed sites HOS2 and HOS3 are located in LCZ5 - an area rated Medium-Highly Sensitivity to development.</p> <p>In addition you state that HOS2 plays a role on the approach to the village from the east (I think you mean West).</p> <p>All three proposed sites (HOS1,2,3) are together on the North West of the village which will concentrate traffic along the very narrow Canal Lane and through the centre of Hose. In addition, placing all the new house together will create a housing estate environment which is totally out of keeping with a village form</p> <p>Based on this, I think you need to re-appraise your designation of Hose as being able to take 57 houses - and in particular, the sites HOS2 and HOS3 are inappropriate.</p>		<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. Hose is correctly identified owing to the presence of the key services identified. The information regarding Primary Education was provided by the Local Education Authority. Increasing capacity does not necessarily mean that physical extensions are required. Site specific issues are addressed in the response to Policies C1 and C1(A).</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Chris Jesson, Planning & Design Group (UK) Ltd on behalf of JGP Properties Ltd	<p>We consider that the plan is unsound on the premise that the proposed settlement hierarchy no longer includes the category of 'Rural Supporter' settlements as a basis of establishing future expectations of growth and how this may be appointed across the Borough. In the earlier iteration of the Local Plan this category was included in the settlement hierarchy, with some settlements highlighted for their role in providing a small but important number of amenities, and others to highlight their distinctive spatial relationship to the main settlement of Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>While the proposed Local Plan spatial hierarchy suggests rural hub settlements which is welcome, the policy's lack of distinction or consistency on settlements that are close to service centres and Melton Mowbray, and applying the candidacy as a 'Rural Hub' makes the policy unsound. The Council has expressed a commitment in the policy that settlements which are within a 500m of a service centre or 2.5km of Melton Mowbray will be regarded as rural hubs. Why is it that settlements referenced in this way include Asfordby Hill, in excess of 2.5km from Melton Mowbray town centre but much closer to the town's amenities on it's edge, when others including Burton Lazars, which has an identical service and amenities score to Asfordby Hill in the Settlements Roles and Relationships Study 2016, are discounted?</p> <p>Burton Lazars is only 1.3km from the outer edges of Melton Mowbray and local amenities in those estates, within 2 miles of Melton Town Centre, on suitable bus routes and close to the proposed sustainable urban extension planned as part of the same Local Plan, the amenities within will be a key consideration to the future sustainability of that settlement.</p> <p>On a separate note following comprehensive review in the Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study, the Local Plan now provides an up to date approach to the merits of Local Green Spaces, but the approach for Neighbourhood Plans to suggest additional sites must take into account evidence contained in the study only. It cannot, for instance, seek to identify sites that have already been justifiably de-allocated from previous designations, nor include sites that have no</p>	<p>There needs to be consistency applied to the settlement review to commit to the distinctive relationship settlements have when they are close to service centres villages and Melton Mowbray. There also needs to be consideration of the proposed urban extension to the south of Melton Mowbray and the implications this may have upon the settlements of villages that lie in close proximity to it and the rest of Melton, to determine a robust and positively prepared approach to the hierarchy.</p> <p>Either consistency has to be applied to rural hubs to truly be accurate to the policy's expectation where they are close to their larger counterparts, or there needs to be a distinction provided for rural settlements that lie in close proximity to those areas and reflect their expected growth levels accordingly.</p>	Asfordby Hill is identified as a Rural Hub in its own right based on the services present rather than its proximity to Melton Mowbray. Burton Lazars is correctly identified as a rural Ssttlement also based on its lower level of service provision and distance from Melton Mowbray. The identification of Local Green Space(s) in Neighbourhood Plans is a matter for them and their Examination.	None Proposed

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	absolute recommendation for potential future designation in the Study. To enhance and reinforce a site does not automatically mean, in the absence of such a recommendation, that it would be a suitable candidate as a Local Green Space.			
normanhoskin@outlook.com	Revise the proportion of allocation from 65% Melton, 35% peripheral rural to 75% Melton, 25% rural		The 'Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015' assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough's housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance to meet the Borough's needs and the Plan's priorities and objectives. This evidence is considered to remain valid. These opportunities were considered in the early plan-making exercise and are reflected in the SA. The 'Assessing Large Scale Development Sites' paper (July 2015) considered 11 alternative options for Large Scale Development Sites. These included: three 'urban extension' options and two large scale 'directions of growth' to Melton Mowbray; two options close to Melton Mowbray at Thorpe Arnold and Welby; an urban extension to Bottesford; and three new settlements at Dalby Airfield, Six Hills and Normanton airfield. The assessment concluded that the proposed 'Melton North' and 'Melton South' Sustainable Urban Extensions offered the best opportunities to provide the most sustainable strategic scale growth. They were most able to deliver the outstanding requirements for new housing and employment development and, because of their scale, are able to support the range of services & facilities, public transport and green infrastructure that help to encourage communities to form and reduce the need to travel.	None proposed.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
rayranns@btinternet.com	The changes are suggested by including Six Hills in Policy SS2		These opportunities were considered in the early plan-making exercise and are reflected in the SA. The 'Assessing Large Scale Development Sites' paper (July 2015) considered 11 alternative options for Large Scale Development Sites. These included: three 'urban extension' options and two large scale 'directions of growth' to Melton Mowbray; two options close to Melton Mowbray at Thorpe Arnold and Welby; an urban extension to Bottesford; and three new settlements at Dalby Airfield, Six Hills and Normanton airfield. The assessment concluded that the proposed 'Melton North' and 'Melton South' Sustainable Urban Extensions offered the best opportunities to provide the most sustainable strategic scale growth. They were most able to deliver the outstanding requirements for new housing and employment development and, because of their scale, are able to support the range of services & facilities, public transport and green infrastructure that help to encourage communities to form and reduce the need to travel.	None proposed.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Catherine J.G. Pugh	<p>Public transport in Bottesford has been drastically cut in recent years. Services to Newark, Bingham and Nottingham have been cancelled. There is a two-hourly bus service to Melton Mowbray (journey time approximately 50 minutes to one hour), though few people have employment there. There is an hourly bus service to Grantham. There are no evening or Sunday bus services. There is a two-hourly train service to Nottingham until just before 9.00 p.m. It is not possible for Bottesford and Muston residents to visit the Nottingham theatres and concert halls unless they have a car.</p> <p>Poor local facilities and lack of public transport make car use essential both for employment and leisure, resulting in an increase in congestion on the A52 and worsening air quality in an area where it are pollution has already been identified as a problem.</p> <p>There are no safe cycle routes in the area, the only route to Bingham or Grantham being along the A52.</p> <p>The draft plan appears to intend to greatly increase housing, correspondingly reducing access to open space, without making any provision for a commensurate increase in any other facilities.</p> <p>Although Bottesford had roughly doubled in size since 1960 there has been a decline in services and little improvement in infrastucture. Such amenities as the village possesses are in the High Street and Queen Street area, which are already severely congested. In some parts of the area pavements are uneven or non-existent.</p> <p>Any examination of the street plan would reveal that there is an S bend at the junction of Belvoir Road and High Street and another at the junction of Market Street and Grantham Road, making the most frequent crossing places dangerous. There are also danger spots at the cross roads of Chapel/Church Street and Market Street/Rectory Lane and a further S bend past the Church, on a road that is already used by lorries from the existing industrial estate and as rat-run from Newark to the A52, sometimes by heavy vehicles which dwarf the surrounding housing.</p>	An influx of newcomers from the proposed new housing could only add to these problems. There is inadequate planning for infrastructure and recreational facilities. The Melton Local Plan proposes the expansion of Bottesford from a village to a dormitory suburb the size of a small town. The village would lose its sense of identity and community. It would be far less healthy place in which to live.	The Local Education Authority has been consulted and has not advised that the school cannot cope, or be expanded, to accommodate the demand arising. The Highways Authority nor the Highways Agency have objected to the proposals within the plan from road safety or capacity perspectives. Other service providers have been consulted and have not objected, advising that some facilities may need expansion.	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Diane Reed	<p>Bottesford: Schools: applying current ratio of children against number of houses in the parish, which is on the low side for a modern build, this would expect to generate over 250 children. The impact on schools and preschool, which are already at, or near full capacity would be catastrophic.</p> <p>Doctors: currently overstretched and could potentially be overwhelmed with an estimated additional 1700 new patients from 428+ houses. This is on top of a reduction/merging of village surgeries in 2017.</p> <p>Drainage: both rain water run off and foul sewers are under increasing pressure, with gardens under water on a regular basis and sewers breaching</p> <p>Bus services: very limited and causing majority of new households to travel by car which will impact on traffic movement in the village and neighbouring districts</p> <p>Train Services: while neighbouring stations of Bingham and Radcliffe on Trent receive assistance to increase the number of trains stopping aligned with increased development, Bottesford is receiving none</p>		<p>The Local Education Authority has been consulted and has not advised that the school cannot cope, or be expanded, to accommodate the demand arising. The Highways Authority nor the Highways Agency have objected to the proposals within the plan from road safety or capacity perspectives. Other service providers have been consulted and have not objected, advising that some facilities may need expansion.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>
Dr Neil James Fortey	<p>The policy fails for Bottesford for a variety of reasons.</p> <p>There is already a perceived lack of green spaces and facilities for cycling and other recreational activities within the parish and the Draft Plan concentrates too much on increasing housing without provision for enhanced facilities, e.g. there is no park, no swimming facility, no tennis facility, no dedicated cycling routes (in spite of the efforts made by SusTrans to create a safe crossing of the A52 consistently thwarted by weak council support).</p> <p>There has been no improvement of streets, safe crossing, bus shelters, traffic access to local schools in order to cater for the population expansion in Bottesford since 1960 such that the village is cluttered and around its shops can be dangerous for old persons or children getting around, and this will be made considerably worse by the influx of newcomers taking up the proposed new housing.</p> <p>Bottesford is being expanded to become a small town but with inadequate planning for infrastructure and</p>	<p>The central street plan of Bottesford should be redesigned to meet the needs of present and future population. Street calming and safe crossings should be introduced, on street parking by shoppers should be discouraged by well planned provision of parking areas, safe secure crossings should be created at key locations for instance where elderly person from sheltered housing need to cross roads to access shops and medical facilities. A network of safe cycling routes should be created as part of the Melton Plan in order to encourage better use of cycling rather than local motor car journeys which worsen congestion and environmental factors such as air quality, noise and light pollution. The cycling network should be integrated into borough wide and national networks of cycling routes to encourage leisure, health and sensible alternative transport usage. In general the Draft Plan should be revised as necessary in order to create strategic planning of the village centre and adjoining areas in order to balance the need for housing with the parallel need for a good environment that will encourage healthy living and reduce pollution and consumption of fossil fuels.</p>	<p>The Local Education Authority has been consulted and has not advised that the school cannot cope, or be expanded, to accommodate the demand arising. The Highways Authority nor the Highways Agency have objected to the proposals within the plan from road safety or capacity perspectives. Other service providers have been consulted and have not objected, advising that some facilities may need expansion. Bottesford has a wide range of services and is considered to be a sustainable location for residential development. This includes leisure facilities and access to the surrounding countryside and network of footpaths. Whilst car journeys remain necessary for some activities, their presence locally mitigates the extent to which it is necessary.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	recreational facilities necessary to make it a healthy place to live.			
JOHN RUST	<p>MBC have used consultants to assess sustainability, rural character etc of Long Clawson then allocated development purely on settlement population and land forwarded for development, so this plan does not comply with the NPPF guidance and is also not in the spirit of the 2011 localism act.</p> <p>The Clawson In Action group provided the Melton Borough Council with a data pack which highlighted the village's lack of sustainability, but it appears to have been ignored .</p> <p>Soundness - Not Positively Prepared : In its preparation of the Strategy we believe that MBC has failed to objectively assess Long Clawson village, rather basing its long held views on perception rather than fact. In particular, MBC has down-played the environment setting; historical significance (two Grade 2* and fifteen Grade 2 Listed buildings; an Ancient Monument; and Conservation area); facilities and services comparative to Plan Consultation, village residents expressed their concerns about traffic, pedestrian safety, congestion and lack of parking in the village centre. Supporting evidence has been provided in the information Pack and Clawson In Action Documents submitted to Mr J Worley in response to this consultation.</p> <p>Soundness - Not Effective: Long Clawson cannot sustain the development if takes place in a short period of time and not over the 20 year period. Table 8 shows the Site Delivery Summary for the Large Scale Sites in Melton Mowbray and the obvious but unwritten conclusion from this schedule is that the majority of other sites must be developed in the first 5 years to meet the Borough 5+20% year land supply targets. As the majority of these are in rural locations this forces rapid expansion of rural villages which is neither sustainable or desirable and is out of keeping with historic rates of increase in the villages. Therefore the Melton Local Plan is unsound as the delivery schedule is not effective and has not listened to feedback from Parish Councils and residents which shows that villages are not adverse to development but that it should</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address all infrastructure problems detailed in the submitted Data Pack and the Clawson in Action consultation response documents , include and budget for them in the MBC Local Plan, and implement them prior to any development being undertaken in Long Clawson. • If all the infrastructure issues are addressed, and if Long Clawson housing allocation of 110 homes is accepted, the building should be evenly spread over 20 years at a rate of no more than six in any one year and tailored to local need; • support the development of the Garden Village at Six Hills and Dalby airfield south of Melton as a sustainable alternatives to 'over-loading' all the villages in the Vale of Belvoir'; • reconsider its decision to unfairly allocate 67%, of the 35% housing allocation for villages, to villages north of the town, concentrated on the Nottinghamshire border. 	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. Site suitability, including heritage, flood vulnerability etc has been taken into account in the site selection exercise and has been updated, resulting in many changes and the deletion of a site (LONG2) in Long Clawson.. Whilst is it noted that Long Clawson has series of constraints such as flood vulnerability, heritage considerations and service capacity, it is not considered that they apply to the whole of the village in sustainability terms, as evidenced by the SA, and it remains appropriate to be allocated a 'service centre' under the methodology devised. These factors are also not always 'showstoppers'; development can go ahead on sites affected by constraints with appropriate layout, design and /or mitigations. The proposals for a garden village would not enable the achievement of the plan objectives and would make it difficult to achieve a five year housing land supply, which is essential if the plan is to be found 'sound'. Alternatives to the 65%/35% distribution would similarly not perform so well in meeting plan and sustainability objectives. The infrastructure issues raised in the data pack supplied to</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation for Long Clawson.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	be phased over the whole period of the plan to allow infrastructure to adapt over time.		MBC in May 2016 (and not as part of this representation) have been followed up by the Council. The Local Highway Authority have indicated that the highway impacts of new development can be dealt with through the development management process and the primary school places is nearing resolution. The site selection process has taken flooding issues in to account in accordance with national guidance.	
Dr Neil James Fortey	There is a glaring inconsistency with regard to the classification of Easthorpe (containing site EAST1) as a 'Rural Hub' while neighbouring Muston is not placed in this class. Easthorpe has been an integral part of Bottesford parish for over 200 years. Most of its historic extent had been become consumed into Bottesford before 1900 and what remained was and still is a small village with no facilities beyond what it has by virtue of being part of Bottesford. It is apparent that Muston qualifies better as a rural hub than Easthorpe in that it (Muston) has traditionally been a separate village, formerly a separate parish, and retains its own parish church, communal building (formerly the village primary school) and better access to employment than Easthorpe in that it is on the No.6 bus route to Bottesford and Grantham whereas Easthorpe has none of these services. Thus the classification of Easthorpe as a separate rural hub while Muston is classified as a rural settlement is absurd and demeaning, resulting in Muston being protected against development pressure whereas Easthorpe is not protected and indeed serves as a means to augment the housing allocated to Bottesford of which it is part.	To achieve consistency and fairness in housing development allocation the stronger identity and services in Muston must be recognised by grading it as a Rural Hub whereas Easthorpe should not even be treated as a separate settlement in that it is to all intents and purposes a part of Bottesford. Otherwise there is the possibility of appearing to manipulate the new housing allocations unfairly.	The categorisation of Muston and Easthorpe is based on evidence of existing services and proximity to those in a nearby settlement collected during preparation of the local plan. Parish boundaries are not relevant to this assessment. No evidence has been provided of any change.	None proposed.
Dr Peter David James	I am unclear why only 65% of housing needs are met within Melton where there might be greater potential for development. Melton provides significant potential for employment, has good transport links and service facilities reducing the need for car journeys and therefore environmentally beneficial. Housing within service centres and rural communities provide less opportunities for employment and therefore are more dependant on good transport links or would require the use of a car. Distribution in rural areas should not be based solely on population. Presence of historic features, sustainability of		The Council considers the 65/35% split between the town and the villages to be the most appropriate to provide a choice of development sites of different sizes and in different locations. This strategy will also ensure the appropriate number of homes are delivered in the town to support a sustainable pattern of growth and deliver the required infrastructure. At the same time this strategy will support and maintain the services and facilities within villages in the rural area and provide the housing choice	None proposed.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	services and road networks and availability of sites for potential development should also be considered when allocating housing requirements		referred to. Each site has been assessed to take account of environmental factors such as those mentioned and selected only if its impacts are concluded to be satisfactory or can be satisfactorily mitigated.	
Elizabeth Wheatley	Sewstern has been included in the wrong category as a Rural Supporter. The village has very limited services (small school shared with Buckminster; pub and limited bus service) if these can be classed as services in their limited capacity and therefore the village should be included in Rural Settlements not Rural Supporter.	Change of classification of village.	Sewstern is included as a Rural Settlement to reflect the lack of local services and facilities. (Appendix 3 shows this). This categorisation is base on evidence collected during preparation of the local plan. The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. Sewstern was not selected under this methodology due to its limited range of services.	None proposed.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Friends of Melton Country Park		Now that the preferred route of the road is to the east of the town, developers will become interested in the land to the east of Burton Road between the distributor road and the current town boundary, and any land becoming available in this area would easily accommodate the extra 700 houses to make up the desired total of 4,000.	These opportunities were considered in the early plan-making exercise and are reflected in the SA. The 'Assessing Large Scale Development Sites' paper (July 2015) considered 11 alternative options for Large Scale Development Sites. These included: three 'urban extension' options and two large scale 'directions of growth' to Melton Mowbray; two options close to Melton Mowbray at Thorpe Arnold and Welby; an urban extension to Bottesford; and three new settlements at Dalby Airfield, Six Hills and Normanton airfield. The assessment concluded that the proposed 'Melton North' and 'Melton South' Sustainable Urban Extensions offered the best opportunities to provide the most sustainable strategic scale growth. They were most able to deliver the outstanding requirements for new housing and employment development and, because of their scale, are able to support the range of services & facilities, public transport and green infrastructure that help to encourage communities to form and reduce the need to travel.	None proposed
Gareth Evans	<p>Para 4.2.3. This emphasizes the need for a Western Distribution Road to serve and enhance the existing business parks at the Leicester Road and Asfordby/Holwell Sites to provide employment.</p> <p>This plan suggests that 30 hectares of employment land could be provided by using a sustainable South neighbourhood and serving these two business parks, so how would the Eastern distribution road provide similar benefits when a major part of Saxby Rd still acts as a flood plain.</p>		Work commissioned by the LHA and MBC identified that the eastern route presented superior value for money and this has now been progressed into a successful bid for funding for design (PROGRESS WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MELTON MOWBRAY TRANSPORT STRATEGY 2016). This route makes the same connections to the arterial routes into and out of the town and provides alleviation to the town centre. Detailed route planning is underway to examine flood risk (and other constraints); no evidence has been provided to demonstrate a solution is not possible. Significant amendments to the provision of infrastructure are proposed within chapter 8 of the Plan	Please see also responses to Chapter 8 of the Plan and proposed 'focussed changes' for consultation relating particularly to the route of the Distributor Road.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Gareth Evans	<p>Para 4.2.4 and 4.2.5 suggest a new categorization of settlements, admitting the previous categorization in the Draft Plan 2016 had flaws. This new categorization is too simple and again flawed.</p> <p>What housing contributions are expected from the settlements that are not rural hubs or service centres?</p> <p>Thorpe Arnold should remain a Rural Settlement not a Rural Hub, based on this new categorization. The WOTWATA Parish Council failed lamentably to comment on categorisation of Thorpe Arnold at the Draft Plan 2016 stage. On the new basis given, why is Burton Lazars not in the same category given its proximity to the Town? the large settlement of Buckminster escapes note and disappears.</p> <p>Thorpe Arnold is a small hamlet with very little or no services; there are approximately 50 houses in the Parish with 30 centred around the village, and it should be categorised as a rural settlement not a rural hub. In the Draft Plan 2016, rural supporting settlements were expected to deliver housing needs by small developments of less than 5 to 10 houses. Policy SS3 states housing allocations for rural settlements would be less, yet the tabled allocation for Thorpe Arnold is currently of 20 for THOR 1 with a further 45 for Thor 2 listed in this Melton Plan 2016. Mentioned in the latest SHLAA 2016, there are six additional potential development sites in Thorpe Arnold to sites THOR 1 and 2. In this same SHLAA 2016, the site panel concluded reducing the number of houses on THOR1, and comments suggested MBC housing density targets as being too high. The Thor 2 site surrounds farm buildings so this will limit the use for agricultural purposes, and the developments next to farm buildings will effectively reduce the number of potential purchasers so additional application to redevelopment might be expected. These allocations grossly exceed any measure of housing need within the village.</p> <p>To develop new housing and sustainable growth by 2035</p>		<p>This categorisation is based on evidence collected during preparation of the local plan. The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing. Thorpe Arnold is included owing to its proximity to Melton Mowbray. Burton Lazars is a little more distant and therefore categorised accordingly. The Pre Submission Plan did not include sites which were not selected.</p> <p>Sites have now come forward in Great Dalby and Scalford and are allocated under SS2. This has resulted in a reworking of SS2 to adjust allocations and the process of redistribution due to shortfalls can be avoided.</p>	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>as required by the Governments Local Plan process, the SUE;s should offer opportunities to develop new communities with good infrastructure and modern designs with ecological innovations in preference to putting strain on existing village infrastructures which were never designed to cope with the large housing allocations.</p> <p>Several SUEs are listed in the latest SHLAA 2016, including Thorpe Arnold: this inclusion was never mentioned in the Draft Plan 2016, this current Melton Plan 2016 nor at consultative meetings, yet the Melton Plan 2016 repeats the desire to keep the area of separation and flood plain between Melton Town and Thorpe Arnold.</p> <p>Para 4.2.11 SUE's : This Melton Plan 2016 nor relevant policy totally fail to adequately explain why the potential SUES at Six Hills, Normanton Airfield and Great Dalby/Melton Airfield have been rejected in in favour of spoiling rural settlements by over development in relation to their infrastructure, transport system etc. This plan fails to nail the rumour/excuses as to why these three SUEs cannot be developed as there is a major opportunity to develop new "eco-friendly" garden villages where the number of houses can more than meet the provisional housing targets, new primary school, sufficient recreation facilities for youngsters wand with the additional cost effect public transport.</p> <p>The Northern SUE proposal was withdrawn after a Public Enquiry, yet MBC continues to include it in this plan. Meanwhile, MBC have allowed "nibble development" in green fields opposite to John Fernley school which created additional traffic hazards for school children with no apparent benefit to providing a Northern Bypass. The delivery of a master plan for the NSUE is strongly affected by the allowed "nibbling" of land for development near John Fernley school.</p> <p>For the existing villages, public transport is totally inadequate and economically will never be cost effective without subsidies. Village populations, particularly youngsters and senior citizens are trapped by the lack of</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>public transport, and there is no mention of how extra transport will be proved for excessive village expansions. the Weak argument for encouraging village shops does not recognize the major changes in shopping patterns, with door step delivery services being provided by all the major supermarkets and on line shopping.</p> <p>Para 4.2.15 states "it is proposed to allocate housing development within the Service Centres and Rural Hubs on the basis of existing settlement size". It claims this to be an inherently fair and proportional approach to allocation". No substantial reasons are given for excluding housing allocations to the larger settlements of Great Dalby and Scalford, and the exclusion of settlements such as Buckminster and Burton Lazars. More than 40 settlements are given no allocation. The tables express percentages of housing allocations of the totals required, rather than the ratios of new housing to existing housing. There are no references to data obtained on the current housing needs of individual villages, despite recent consultant based surveys.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Gary Fox	<p>Representations by GADDESBY COMMUNITY GROUPFor the following reasons I do not consider the Plan to be justified, effective or consistent with national policy.</p> <p>General in relation to Gaddesby</p> <p>1. Rural hub or settlement?</p> <p>In the original draft plan Gaddesby was deemed to be a “rural supporter.” A rural supporter is identified by a clear scoring methodology. Attached is a copy of the scoring methodology, role and function of settlements, role and spatial analysis together with the scores themselves taken from the Melton Local Plan Settlement Roles and Relationships of April 2015 (MLPSRR).</p> <p>It will be seen that the criteria used were much more extensive and sophisticated than the four used in the latest draft plan and that Gaddesby was very much at the lower end of the rural supporter range of 10 to 20 points with 12. Why the change?</p> <p>Not only therefore has Gaddesby been “upgraded” but also it is proposed to assign to Gaddesby a greater proportionate increase in housing than any other village (see 4 below).</p> <p>Of the four current criteria comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary school – agreed. • Access to employment opportunities – not agreed for the reasons set out in 8 and 9 below. • Fast broadband – not accepted – see 10 below. • Community building – agreed. <p>Therefore Gaddesby does not enjoy the requisite three out of the four criteria to qualify as a rural hub and should therefore be classed as a rural settlement. The methodology now proposed is unacceptable as being simplistic and unsound.</p> <p>The criteria should include more day to day facilities in the</p>	The methodology of selecting which villages should be the subject of development should be revised and if not revised Gaddesby should be reassessed as a rural settlement	The methodology for determining the settlement hierarchy was revised following comments received to the Emerging options Consultation. It must be recognised that there will always be some degree of support and objection to the methodology depending on the conclusions, The new methodology is considered robust and defensible. The categorisation of Gaddesby is based on evidence collected during the preparation of this version of the plan.	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation for Gaddesby.</p> <p>Please see also responses to Policies C1 and C1A relating to site specific issues.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>methodology such as food shop, GP surgery, library, post office, primary school and pub. Not many rural villages will have employment facilities, those that do should be higher up the hierarchy and receive more development, and that facilities such as a food shop and doctors surgery are just as important as broadband in reducing the need to travel. There should also be more differentiation between the settlements, perhaps a return to the Primary and Secondary Services Centres previously proposed.</p> <p>2. Housing needs survey</p> <p>A housing needs survey has not yet been carried out by Melton Council. Apparently the Council are to carry this out in the New Year (2017). If so how can it be said that there is a need for housing in Gaddesby?</p> <p>3. Existing permissions currently un-built</p> <p>The Council have taken into account the 14 permitted dwellings at GADD1 but have not taken into account the 5 houses for which permission has been granted on Ashby Road (12/00530/FUL) and the one further dwelling at The Hall (15/00826/FUL). Accordingly, in reality Gaddesby has already been allocated 6 houses which, when added to the 55 houses allocated in the draft plan, takes the total allocation to 61 new houses. This cannot be sustained or justified for the reasons set out in these representations.</p> <p>4. Natural growth</p> <p>At Appendix 2 of MLPSRR it will be seen that over the period 1994 to 2014 on average one new house was built in the village every year. On the assumption that this continues an additional 20 houses will be built over the life of the Plan.</p> <p>5. Percentages</p> <p>If one looks at paras 4.2.21 and 22 of the draft Plan it will be seen that Gaddesby has a markedly higher percentage of proposed housing than any of the other villages. There are currently 158 houses in the village itself. An increase of 61 would be a 38.6% increase and would clearly change the nature of the village. When the additional 20 houses</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>likely to be built from “natural growth” are included, this pushes the figure up to an increase of 51.2%. The calculation by estimated population of the villages at 4.2.21 and 4.2.22 of the draft plan is unsound. It is the number of houses which is material.</p> <p>6. Highways</p> <p>The A607 is already a very busy road as it leads to the Hobby Horse roundabout and the A46. Both these roads are over capacity certainly. It is not unusual to be queuing from Syston/Queniborough/East Goscote all the way to the Hobby Horse. The junction between Gaddesby Lane and the A607 is very dangerous and one sometimes has to wait minutes to join the A607.</p> <p>In addition, Rearsby Lane (which connects Gaddesby Lane to Ashby Road) is a busy, narrow and winding road which is already unsuitable for the existing traffic burden placed on it.</p> <p>If the 61 (or more) houses were to be built this is likely to add another 120 plus cars to the mix. This impact has not been assessed by the Plan.</p> <p>7. Weight limit</p> <p>There is a weight limit throughout Gaddesby of 7.5 tonnes, which demonstrates how minor the roads are into the village.</p> <p>8. Buses</p> <p>The suggestion that the 100 bus service can be used to get to work is incorrect. The 100 bus service runs very infrequently and does not run at all on Sundays or bank holidays. Gaddesby is the closest settlement in the borough to Leicester and it is there that most people go to work rather than to Melton. We called a village meeting to discuss the plan and 74 villagers attended, when we asked for a show of hands not one indicated that they work in Melton. The only suitable bus to Leicester leaves Gaddesby at 07.49 and the last bus leaves Leicester at 17.10. In other words it is impossible to use the bus to attend work full-time in Leicester. Further Leicestershire</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>County Council will review the contract next year (2017) and there is a risk that it will be withdrawn.</p> <p>9. Employment</p> <p>The suggestion that there is access to employment opportunities is incorrect and requires re-assessment because of the lack of public transport. There is minimal employment within Gaddesby itself.</p> <p>10. Broadband</p> <p>Gaddesby's phone exchange has been "upgraded" in 2016 as part of the "super-fast" Leicestershire program. It has added support for Fibre to the Cabinet broadband. There isn't a lot of choice of provider; the majority of residents are using BT.</p> <p>This broadband service is sold as "up to" 56Mbps download speed, which is more than adequate for an average modern home. The actual delivered speed at the time of writing is 20Mbps, or 40% of the advertised maximum, which is the same as the pre-upgrade ADSL offering. Given this failure to perform under the existing load of the village and surrounding areas, any additional load is likely to make the service deteriorate further. Many existing residents have not yet upgraded to fibre broadband, which means that, when they do, this would increase the load further thereby reducing the actual delivered speed further.</p> <p>In the neighbouring village of Queniborough, the broadband speeds can be over double the delivered speed in Gaddesby.</p> <p>11. The School</p> <p>Only in 2014 did the school intake increase to 25 each year from 15. Years 2, 1 and reception are therefore already at capacity. The catchment area for the school includes Barsby, South Croxton, Ashby Folville and almost to Queniborough and attracts pupils from further afield. Within 4 years the school will be at capacity and, therefore, there is no requirement to fill spaces with new families coming into the village. Having only recently been</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>substantially extended, it is unrealistic to suggest that the school will be capable of further expansion in the short/medium term.</p> <p>Specific to GADD2</p> <p>1. Highways</p> <p>The Site is opposite the newly expanded primary school and the village hall. At school drop off and collection times cars are parked nose to tail along the school side of Ashby Road making the road all but impassable and impossible for those trying to emerge from the Site.</p> <p>The village hall is occupied every weekday by a playgroup which is frequented by, on average, 25 to 30 children at any one time who are also dropped off and collected. In addition at certain other regular times cars are parked nose to tail on Ashby Road opposite the Site. All this traffic makes the road dangerous to both motorists and pedestrians. Attached are various photos taken on 1 December 2016 at about 8.30am. Ashby Road is a busy road, which is narrow and has a sharp bend adjacent to the Site which will make it impossible to see traffic coming round the bend for vehicle exiting the Site. Ashby Road is totally unsuitable to service the existing traffic let alone the increased traffic that the proposed development would generate. In addition if one looks at the permissions granted but un-built on Ashby Road (see 3 above) a further 19 houses will potentially be serviced by Ashby Road which is already very busy. On the assumption that each house has 2 cars this makes a further 38 vehicles using the Ashby Road regularly. Highways issues have not been assessed when considering the Site.</p> <p>The school have recognised the problem and the potential danger but clearly do not know how to deal with it – see the attached letter from the Head Teacher to parents dated 24 November 2016.</p> <p>Without proper assessment there is no evidence to show how the Site can be satisfactorily accessed and the impact this will have on the surrounding road network.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>2. Flooding</p> <p>A large part of the Site is subject to flooding. Those who walk regularly on the footpath across the Site can confirm that in wet weather most of the Site is subject to standing water. It is at the bottom of a hill.</p> <p>As it is, the village hall and the school have to pump their soil waste to the west of the site to the pumping station near to the Cheney Arms public house to join the waste from the rest of the village. All of the Gaddesby village waste is then pumped east towards Ashby Folville. The existing sewage system is very old and lacks the capacity to cope with the extra demand which any development would place upon it.</p> <p>If the Site were to be developed surface water is likely to cause Gaddesby Brook to flood threatening to cause damage to properties in the vicinity including the Primary School and Village Hall. Whilst at Appendix 1 of the Local Plan it is proposed that a policy requirement ensuring mitigation measures against flood risk are provided at GADD2, further investigation into surface water and foul drainage solutions is required before the Plan progresses any further. Without such investigation and supporting evidence it cannot be said that the allocation of the site has been properly justified in accordance with the requirements of the Framework.</p> <p>3. St Luke's Church</p> <p>This sits at the top of Church Lane. It is a Grade 1 listed building. It is thought to be the most important church in the County from an archaeological perspective. If the Site were to be developed this would interfere with the setting of this wonderful building. The Site provides the only long view to and from the Church. The impact of development upon the Church's setting has not been properly assessed in the accompanying assessment for the wider site. Without having regard to this potential impact, the Plan has the potential to conflict with national policy which states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset it should be refused consent, unless it can be demonstrated that</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm of loss. Further that where a development will lead to less than substantial harm, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Without a robust heritage assessment, the public benefits balancing exercise cannot be undertaken and the presumption in favour of sustainable test cannot be properly applied.</p> <p>4. Ridge and Furrow</p> <p>The Site is ridge and furrow and constitutes a heritage asset. This also does not seem to have been taken into account and its loss assessed.</p> <p>5. Ecological impact</p> <p>The site is in close proximity to a number of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), including the Gaddesby Brook. In Appendix 1 of the Local Plan, the Council is proposing a policy requirement “that there are no adverse impacts on the nearby LWS located in proximity of the eastern boundary.” With regard to biodiversity impacts, national policy states that the planning system should minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible and that local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development affecting protected wildlife sites will be judged. Gaddesby Brook contains Otters and also White Clawed Crayfish which are protected species. In order to comply with national policy, further information about the likely ecological impact of the development of GADD2 needs to be provided so a judgement about suitability of the site for development can be made.</p> <p>6. Previous assessments</p> <p>GADD2 was the subject of an SHLAA assessment – MBC/016/13. The site was assessed and rejected as being undeliverable and undevelopable. No further site assessment has been carried out. The failure to properly assess the site clearly demonstrates that the proposed allocation is not based on robust evidence or been appropriately considered against alternative sites within the village or elsewhere in the Borough. This is a</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>fundamental shortcoming in the preparation of the Local Plan which as a result means the allocation of the site is not 'justified' or consistent with national policy, as required.</p> <p>7. Visual Impact</p> <p>In defining a site to provide 30 dwellings, the Council has drawn up arbitrary site boundaries without justification; these are not defined or contained by physical features, for example by a hedgerow or surrounding development. The site's northern and eastern boundaries are exposed, meaning the proposed housing development is likely to have an adverse visual impact on the wider countryside, therefore, failing to meet the 'environmental' element of sustainable development (the Council's assertion in the accompanying wider site assessment that the site is "well hidden" is considered to be inaccurate). Furthermore, the site is considered to be out of character with the surrounding development which extends along Ashby Road and Church Lane and is linear in nature. The likely adverse impact of the proposed allocation upon the character of the settlement and surrounding landscape has not been properly considered through the site assessment process.</p> <p>Specific to GADD3</p> <p>1. Previous assessment</p> <p>GADD3 was the subject of an SHLAA assessment – MBC/017/13. This site was also rejected as being undeliverable and undevelopable. No further site assessment has been carried out. The failure to properly assess the site clearly demonstrates that the proposed allocation is not based on robust evidence or been appropriately considered against alternative sites within the village or elsewhere in the Borough. This is a fundamental shortcoming in the preparation of the Local Plan which as a result means the allocation of the site is not 'justified' or consistent with national policy, as required.</p> <p>2. Highways</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Site Appendix 1 of the Melton Local Plan states the following with regard to GADD3:</p> <p>“The site is situated in the northern edge of the village and therefore slightly detached from the limited services that the village provides. Its access via either of two well-connected roads and the proximity to the bus stop makes this site a suitable allocation for housing.”</p> <p>The two roads in question, Rotherby Lane and Pasture Lane, are both unsuitable for more than the occasional vehicle, and certainly not suitable for any heavy vehicles such as buses and lorries. The main access for properties at this end of the village is Pasture Lane for traffic approaching from Melton Mowbray, or Gaddesby Lane/Rearsby Lane, via Main Street and Park Hill from Leicester. Main Street is often reduced to a single lane with overflow parking of pub patrons, and also from the vehicles belonging to residents of Main Street without off-road parking. These roads are not “well-connected” and are in fact highly restrictive, dangerous in some weather conditions, and are not effective to support additional residences.</p> <p>Park Hill is exactly what it says - a steep hill. Vehicles naturally speed down the hill (it can be difficult to keep to the speed limit due to the steepness). By the same token vehicles ascending tend to speed to be able to get up the hill. There is only one narrow footpath which is on the opposite (west) side to the main body of housing at Paske Avenue and Barrow Crescent and indeed GADD3. Therefore when walking children to school, Parents have to cross the road to the footpath which is dangerous due to the speed of the traffic and due to the fact that it is on the brow of a steep hill. There are also a number of concealed entrances along Park Hill. See 9.4.18 of the 2016 draft plan.</p> <p>3. The bus service</p> <p>The bus service also currently uses Paske Avenue to turn around and head back down the hill to continue its route.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>This creates a traffic danger, as Paske Avenue is a narrow road, which often has many vehicles parked on it due to the housing and the children's playground, and really is unsuitable for large vehicles such as buses.</p> <p>4. Ground Quality & Drainage of Existing Properties</p> <p>The ground on GADD3 plot is clay heavy, and as a result there is a lot of surface water retention and runoff from fields. This affects a number of properties, and any new development in the area will undoubtedly have a negative knock on effect on the other existing properties. There is no mention of attempting to improve drainage facilities for existing properties, and existing drainage of the land could be called ineffective in areas, so any additional load would also be ineffective without improvement. This has not been properly assessed.</p> <p>5. Visual impact</p> <p>GADD3 would have an adverse visual impact on the entrance to and exit from the village and on the wider countryside. As one reaches the top of Park Hill it is clear that one has reached open country. This would not be the case if the development were to be built. The site is considered to be out of character with the other development, which extends along Pasture Lane. The likely adverse impact upon the settlement and surrounding landscape has not been properly assessed.</p> <p>6. Ecological impact</p> <p>National policy states that the planning system should minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible and that local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development affecting protected wildlife sites will be judged. There is a pond on the GADD3 site which is understood to be habit for protected wildlife (newts). In order to comply with national policy, further information about the likely ecological impact of the development of GADD3 needs to be provided so a judgement about suitability of the site for development can be made.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Howard Blakebrough	<p>The criteria for Service Centres. This has changed during the process and now takes no account of shops, sustainable bus services, post offices and the like. The criteria chosen are there largely because they fit the SHLAA locations.</p> <p>Somerby does not meet all the criteria. It does not have Access to Employment; there are a few small employers, mainly equestrian, but nowhere near the scale necessary to accommodate the housing proposed. As a result just about every potential occupant will have to travel to Melton, Oakham, Leicester for work; the opposite of the green agenda we are supposed to be pursuing</p>	<p>Take another look at the criteria for Service Centres, especially as it applies in the south of the borough</p> <p>Remove Somerby from the list of Service Centres; it simply does not qualify, specifically re. access to employment.</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites.</p> <p>Site suitability, including heritage, flood vulnerability etc has been taken into account in the site selection exercise and has been updated,</p> <p>Employment opportunities are available both within Somerby and at nearby John O'Gaunt. Somerby is considered to be the 4 essential criteria prescribed by the methodology - it also has a number of additional "desirable" criteria.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>
Jo Althorpe on behalf of Stephen Lee and the VB Trust	<p>The identification of Easthorpe as a 'rural hub' is fully supported and recognises its sustainable location adjoining Bottesford, a service centre within walking distance that contains a range of services and facilities. The conclusions within Appendix 3 of the Local Plan, are considered justified in the case of Easthorpe:</p>		Support noted	None proposed

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
John Matthew Williams, Secretary to the Wymondham and Edmondthorpe NPlan Group	<p>1.Wymondham is categorised as a Service Centre. p25 describes the attributes of Service Centres. Appendix 1 Site Allocations and Policies describes Wymondham as having a shop with post office, a newsagent, a garage and a bus service linking Wymondham to Bingham and Bottesford. Thus the conclusion drawn that "these key services mean that it is one of the more sustainable locations in the borough with public transport access to larger centres" cannot be correct as it is based on an incorrect statement of the facts.</p> <p>A policy justified on inaccuracies cannot be effective.</p>	<p>1.Wymondham's categorisation as a Service Centre should be reassessed in light of an accurate appraisal of the facts of the case and Appendix 1 amended to bring it up to date.</p> <p>2. The cut off date for taking into account small sites with extant planning permission should be reset at 31/12/16, marking the end of the calendar year and the completion of the Pre-Submission draft. This will result in a more realistic picture of requirements from housing allocations and ensure that localities that have experienced a peak of such planning applications over 2016 do not as a result have disproportionate housing allocations.</p> <p>3. Windfall allocations should be set at 15% of specific housing allocations for rural areas.</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing.</p> <p>, The new methodology is considered robust and defensible. The categorisation of Wymondham is based on evidence collected during the preparation of this version of the plan and is considered accurate. No evidence has been provided to show otherwise. The windfall allowance set has taken account of past delivery from these types of development and the consideration of factors that might affect whether this level of provision will continue to be made in the future.</p> <p>The allocation to villages has ben updated to take into account recent completions and permissions and a revised version of SS2 and its reasoned justification is proposed as a 'focussed change'</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
John Palmer	<p>Where has the requirement for another 6000 houses come from? If from the government, why is this not being challenged? How does Melton Borough Council justify the need for such a large number? Where are all of these people coming from other than from outside the Borough?</p> <p>I recognise that some of the Town’s hotels are often used to house homeless families on an emergency basis but these numbers must only be a handful and certainly not a significant contribution to the 6000 projected need. I am also not aware of great numbers of homeless individuals living on the streets within the Borough.</p> <p>Why wasn’t the old aerodrome site pursued for development as was intended back in the 70’s? A complete village (Kettleby Magna) was proposed which would have provided a suitable ‘suburb’ village and would have funded much of the relief road without inflicting harm to the character of Melton. Can this still be pursued?</p> <p>As for current major employers, Jeld-Wen, Samworths and Mars all seem quite reliant on using agency labour from outside the Borough and of course these agency staff are not contributing to the Borough Council coffers and are probably not spending at any of the local businesses in the Town. Small time businesses employ small time numbers so I very much doubt if we will attract suitable businesses to warrant 6000 new houses.</p>		<p>Evidence prepared to support the Local Plan including the new HEDNA for the Leicestershire and Leicester housing market area and the Council's 'Towards a Housing Requirement for Melton' report demonstrate a need for additional homes in the Borough to accommodate changes in population and household size originating from within the Borough, and to provide sufficient workforce to support the economic aspirations of existing businesses and future economic growth.</p> <p>A range of reasonable alternatives for accommodating the level of new housing required was investigated at an early stage in the plan making process including the Melton Airfield opportunity, and the proposed spatial strategy is the one that was the most sustainable and did most to deliver the plan objectives. The sustainable extensions to Melton that are being planned to not adversely affect the character of the town, and there will be advantages that accrue to the town if both are delivered as the policies envisage.</p>	<p>Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 to reference the HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement and its addendum.</p> <p>HEDNA and ‘towards a housing requirement for Melton’ evidence documents to be published alongside consultation on ‘focussed changes’</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
JOHN RUST	<p>7 of the 12 Service Centres and 1 rural Hub are located on the borders of Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire county borders which have been allocated 897 dwelling that is approximately 50%.of the 35% allocation for rural areas. These settlements will tend to attract new residents from Nottingham and Grantham area which will reduce the benefit to the Borough of Melton. South of Melton where the majority of employment is located has only 2 Service Centres and 1 Rural Hub Which have been allocated 167 dwelling in total approximately 9% of the 35% allocation for rural areas. This will increase the need to travel from the Northern edges of the Borough through Melton to employment South in Melton and Leicester. This proposed distribution is at odds to the NPPF which seeks to reduce the need to travel in the interest of preventing climate change.</p> <p>The Clawson Action group provided the Melton Borough Council with a data pack which highlighted the village's lack of sustainability. The information in the data pack appears to have been totally ignored in producing the Local Plan and no response by the MBC has been received.</p>	<p>Give priority and support a new Service Centre South of Melton at the Dalby airfield 1000 dwelling and the Garden Village of 2000-3000 dwellings at Six Hills.</p> <p>The Six Hills village is next to the A46 which connects to all the major routes in the UK and local area of employment South and North of Leicestershire.</p> <p>It could support a doctors, surgery, primary school, pub and store.</p> <p>If built in a responsible way the housing could have very high environmental credentials by using electrically powered ground or air source heat recovery systems and roof solar panels . The Ecotricity wind and solar farms are next to the site along with the biomass plant 3.5 miles away which could supply nearly all electrical power required allowing the houses to be totally electrically powered this would offset the present transmission losses that these renewable energy supplies are suffer at present due to their remote load centre connections.</p> <p>Delay the plan and reassess the housing allocation based on inclusion of Six Hill and Dalby airfield site</p> <p>According to a latest report the Borough can now provide evidence of a 5+20% year deliverable housing supply. The data provided within the report shows that the development sites in Long Clawson are not included in the first 5 years, so no planning application should be approved until the village's infrastructure and education issues are resolved.</p>	<p>The spatial strategy plans the majority of the new development in the town of Melton Mowbray which is the most sustainable location in the Borough and where many of the Borough's employment opporrtnites are located. Outside the town, development is distributed to those villages which provide the best opportunities for sustainable patterns of development. This is the same approach adopted by councils in neighbouring Lincolnshire, Rutland and Nottinghamshire. Sufficient new housing land has been identified in these locations to meet the housing requirement for the Borough, so further land at Six Hills is not needed as well. if land at Six Hills were identified instead of within villages it would not enable the objectives of the plan to be delivered, and would make it difficult to achieve a five year housing supply for the first 5 years of the plan period, which a sound plan must include. The environmental information provided to the Borough Council in May 2016 has been considered, although it was not submitted as part of the local plan representation. Much of the data was already known to the Council - e.g. Housing needs survey, heritage and conservation area information, bus services, whilst other data, e.g. questionnaire findings, provides insight into the views of residents and may well be of use in developing a neighbourhood plan, but cannot be regarded as robust data for local plan purposes. The information about great crested newts has added to the Council's information, but their presence is not regarded as a 'showstopper'; development can take place provided appropriate mitigations are put in place. The impact of environmental and other constraints has een taken into account in the assessment of individual sites under Policies C1 and C1A</p>	<p>None proposed</p> <p>See alos responses to Policies C1 and C1A</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
John Warner	<p>General to Gaddesby - The proposed increase in housing is not proportionate; it's massive! It will increase the village by way over a third and we have no facilities.</p> <p>In conclusion, please think again. This borough is so fortunate to have 3 or 4 large sites to accommodate the increase in housing required re: airfield along Dalby Road. Why these sites have not been ongoing and part of the Local Plan is a mystery to everyone I meet.</p>		<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites.</p> <p>A range of reasonable alternatives for accommodating the level of new housing required was investigated at an early stage in the plan making process including the Melton Airfield and other large sites opportunities, and the proposed spatial strategy is the one that was the most sustainable and did most to deliver the plan objectives. The sustainable extensions to Melton that are being planned to not adversely affect the character of the town, and there will be advantages that accrue to the town if both are delivered as the policies envisage.</p>	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation to Gaddesby.
K Lynne Camplejohn	The criteria used to identify service centres and rural hubs for the south of the Borough is unsound. In a similar way the distance between a village and its service centre or rural hub is too short.	<p>Make the criteria for identifying service centres and rural hubs more flexible. The inclusion of a primary school for a rural hub is too rigid other criteria such as public transport links should be considered.</p> <p>A review of the distance between service centres and the villages adjacent to them should be similar to the distance used for those villages out -lying Melton Mowbray itself.</p>	The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. Somerby is identified appropriately under this methodology.	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation to Somerby.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
			<p>The capacity of villages to receive the allocations defined by this approach is based upon an individual assessment of the range of available and suitable sites. The new methodology is considered robust and defensible.</p>	
Leigh Higgins	<p>Some villages in the "Rural Settlement" are clearly more sustainable than this policy gives them credit for. Too much weight has been given to primary schools in the villages and not readily available access to a school.</p> <p>Somerby has a very small school yet other villages in the Southern Rural Area enjoy more access by car or school transport to two or three schools. Some far larger than Somerby.</p>	<p>Employment at Burrough Court is approximately 200 people and its relationship to Burrough/Twyford should be considered.</p> <p>Consider schools within a few miles of the settlement that it has access to them (again villages as clusters).</p> <p>Be more positive about supporting clusters of village amenities.</p> <p>Ensure that housing that addresses the demographic issues are given some positive considerations.</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing.</p> <p>The methodology for determining the settlements was revised following Emerging Options consultation last year. The new methodology is considered robust and defensible. The categorisation of villages is based on evidence collected during the preparation of this version of the plan and is considered accurate. The continuing availability of public transport cannot be relied upon.</p> <p>However read in conjunction with SS3 it does not preclude development in villages where no allocation is made provide they can positively contribute to sustainability. This would include applications configured to meet specific very local housing needs. It is recognised that needs will vary over time and from place to place and is therefore prosed to amend Policy SS3 so as to delete the strict application of size limits of 3, 5 and and 10 and allow the appropriateness of scale of proposals to be a matter of judgement based</p>	<p>Proposed to amend Policy SS3 as a 'focussed change' so as to delete references to 3, 5 and 10 and allow greater flexibility as needs and circumstances change over time. Control over scale would be managed by reference to compatibility with the settlement concerned.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
			on the location concerned.	
Lori King	<p>The roles of towns and villages is not sound or justified. For example, Somerby village as a Service Centre. There is very little employment available, there is not regular public transport nor fast broadband. Therefore, they do not have all four Essential services (4.2.4)nor a good range of important and other facilities.</p> <p>The redistribution of 162 dwelling shortfall amongst the remaining Service Centres and Rural Hubs on a proportionate basis is unjust. Why do these villages not have enough capacity, and why are those receiving the redistribution, deemed to have excess capacity? Based on what?</p>	An unbiased, thorough assessment of the roles of towns and village must be done and published, with an accounting of those requirements for sustainable development to occur.	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The new methodology is considered robust and defensible. The categorisation of a villages is based on evidence collected during the preparation of this version of the plan and is considered accurate. The methodology is contained in 2 papers: Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report, 10th May 2016, and Review of Settlement Roles and Housing Distribution, 13th July 2016, both of which are available to view on the Council's local plan website, www.meltonplan.co.uk.</p> <p>The distribution contained within SS2 and its reasoned justification has been updated as a result of site information including new sites and now avoids the need for redistribution.</p>	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Martin S Herbert (Brown & Co) on behalf of M Hill, P Hill, Mrs M Hyde & Mrs P Pickup	<p>Paragraph 4.2.7</p> <p>The number of Service Centres is, in our opinion, overstated and is inconsistent with earlier drafts of the Plan. The validity of including all the other villages in this category and the unsustainable growth that would be achieved as a consequence, is challenged.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.11</p> <p>We have commented before about the need to make sure that all the development growth is in a sustainable way and is linked to Melton Mowbray and the Service Centres. This is in line with Planning Guidance under the NPPF. The amount which has been allocated to the Rural Hubs is excessive and whilst some limited growth in rural settlements might be possible, the proportions are, in our opinion, incorrect. Also these policies were formed before the provision of the EDR was being seriously considered and policies needed to make sure that it is implemented and the Plan is sound which it will not be without the EDR. As is emphasised before in the section relating to the Vision, congestion in Melton town centre exacerbated by the number of HGV's and the associated environmental issues, will not be overcome until the EDR has been provided and there are enabling policies in place.</p>	<p>The Plan could be made sound by the inclusion of Site MBC/049/13. This site should be allocated and/or at the very least become a reserve site in preference to other locations for growth which are proposed through the Plan. It is more sustainable and will also provide development and part of the route of the proposed Eastern Distributor Road which is now gaining political and local support.</p>	<p>The spatial strategy already directs the majority of the new development to the town of Melton Mowbray which is the most sustainable location in the Borough and where many of the Borough's employment opportunities are located. It is also important that the plan makes sufficient provision for development in the rural parts of the district to continue to support those settlements as well as to provide a choice of housing sites and locations and to maintain a deliverable supply of housing land. The distribution of housing land chosen reflects the option that is most sustainable and best enables the plan objectives to be met. The land identified would be considered at any plan review, alongside land in the locations mentioned in Policy SS6 and others that emerge at that time.</p>	<p>None proposed</p> <p>See also comments relating to Chapter 8 regarding the Distributor Road routing and finding mechanisms.</p>
Maurice Fairhurst	<p>The 65% :35% split has not been fully justified, relies on placing too much development both in Melton and the villages and is unpopular with too many local communities.</p> <p>The substantial benefits of a new Garden Village at Six Hills have not been properly considered by the Council.</p> <p>More detailed comments on the strategic policies are set out later.</p>	<p>A consideration of SHLAA submissions should not be the only factor in Strategic Planning.</p> <p>Settlement capacity studies are also required.</p>	<p>The 'Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015' assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough's housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance. This evidence is considered to remain valid</p> <p>The Council considers the 65/35% split between the town and the villages to be the most appropriate to provide a choice of development sites of different sizes and in</p>	<p>None proposed</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
			<p>different locations. This strategy will also ensure the appropriate number of homes are delivered in the town to support a sustainable pattern of growth and deliver the distributor road. At the same time this strategy will support and maintain the services and facilities within villages in the rural area.</p> <p>A range of reasonable alternatives for accommodating the level of new housing required was investigated at an early stage in the plan making process including Six Hills and other large sites opportunities, and the proposed spatial strategy is the one that was the most sustainable and did most to deliver the plan objectives</p>	
Melanie Steadman	<p>Many of the villages taking the 35% of housing outside of Melton are not sustainable. Long Clawson has documented, parking, flooding, school capacity and footpath problems. This makes us unsustainable - this has been ignored.</p> <p>Of the 1800 houses to be built in rural locations, 1197 of them are north of Melton. The Bottesford to Melton bus services runs six days a week and does not allow time for an onward journey to a higher employment centre. As such, development in these villages will necessitate the need for car ownership, further congesting on our already overloaded country roads. We have a traffic/speed survey to back these claims. As the employment land allocation is south of Melton, together with the main existing employment base, this means all this traffic will have to pass through Melton morning and night, if they are to fill these projected jobs.</p>	Build a new, custom made village south of Melton or consider Six Hills or Great Dalby airfield site, where the necessary infrastructure can be built in.	<p>A range of reasonable alternatives for accommodating the level of new housing required was investigated at an early stage in the plan making process including Six Hills and other large sites opportunities, and the proposed spatial strategy is the one that was the most sustainable and did most to deliver the plan objectives</p> <p>A new village will take time and significant infrastructure before it begins delivering new homes. If the Council is to ensure it delivers a five year supply of housing land now and in the future the Local Plan must identify a range of sites in different locations which are deliverable now.</p> <p>The Distributer Rod will allow access to all key employment locations around Melton Mowbray without having to enter the town centre.</p>	None proposed
Mr P J F SPringett	Sewstern village has been categorised as a Rural Supporter village and should be categorised as a Rural Settlement as it has 'very little of no services'.	Sewstern village to be categorised as a Rural Settlement. It is a small village with an already strained infrastructure which needs to be addressed before development can take place. Local residents are in the process of evolving a neighbourhood plan to set out the sustainable development suitable for local people	The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish	None proposed

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
			the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The new methodology is considered robust and defensible. The categorisation of a village is based on evidence collected during the preparation of this version of the plan and is considered accurate. The methodology is contained in 2 papers: Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report, 10th May 2016, and Review of Settlement Roles and Housing Distribution, 13th July 2016, both of which are available to view on the Council's local plan website, www.meltonplan.co.uk .	
Mr Richard Ling on Behalf of the Bottesford Forum	<p>Chapter 4 of the Pre-Submission Draft sets out the way in which the Borough Council has formulated the overall quantity of housing for the Plan Area and the distribution of that overall total to specific settlements and sites.</p> <p>The Forum considers that the methodology of allocating the Borough-Wide total to the rural areas at 35% and then allocating housing to rural settlements according to their classification - in itself purely arbitrary - and then by population is a very prescriptive and sterile mathematical exercise which does not take into account the relative planning factors namely the availability of sites within or adjacent to settlements be they Melton or rural villages, the wider infrastructure requirements for settlements should they be selected for development and the ability of services within rural settlements to meet additional demand caused by development.</p> <p>A small upwards percentage change to the housing requirement for Melton Mowbray has greater impact on the quantum of housing required in particular rural settlements, yet no analysis appears to have been made by the Council with regard to the sensitivity of the precise percentage allocation to Melton and the Rural Areas.</p> <p>In not adopting such approaches as set out in the two paragraphs above, the Forum considers that the Pre-Submission Draft is unsound and not positively prepared.</p>	A different approach to the distribution of housing in the Borough which did not take as a starting point arbitrary percentages and the categorisation of rural settlements but also took into account site availability and suitability. The Council should have this information from sources such as SHLAA, the Environment Agency and the Highways Authority and will require a radical rewrite of Chapter 4 and bits of other chapters which use arguments or labels derived from chapter 4.	<p>The 'Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015' assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough's housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance. This evidence is considered to remain valid</p> <p>The Council considers the 65/35% split between the town and the villages to be the most appropriate to provide a choice of development sites of different sizes and in different locations, and to deliver the strategic priorities of the plan - the strategy will ensure the appropriate number of homes are delivered in Melton Mowbray to support a sustainable pattern of growth and deliver the distributor road, and at the same time support and maintain the services and facilities within villages in the rural area.</p> <p>The Council has produced a separate</p>	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>The Forum noted at the Draft Plan stage that there was a reserve major housing allocation around Melton and this reserve is part of the Pre-Submission Draft as well. If this reserve site is considered suitable for development in planning and transport terms surely it could be formally allocated in the Plan. Such a site would be close to employment and transport opportunities and major services in Melton and be more sustainable than major development around small rural settlements such as Bottesford. In this respect the Forum believes that the Pre-Submission Draft is unsound.</p> <p>The Forum also considers that the council has not adequately met the statutory duty to co-operate with neighbouring authorities notable Rushcliffe Borough Council and South Kesteven District Council as major housing development in Bottesford will have more impact upon transport links, jobs and services in neighbouring areas along the A52 corridor than it will with the rest of Melton Borough.</p>		statement setting out how it has met the Duty to Co-operate, which demonstrates that neighbouring authorities have not indicated discontent with the spatial approach set out in the draft plan.	
MRS NICOLA MORLEY	Somerby for example- 90 more houses will be too many the local primary school can not provide for these, the drs is too full the broadband is inconsistent, as is electricity supply to the village there is very little access to employment and the poor bus service is under threat.		The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The new methodology is considered robust and defensible. The categorisation of a villages is based on evidence collected during the preparation of this version of the plan and is considered accurate. The methodology is contained in 2 papers: Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report, 10th May 2016, and Review of Settlement Roles and Housing Distribution, 13th July 2016, both of which are available to view on the Council's local plan website, www.meltonplan.co.uk .Somerby is included	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
			as a Service Centre to reflect the local services and facilities within the village. Appendix 1 recognises that there is limited capacity within the local school for additional pupils and includes specific policy provision to ensure that capacity is available to meet the needs arising from allocated sites.	
Mrs Sarah Grey	<p>Paragraph 4.2.7 Queensway, Old Dalby should be identified as a Service Centre or, preferably as a community linked to the neighbouring village of Old Dalby.</p> <p>On 6 September 2016, the Defence Secretary, the Rt Hon Michael Fallon MP, announced the expected release of 13 sites, one of which is at Old Dalby. These sites will contribute some £225 million toward the MOD's £1 billion target for land release sales as set out in Spending Review 2015. These sites also contribute to the Government's commitment to provide land for 160,000 homes in this Parliament.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.18</p> <p>The 2011 Census is used to determine the population size of each Service Centre and the housing provision for individual Service Centres. It follows that the population of individual settlements should be accurate. In the case of Old Dalby, the population of the settlement has been significantly understated. This is because Old Dalby and the adjoining area of Queensway should be treated as a single place as they share the same services and facilities- employment, school, bus services etc. It follows that the population should be based on Census Output Areas E00131478 (355 residents), E00131477 (337 residents) plus E00131480 (260 residents) i.e. a population of 952. It follows that the housing provision of Old Dalby (or perhaps more accurately Old Dalby/Queensway) should be significantly increased.</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.2.7</p> <p>The Queensway area of Old Dalby should be identified as a Service Centre or otherwise linked to Old Dalby.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.18</p> <p>The housing provision for Old Dalby/Queensway should be significantly increased.</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing. The new methodology is considered robust and defensible and Queensway is considered to be appropriately categorised in this exercise.</p> <p>The categorisation of a villages is based on evidence collected during the preparation of this version of the plan and is considered accurate. The methodology is contained in 2 papers: Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report, 10th May 2016, and Review of Settlement Roles and Housing Distribution, 13th July 2016, both of which are available to view on the Council's local plan website, www.meltonplan.co.uk</p>	None proposed.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Peter Wilkinson	<p>Para 4.2.18 - Typo on 4th line "exiting"</p> <p>Designation of Frisby on the Wreake as a Rural Hub is unsound, as this settlement now has fast broadband provision (all classification criteria for a Service Centre are therefore met: primary school, access to employment opportunities, fast broadband and at least one community building).</p> <p>Frisby was previously categorised as a Secondary Service Centre in the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (April 2015) due to the sustainable services and facilities it provides, which should be kept. No services or facilities have been lost since then, and indeed this has been enhanced with fast broadband provision.</p>	<p>Frisby on the Wreake should be classified as a Service Centre, and housing allocations across Service Centres should be proportionately higher, particularly in Frisby on the Wreake, a sustainable settlement with significant potential in supporting substantially more development. Housing allocations should be purely based around the sustainability of a settlement.</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing. The new methodology is considered robust and defensible. The categorisation of a village is based on evidence collected during the preparation of this version of the plan and is considered accurate.</p> <p>The amendment from 'rural hub' to serviced centre would not impact on the allocation to Frisby as in both categories it is based on existing population.</p>	<p>Minor modification to correct typo in 4th line of para 4.2.18</p> <p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>
Robert Ian Lockey	<p>The 65:35% split appears to be arbitrary, there being no justification of why this satisfies the housing needs of the town and the rural areas.</p> <p>The method of allocation of housing to villages is flawed in many ways.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - floodable land in Environment Agency categories 3a and 3b should have been eliminated before allocation of housing to communities. Failure to do this is inconsistent with 7.22.3 of the Plan. - Definition of villages as service centres is based only on the existence of services, not on their adequacy to meet the needs of the existing or increased population. - Allocating simply on the mathematical basis of existing population shows a failure to consider the needs and aspirations of individual communities. - In the case of Bottesford, the quoted population figure in the Plan is about 500 greater than in the Emerging Options 	<p>Eliminate all floodable land before allocation housing to villages.</p> <p>Assess the needs of each village by consultation with Parish Councils and/or Neighbourhood Plan steering groups.</p> <p>Eliminate errors in the allocation process</p>	<p>The 'Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015' assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough's housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance. This evidence is considered to remain valid</p> <p>Areas at high risk of flooding have been avoided through the site assessment process, however where evidence from a detailed Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out which demonstrates that a site can be developed with appropriate flood mitigation measures (usually by avoiding the parts of a site at most risk) a site may be considered suitable for development. The sequential and</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>document (January 2016). No other community has changed figures.</p> <p>- There is a deficit in available SHLAA sites in Bottesford to meet its allocation. For other communities, such deficits have been reallocated to villages with spare capacity. It is inconsistent not to do the same for Bottesford.</p> <p>Failure to consult: Bottesford's allocation was increased by 50% without any consultation.</p>		<p>exceptions testing document outlines this process. The six week consultation on the Pre-Submission draft plan and the engagement activities carried out were in excess of the Council's regulatory requirements and accords with or exceeds the Council's commitments in its Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p>The distribution contained within SS2 and its reasoned justification has been updated as a result of site information including new sites and now avoids the need for redistribution.</p>	
Robert Widdowson	<p>Frisby services are basic and NOT "well served". We have a small post office which also stocks a limited range of basic grocery products and can also provide hot drinks on request with 4 chairs. It cannot by any measure be properly described as a convenience store or a tea room. In a single room with approximately 10ft x 12ft of floor space there is a limit on what it can sell or provide.</p> <p>The sports facilities referred to is in fact a cricket field.</p> <p>We do enjoy a decent bus service throughout the day but no mention is made of the fact that there are no buses to Melton beyond 20.05 or Leicester after 19.30. The 5A bus service is some distance from the village centre and incurs a steep hill for those seeking to use this facility. With an aging population it is not an option for many.</p>		<p>Frisby is included as a Rural Hub to reflect the local services and facilities within the village. To be a Rural Hub a village needs 3 out of the 4 essential criteria of school, access to employment, fast broadband and a community building. The presence of the shop and sports facilities are considered to be additional "desirable" facilities which contribute further to a place being considered sustainable and means that it performs better than some smaller settlements in the Borough without these facilities.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>
Ros Freeman	<p>The Settlements Roles and Relationships approach is flawed; it does not consider the sustainability with respect to transport and the already overloaded facilities (school, doctors, parking, roads etc) in Somerby or the impacts of construction on heritage and flooding. Classification of Somerby in the same group as Waltham and Asfordby is ridiculous and using the population size to allocate housing numbers is flawed. The size of a population does not mean that the village is more able than others to take even more houses.</p> <p>Development should be concentrated in Melton Mowbray or large villages such as Waltham, Bottesford and Asfordby that have good road connection, by-passes, good public transport infrastructure to places of work and</p>	<p>Re classify Somerby as a rural hub</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing.</p> <p>Somerby is included as a Service Centre to reflect the local services and facilities within</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>sufficient facilities (shops, schools, libraries etc) to support growth.</p> <p>The housing allocation for the rural areas should be spread more evenly between all the villages taking account of aspects such as the number of school places available and the need to keep those communities vibrant and sustainable. Large-scale developments of greater than 10 houses should not be considered in the villages to maintain their rural identities.</p> <p>It does not appear that the Council have cooperated sufficiently with Rutland and taken into account the massive expansion of new development in the nearest town to Somerby- Oakham. This should mean that the surrounding villages like Somerby should be retained in their rural nature to an even greater extent.</p>		<p>the village. Appendix 1 recognises that there is limited capacity within the local school for additional pupils and includes specific policy provision to ensure that capacity is available to meet the needs arising from allocated sites. The policies within Appendix 1 also address impact on heritage assets.</p> <p>The Plan proposes a concentration of development within Melton Mowbray as suggested (65%) and an allocation to Somerby commensurate with its size (approx. 1%). Policy SS3 allows development within villages outside the allocated sites where they will contribute to need and sustainability, as suggested.</p> <p>The Council has prepared a separate statement relating to the Duty to Co-operate. Rutland County Council have also responded to this consultation.</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Sheryl Smart	<p>The desire for a relief road in Melton has influenced all aspects of the plan in the need to help deliver this. It is dependent on building in the rural areas for a significant part and appears to rely on some rural areas to deliver housing above its capacity and fails to provide adequate safeguards.</p> <p>Object to targeting housing development primarily at 15 villages rather than the whole rural area (74 villages) and apportioning development depending on land put forward by owners. The allocations of dwellings are not related to local needs and are apportioned to villages where sites have been made available on a crude pro-rata basis.</p> <p>Windfall sites in villages are high, at 15% of the total, and are likely to be exceeded following a 'relaxation' of previous limits. The windfall limit of 10 dwellings per site is high for villages (no account of current village size appears to be taken into account) and the same limit of dwellings applies to Melton town. For some villages, this may be several times the average yearly target and could put too much pressure on them.</p> <p>Speed of development is not defined or controlled in a meaningful way. For example, in Stathern we have an allocated site for 40 houses which equates to ten years' worth of housing out of the total for the 20 year period. These could all be built within 2-3 years which would be difficult to absorb in the village so quickly.</p> <p>No specific mention is made of Conservation areas and their protection.</p>	<p>Rather than expectations of villages exceeding their allocations, and predictions of Melton town failing to hit theirs, there should be proper protection for villages in line with the NPPF, allowing them to grow whilst controlling the rate of growth to a manageable and sustainable level. More sites in Melton need to be accepted, including brownfield sites.</p> <p>Villages are offered potentially achievable 20 year targets, but there is no protection from rapid development. Therefore, a robust method of control should be built into the plan.</p> <p>Growth in villages should be equally spread across all villages (except where there is an identified local need for a higher rate) Planning permissions in villages should not be given where, for example, 5 years of planning permission has already been granted for that village or against that villages target. Currently an individual village could get all of the 16 windfalls which is the total suggested across all villages (or even more).</p> <p>Sites put forward in Conservation areas should be strictly controlled and subject to local approval.</p> <p>We could follow the example of our local neighbours (Rushcliffe and Kesteven) who have strict controls relating to building in villages, restricting building (except nominated large {pop 1200+} villages on main roads) to 'local needs only' and these are defined. The current plan will only serve to fuel demand from adjoining counties rather than satisfy local needs.</p> <p>An option that has been rejected but perhaps should be reconsidered is the development of a 'large scale site option' where there is the flexibility to create new dwellings with appropriate services and sufficient affordable housing.</p>	<p>The housing requirement for the Borough is based on evidence on need arising from changes in population and household size and formation. Focusing 65% of the housing requirement on Melton Mowbray reflects its role as the main town and employment centre for the Borough. The allocation of the SNs to north and south of the town will help to deliver key parts of the Distributer Road. The apportionment of 35% of the housing requirement to the villages is to is unlikely to provide any benefit to the town and will not contribute to the delivery of the road. However this development will help to support villages and the existing facilities within them - particularly local schools. It is worth noting that Stathern school has a falling school role and currently has 44 space places. Without development in these locations there is a risk that vital local services could be lost.</p> <p>The Plan proposes a concentration of development within Melton Mowbray as suggested (65%) and an allocation to Somerby commensurate with its size (approx. 1%). Policy SS3 allows development within villages outside the allocated sites where they will contribute to need and sustainability, as suggested.</p>	None proposed
Stuart Mogg	Sewstern has been included in the wrong category, as a Rural Supporter, it should be included in Rural Settlements. The village has little or no services.	It would be sound and justified if Sewstern was included in the category Rural Settlements.	Sewstern <u>is</u> included as a Rural Settlement to reflect the lack of local services and facilities. Appendix 3 shows this. This categorisation is base on evidence collected during preparation of the local plan.	None proposed

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
MRS NICOLA MORLEY	Somerby transport infrastructure is not capable of coping with such developments and has a poor soon to be stopped bus service, and the village can not absorb ANY more traffic, cars are constantly damaged going through the village on an almost daily basis. Horse riders are so frequent through the village and are at a huge risk of further injuries due to any increased traffic.	see above	The local highway authority has not indicated that the roads in Somerby are at capacity and have indicated that the highway implications of the growth proposed can be addressed through the development management process.	None proposed.
Elizabeth Crowther	Settlement requirement for Long Clawson at 127 is not based on a fair share of Objectively Assessed Need within the locality and is likely to lead to unsustainable oversupply and undue pressure on limited infrastructure and local services, while also causing harm to rural character and appearance of the village and its setting in the wider landscape. Hence the LP is UNSOUND in this regard. Not consistent with NPPF 47, 48 and 54.		<p>The Council has received the HEDNA referred to and has taken into account its content in arriving at a housing target for the Local plan. It has not reduced the overall scale of development arising from the reports conclusions for OAN in order to retain commitments to its vision and objectives and to integrate economic and housing strategies. The Plan is therefore based on the most up to date evidence available</p> <p>The review and update of housing sites has resulted in the reduction in the allocation of Long Clawson and deletion of a previously identified site.</p>	<p>A revised Policy C1(a), C1(B) and associated reasoned justification and Appendix 2 are proposed, to reflect the housing site assessment changes.</p> <p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>
Michelle Colclough	By building on the periphery of the town centre, then introducing link roads - people will be encouraged to drive and thus increase the percentage of obese people living in the borough.		The package of sustainable transport measures that will complement the MMDR in the MM Transport Strategy will be delivered alongside implementation of the road, not afterwards.	A proposed change to introduce a dedicated policy (a new Policy IN1) and reasoned justification for the for the MMTS is proposed.
Carl Powell	4.2. Defined settlement roles for the 'villages' are not sound. The 'four criteria' approach is more subjective and so harder to criticise. In particular MBC has insufficient evidence of 'employment opportunity' in the villages - asked for evidence/database for employment opportunity in Somerby but reply was they dont hold it, as employers don't usually share that information. They cite 'John O Gaunt industrial Estate' as an employment opportunity - there is no such thing - I got information - they said MBC have not asked them.	In rural Melton ('the villages') reasonably accurate measurement of employment numbers and, more importantly, employment opportunity, must take place. These are not the same thing. Two questions must be asked of businesses 1. how many people do you employ 2. how many more people do you want/expect to employ in the next 5/10/15/20 years. Only an identified positive value to 2. is evidence of 'employment opportunity' and thus for designation of a settlement as a 'service centre'.	The work underpinning identification of settlement roles (set out in the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report 2016) was proportionate for the purpose. It would be too costly and time consuming to be as precise and detailed as this comment suggests. Both the John O Gaunt trading area, and Burrough Court provide employment opportunities that are easy to access from Somerby.	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
JOHN RUST	<p>2.2.3 -Out of the 1515 12 Service Centre and 7 Rural Hubs allocation of houses why are 969 of these to be built in villages north of Melton and close to the Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire borders when the majority of Leicestershires employment is south of Melton. The only villages to the south are Great Dalby 0 houses, Gaddesby 50 houses and Somerby 49 houses a total of 99. To the North of Melton there is Bottesford 428, Easthorpe 19, Stathern 57, Harby 98, Hose 57, Long Clawson 127, Scalford 0, Waltham 91, Croxton Kerrial 76, Ab Kettleby 9 and Old Dalby 35. a total of 997.The remainder East and West of Melton in Thorpe Arnold 20, Wymondham 68, Asfordby 181, Frisby on the Wreake 78 and Asfordby Hill 70. a total of 417.This is a very disproportionate split. There is only one Primary Rural Service Centre south of Melton. Long Clawson is not situated on or even near a main road.</p>	<p>2.2.3 - contrary to what this paragrph says, the majority of new housing in Service Centres and Rural Hubs is North of Melton, away from the areas of employment which increases travelling distances and is at odds to the NPPF climate change policy.</p> <p>2.3.5 - the "other larger villages, particularly to the south of the Borough' referred to should be fully assessed for their sustainability and allocated a proportionate share of the new housing allocation to relieve the pressure on the northern Service Centres and Rural Hubs some of which could be unsustainable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address all infrastructure problems detailed in the submitted Data Pack and the Clawson in Action consultation response documents , include and budget for them in the MBC Local Plan, and implement them prior to any development being undertaken in Long Clawson. • If all the infrastructure issues are addressed, and if Long Clawson housing allocation of 110 homes is accepted, the building should be evenly spread over 20 years at a rate of no more than six in any one year and tailored to local need; • support the development of the Garden Village at Six Hills as a sustainable alternative to ‘over-loading’ all the villages in the Vale of Belvoir’; • reconsider its decision to unfairly allocate 67%, of the 35% housing allocation for villages, to villages north of the town, concentrated on the Nottinghamshire border. <p>To the South of Melton where the majority of employment is located support the Old Dalby airfield village as a new Service centre</p> <p>Note; the issue housing development north of Melton when employment was in the south was raised by the inspector when rejecting the Melton Core Strategy (old local plan) in 2013</p>	<p>This is an over simplification of how people travel. Whilst the HMA is clearly centred around Leicester and M1 employment opportunities, there are employment opportunities within the Borough and outside the HMA which are commutable for the villages. It is not wrong to assume that people living on the ‘Nottinghamshire border’ work within Nottinghamshire, nor should it be assumed this is a problem. This forms part of conversations of which the duty to cooperate was conducted.</p> <p>The most sustainable settlements outside of Melton Mowbray are in the north of the Borough. The NPPF directs development to the most sustainable locations. As the most sustainable location, Melton Mowbray is taking 65% of housing growth, despite accounting for only 50% of the population. Development at Six Hills would not be possible for many years, meaning that the facilities to make six hill sustainable will not be present until potentially beyond the plan period. It is countered that this is more sustainable then delivering houses in villages with services and facilities already in place. The Inspector was referencing development directly adjoining Melton in an SUE, not the spread of housing to the villages in general. In reality with regard to housing distribution to the villages, the inspector critiqued Melton Borough Council for not allocating more housing to the villages.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
A.Thomas	<p>Listen to opinions of local residents who want to preserve the area in which they live and not have vast housing estates unilaterally imposed on the villages in which they live.</p> <p>Long Clawson for example will not be sustainable if the quantity of houses proposed in the draft plan is imposed upon the village.</p>	<p>Build new villages with new infrastructure at Six Hills &/or Great Dalby.</p> <p>Only allow individual, one off new builds in the villages thus preserving the rural ambience of those villages.</p>	<p>The views of local people have been considered in preparation of the local plan - as detailed in the Council's Consultation Statement 2016 and update (2107). They have been considered alongside evidence from other stakeholders and studies, of which the draft plan is the result. The sustainability and suitability for development of each village has been assessed, as set out in the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report. Additional housing can help to sustain and improve village services and facilities. The option of including a new village in the plan was considered as an option, but was less sustainable, and did not meet as many of the plan objectives as will the proposed spatial strategy. One-off new builds are allowed by Policy SS3 in the 'unallocated sites' section.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. This has the effect of reducing the allocation to Long Clawson.</p>
Alison Cathie	<p>Sewstern is in the wrong category as Rural Supporter. It has little or nothing in the way of service. It should be in the category Rural Settlements.</p>	<p>Change the category that Sewstern is included in to Rural Settlements.</p>	<p>Sewstern is included as a Rural Settlement to reflect the lack of local services and facilities. Appendix 3 shows this. This categorisation is based on evidence collected during preparation of the local plan, and analysed in the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report 2016.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
Anthony Paphiti	<p>As the Melton Housing requirement is based on a HMA wide assessment, that means housing expansion is a response to government targets rather than local need/demand, and other policies about transport and industry are being made to fit around this.</p> <p>For the Ward of Gaddesby, over the 10 year period 2004 – 2014 population has grown by only 68, that is, under 7 people per year, across all villages in the Ward. It is unclear where the 'shortfall' referred to in para 4.2.1 comes from, when 72 houses are proposed in Great Dalby alone, thereby increasing its current population of 544 by about 288 (on an average of 3/household), whereas it has hardly grown since 1851, when it had 479 inhabitants. It is hoped that affordable housing will keep young people in the villages like Gaddesby .</p>	<p>Meet local expectations about town and housing expansion, rather than follow external diktats from LCC about what is good for the Borough. Stop creating an expansion which will then have to be filled by importing people into the borough from urban areas, when there isn't the transport, medical, educational, or employment infrastructure there to support them. These proposals do not address need. They address policy.</p>	<p>The housing proposed in the local plan is to meet local needs and the needs of businesses for sufficient working age population to fill local jobs and reduce in-commuting. The HMA wide evidence is not Government imposed - it was drawn up on behalf of all the Leicestershire and Leicester Local Planning Authorities. The shortfall referred to the gap between the housing target for the period before this plan period and the amount of housing that was actually delivered then. New housing can help to sustain and improve local services and Policy C4 will help ensure that young people can afford homes in the villages.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Brian Howes	Soundness: Pleasing to note that the draft Melton Local Plan and the draft Frisby-on-the-Wreake Neighbourhood Plan are in broad agreement on number of houses that could be built within the Frisby boundary (as stated in chapter 4). This is the maximum number of houses that the village could cope with given that it will increase the size of the village by 40-50%. The infrastructure of the village would certainly not cope with any bigger development.		Comments noted.	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.
Carl Powell	Employment opportunity in the rural areas has not been evidenced sufficiently to justify the identification of Service Centres or rural hubs. MBC are unable to provide evidence for Somerby Parish. I am thinking of possible judicial review because of this. It is unproven that 'The number of homes needed in Melton Borough relates directly to the sustainability and success of the local economy'. It is a political opinion. Increasing quantity cannot be assumed to improve quality.	Comprehensive research into future employment opportunity (not just present employment levels) before deciding on the need for, or levels of, population growth and housing development. In other words evidence before policy.	The Leicester and Leicestershire Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) 2017 explains the relationships between employment growth and the need for housing, and the Towards a Housing Requirement Report for Melton, 2017 analyses this for Melton specifically. Proportionate evidence of employment opportunity underpinned the identification of the hierarchy of settlements. The plan seeks to drive up the quality of new housing through policies such as D1 and C3.	None proposed.
Carole Brown	1) I support the proportionate approach to housing allocation via rural population distribution based on existing settlement size, but do not consider allocating sites for 20 years in a local plan as sound, and thinks these should be identified in Neighbourhod plans instead. 2) The delay in delivering the Northern and Southern SUEs commits the delivery of new housing in the Rural Area to be 'front-loaded' within the first five years period. This should instead be phased over time as has happened historically in the villages, to allow infrastructure and community services to adapt and be improved where necessary.	1) MBC should identify all known possible sites at present and update annually, and then as development applications come forward, the outstanding required for each settlement should decrease accordingly. Neighbourhood Plans should be the only predetermined allocation of housing sites based on community ratified proposals. 2) Review and amend phasing of housing delivery to ensure that sites for potential development in rural locations can deliver new housing over 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th five year plan periods unless there is an infrastructure constraint that does not allow this or a Neighbourhood Plan shows that a community want all the development to take place together. Ensure that this is expressly included within the adopted plan.	Para. 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework indicates that local plans must be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15 year time horizon. The draft plan will have just over 15 years to run when it is adopted. NPPF para 47 requires local plans to set out a specific deliverable sites to provide five years worth of housing and developable sites or broad locations for years 6-10 and where possible for years 11-15 as well. The Council cannot rely on identification of sites in neighbourhood plans, as plans are not in preparation in all neighbourhoods across the Borough, and none have yet been 'made'. The housing trajectory does indicate that the majority of new housing is expected to take place in the villages in the first 5 years of the plan period. This is necessary to ensure sufficient supply of sites can be identified for the first 5 years, as mentioned above.	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites. See also comments regarding individual site selection relating to Chapter 5.
carolineIstuart	Paragraph 4.2.20 states 'figures have been calculated		An updated housing site assessment has	Amend Policy SS2 and the

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
@hotmail.co.uk	<p>identifying the number of new dwellings to be provided in each settlement based on existing population size. This figure has been amended to take into account dwellings that have been completed or are under construction since the beginning of the planning period in 2011, and to allow for those dwellings on small sites with an extant planning permission which are yet to be started'. This methodology sees an exclusion of 11 houses for Gaddesby, the difference between Tables 4 and 5 on page 32 of the Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan. It is not clear what / where these 11 houses are. The 14 houses proposed at GADD1 (Policy C1A – Housing Allocations, p55) already have approved planning permission (planning application ref. 15/00361/OUT), so these should actually be the difference between tables 4 and 5 (or at least included in this number), resulting in an allocation in Table 5 of a maximum 41 (though likely to be less). It is further unclear where the 5 houses feature which have been granted permission on Ashby Road (12/00530/FUL) and the one further dwelling at the Hall in the village (15/00826/FUL). There is potential for Gaddesby to be allocated a baseline of 67 houses (55+6+5+1), notwithstanding any further allocation under Policy SS3 (Sustainable Communities (unallocated sites) which allows for small scale development of up to 5 dwellings in Rural Hubs, plus its allocation of the 15% 'windfall' houses numbering 322 over the life of the Melton Plan refer to 4.2.13 and 4.2.14). A methodology for allocating the 322 'windfall' houses across the villages is not presented in the Plan, but applying the same 3% of population for Gaddesby as per Table 4 (p32), would result in an additional 10 houses (rounded up to the nearest whole number). In total that would be an increase of circa 82 houses, in a village with currently 138 residences, an increase of 59.4%. This increase in housing is not matched by a corresponding increase in facilities and infrastructure, nor reflecting the lack of current facilities, making a development of this size completely unviable. I object to Paragraph 4.2.20 in that the methodology for housing allocation in Gaddesby is incoherent, misleading and flawed.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.18 states 'Information on population has been compiled and an estimate of the number of households in each settlement has been calculated. This allows a clear idea of the size of settlements, with the</p>		<p>been undertaken, and this has resulted in a number of changes to sites, capacities, site boundaries, etc. It also takes account of permission granted and houses already built in the Plan period. Changes are also proposed to the reasoned justification, setting out more clearly how the amount of new housing for which new land needs to be allocated has been derived.</p> <p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing.</p> <p>The 'windfall' allowance is informed on past trends which the Council consider will be achievable, and represent a much lower rate(21 pa) than has been achieved in previous years (70 pa) as set out in the Five Year Land Supply and Housing Trajectory Position (2nd November 2016) (page 11) which has also been updated.</p> <p>The scale of growth proposed by the Plan far exceeds 3% and the allocation to Gaddesby, as a Rural Hub, is commensurate to this scale.</p> <p>Sites have come forward where there were previously none available and this removes the need for a 'redistribution' process.</p>	associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>general approach that development should be commensurate with existing settlement size’. 4.2.21 identifies 5 villages (Asfordby, Hose, Scalford, Stathern and Great Dalby) however, that do not have capacity to take their share of the 162 residual requirement. Distribution of this 162 across the remaining villages inherently means that some villages will be taking a disproportionate share compared to others.</p> <p>The methodology of converting current population estimate to actual number of dwellings is also not clear and transparent; the assumptions made here need to be fully understood.</p> <p>For the village of Gaddesby with currently 138 residences, a further increase of 61 houses (taking in to account the deduction of 11 houses completed, under construction or small sites with extant planning permission) would increase the size of the village by 44%. This increase in housing is not matched by a corresponding increase in facilities and infrastructure, nor reflecting the lack of current facilities, making a development of this size unviable. A methodology based purely on allocation through population estimate and not existing or required facilities to support that level of housing is flawed.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.15 states ‘it is proposed to allocate housing development within the Service Centres and Rural Hubs on the basis of the existing settlement size. This is considered to be an inherently ‘fair’ and proportionate approach to allocation and will encourage growth in communities that is at a comparable rate, commensurate to their existing size’. 4.2.21 identifies 5 villages (Asfordby, Hose, Scalford, Stathern and Great Dalby) however, that do not have capacity to take their share of the 162 residual requirement. Distribution of this 162 across the remaining villages inherently means that some villages will be taking a disproportionate share compared to others.</p> <p>The methodology of converting current population estimate to actual number of dwellings is also not clear and transparent; the assumptions made here need to be fully understood.</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>For the village of Gaddesby with currently 138 residences, a further increase of 61 houses (taking in to account the deduction of 11 houses completed, under construction or small sites with extant planning permission) would increase the size of the village by 44%. This increase in housing is not matched by a corresponding increase in facilities and infrastructure, nor reflecting the lack of current facilities, making a development of this size unviable. A methodology based purely on allocation through population estimate and not existing or required facilities to support that level of housing is flawed.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.14 suggests an overall allowance for 'windfall' development of 15% of the total, allocated to Service Centres, Rural Hubs and Rural Settlements (322 houses). A methodology for allocating the 322 'windfall' houses across the villages is not presented in the Plan, but applying the same 3% of population for Gaddesby as per Table 4 (p32), would result in an additional 10 houses (rounded up to the nearest whole number). Between the years of 1994 and 2014, 15 houses were added to the village of Gaddesby (refer to 'Melton Local Plan Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report April 2015 - Appendix 2'). At an average natural growth rate of 0.75 houses per annum, this would actually suggest a further 17 houses (rounded up to the nearest whole number) in Gaddesby for the remaining 22 years of the Melton Plan period (2014 – 2036). The point is that Gaddesby would contribute a greater proportion through 'windfall' houses than is intimated through the Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan. Based on an under estimation of the contribution of windfall, the housing allocation to Gaddesby is overestimated in turn. I object to Paragraph 4.2.13 in that the methodology for housing allocation in Gaddesby is incoherent, misleading and flawed.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.13 suggests an overall allowance for 'windfall' development of 10% (522 houses), with 15% of this total allocated to Service Centres, Rural Hubs and Rural Settlements (322 houses). A methodology for allocating the 322 'windfall' houses across the villages is not presented in the Plan, but applying the same 3% of population for Gaddesby as per Table 4 (p32), would result in an additional 10 houses (rounded up to the nearest</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>whole number). Between the years of 1994 and 2014, 15 houses were added to the village of Gaddesby (refer to 'Melton Local Plan Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report April 2015 - Appendix 2'). At an average natural growth rate of 0.75 houses per annum, this would actually suggest a further 17 houses (rounded up to the nearest whole number) in Gaddesby for the remaining 22 years of the Melton Plan period (2014 – 2036). The point is that Gaddesby would contribute a greater proportion through 'windfall' houses than is intimated through the Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan. Based on an under estimation of the contribution of windfall, the housing allocation to Gaddesby is overestimated in turn. I object to Paragraph 4.2.13 in that the methodology for housing allocation in Gaddesby is incoherent, misleading and flawed.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.4 sets out the four 'essential criteria' for identifying settlements relating to service and facility provision, as follows: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. primary school; 2. access to employment opportunities; 3. fast broadband; and 4. a community building. <p>Paragraph 4.2.5 states that 'The essential criteria have been used to distinguish between the proposed Service Centres and Rural Hubs. A Service Centre must have all 4 of the essential criteria, whilst Rural Hubs must have at least 3 out of 4, with one of those being a primary school'. Paragraph 4.2.7 identifies Gaddesby as a Rural Hub.</p> <p>Gaddesby village does not qualify for the Rural Hub status that it has been allocated, as it does not fulfill at least 3 of the 4 essential criteria. Gaddesby on this basis should be considered as a rural settlement only. In respect of the 4 essential criteria in application to Gaddesby, my comments are as follows: -</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Primary school – Gaddesby does have a primary school. The school increased its intake of children from 15 per year to 25 per year in 2014 but with places in these years all filled, Years 1,2 and Reception are already at capacity. Within 4 years the school will be at total capacity. Filling places moreover is unlikely to be difficult, given the size of the catchment area (including Barsby, South Croxton, Ashby Folville and almost to Queniborough). This is acknowledged in Appendix 1 (p24) of the Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan, which states ‘The Primary School is currently has capacity for 210 students, with 78 spare, decreasing yearly until 2020 when projections indicate it is expected to be close to capacity’. Whilst Gaddesby nominally complies with this first essential criteria in that is physically has a primary school, in practical terms it does not comply if there are not the school places available for the duration of the Melton Local Plan. A primary school can only fulfill the essential criteria if it can actually accept an intake of children.</p> <p>Access to employment opportunities - Gaddesby has extremely limited employment opportunities, these being restricted to the two employers in the village, the primary school and The Cheney Arms public house. The Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan does not make any reference to the creation of employment opportunities within Gaddesby nor the infrastructural requirements to facilitate employment opportunities. In contradiction to this essential criteria, paragraph 6.9.3 in the Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan actually states that ‘The Local Plan policy does not allocate specific sites in the rural areas’ (for additional employment growth). Appendix 1 (p24) of the Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan further acknowledges that ‘the closest employment areas are in Melton Mowbray (over 7km). To facilitate access to employment opportunities, Appendix 1 acknowledges existence of a bus service throughout the week (Centrebus 100 between Leicester and Melton Mowbray), though goes on to state ‘However its frequency (every two hours) and the lack of service on Sundays and Bank Holidays should be taken into account when the service is considered with regards to Gaddesby’s sustainability (i.e. for accessing Employment as mentioned in the point above)’. The suggestion that the Centrebus100 week day service can be used to facilitate access to employment</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>opportunity is also highly questionable. Gaddesby is the closest settlement in the Melton borough to Leicester and it is there that most people go to work. The only suitable bus to Leicester leaves Gaddesby at 07.49am and the last bus leaves Leicester at 17.10pm; this service is not conducive to attending full-time employment in Leicester.</p> <p>Fast broadband - Gaddesby's phone exchange has been 'upgraded' in 2016 as part of the "Super-fast" Leicestershire programme. It has added support for Fibre to the Cabinet broadband. There isn't a lot of choice of provider; the majority of residents are using BT. This broadband service is sold as "up to" 56Mbps download speed, which is more than adequate for an average modern home. The actual delivered speed was tested at the time of making these representations and confirmed as 20Mbps, or 35.7% of the advertised maximum, which is the same as the pre-upgrade ADSL offering. Although there is fibre optic to the exchange there is none from the exchange. Gaddesby cannot be considered to comply with this essential criteria on this basis. Given this failure to perform under the existing load of the village and surrounding areas, any additional load (resulting from housing allocation) is likely to deteriorate the service further. Many existing residents have not yet upgraded to fibre broadband either, which would increase the load further. In the neighbouring Village of Queniborough, the broadband speeds can be over double the delivered speed in Gaddesby. Super "fast" broadband in Gaddesby is barely effective. Evidence of a poor broadband service further contradicts paragraph 6.9.4 in the Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan ('increased homeworking and small business start-ups are anticipated over the plan period, particularly in light of improvements in broadband speeds') and provides further evidence in support of lack of access to employment opportunities outlined above.</p> <p>A community building – Gaddesby has a village hall and fulfils this essential criteria.</p> <p>Gaddesby only fulfils one of the four criteria to qualify it as a Rural Hub. Table 2 in the Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan suggests 'Rural Hubs are a village or a group of villages which share a range of essential and important local services which serve the basic needs of people living</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>within them and in nearby settlements, which can be accessed by cycling and walking...These villages will have 3 out of the 4 essential services...and a range of other facilities, or easy access to them, in nearby settlements'. Gaddesby does not share local services / a range of other facilities with nearby settlements and nearby settlements cannot be accessed by cycling or walking due to distance.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.4 outlines the services considered within the annual 'audit of village services by Melton Borough Council, as follows: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - education facilities (nursery and primary school and secondary school) - local shops, post offices and petrol stations / garages - health care facilities (general medical practice, dentist and pharmacy) - community facilities (village hall, public house, library, sport and leisure groups and places of worship) - transport facilities (a regular 6 day a week bus service) - opportunities of employment in other businesses - allotments <p>Of the above list, Gaddesby only has a primary school, a village hall, a public house and a church, further emphasising its existence as a rural settlement only and not a Rural Hub.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.4 states that 'The roles of the town and villages in the Borough were reviewed following the Emerging Options consultation, and a revised approach adopted'. In the first iteration of the Melton Local Plan, Gaddesby was classified as a 'Rural Supporter', in the Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan the village has been upscaled to become a Rural Hub. A rural supporter was identified in the Melton Local Plan Settlement Roles and Relationships of April 2015 (MLPSRR) by a clear scoring methodology based on 42 criteria, with role and function</p>			

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>of settlements and role and spatial analysis. The scoring criteria used was much more extensive and sophisticated, in comparison to the four criteria only used in the Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan (4.2.4), which appear to be much more of a blunt tool in evaluating village classification. Scoring only 12 points, Gaddesby was very much at the lower end of the rural supporter range of 10 to 20. Moreover, the previous rural supporter classification could now be argued to be over estimated, skewed by the availability of a regular bus service, which has since been drastically reduced. Reflecting the deterioration in the bus service provided, Gaddesby is akin to a rural settlement only. Gaddesby compares in size and facilities with its neighbour Ashby Folville, yet Gaddesby is classified as a Rural Hub but Ashby Folville as a rural settlement. My objection to paragraph 4.2.4 is that the change in classification between iterations of the Melton Plan is not clear and transparent, no clear reasoning is presented as to the re-classification of Gaddesby. The scoring is furthermore inconsistent at best, with similar villages being classified entirely differently.</p>			
Catherine J.G. Pugh	<p>The hamlet of Easthorpe (containing site EAST1) cannot be described as a rural hub since it is and has long been part of Bottesford. Indeed, the census returns for Bottesford place the boundary between Easthorpe and Bottesford along Church Street in the old centre of Bottesford village. Muston was a separate parish until the 1930s and retains its own identity as a community. Easthorpe has no seperate has no services. The classification of Easthorpe as a separate rural hub while Muston is classified as a rural settlement makes no sense and serves to distort the allocation of housing to Bottesford.</p>	<p>Muston should be recognised as a Rural Hub. Easthorpe should not be treated as a separate settlement as it is a part of Bottesford. The allocation of housing to Bottesford and Muston should be revised accordingly.</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The categorisation of Muston as a rural settlement is considered appropriate.</p> <p>Parish boundaries are not relevant to this assessment as they are not reliable indicators of 'sustainability'. Policy SS3 allows for appropriate development in Muston.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Catherine Pacey	Bottesford will not remain a village with the amount of houses proposed, unable to cope with the amount of vehicles. Building on recognised flood plains - not acceptable. Doctors, transport will not cope. The Highway Authority have also been consulted as the local plan was being prepared and have not indicated that any highway improvements are needed to mitigate the overall effects of new development.	Do not require no. of houses proposed. Easthorpe and Bottesford should remain separate villages, should consider small developments in our neighbouring villages and not concentrate on one area.	<p>Housing requirements overall have been devised from the evidence collated (HEDNA and 'Towards a Housing Target for Melton' and relate to local needs. Within this Bottesford accounts for approx. 7% of the population and its allocation is a little under 7% of the needs calculated. No evidence has been provided to suggest Bottesford's needs follow a different profile to that of the remainder on the Borough , on which basis the needs have been calculated.</p> <p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The categorisation of Bottesford as a Service Centre is considered appropriate.</p> <p>Bottesford has the best range of local services and facilities in the rural area and as such is considered a sustainable location for new development. Development will help to support existing services into the future. No service providers have indicated their facilities cannot either cope or can be expanded to meet the demand arising from the quantity proposed.</p> <p>No allocations are made on land within Flood Zone 3. It is for the CCG to plan the provision of appropriate GPs for an area, and the Council has engaged with them under the Duty to Co-operate</p>	Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Christopher Noakes	<p>Para 4.2.4 et seq: The revised settlement policy and its methodology is supported. It recognises earlier representations (Emerging Options) to better reflect the relative availability of services/facilities in each settlement (i.e. their relative 'sustainable' locations) and give relevant weight to 'essential' facilities and services. However para 4.2.5 refers to 5 (not 4) settlement roles, presumably a 'typo'.</p> <p>Para 4.2.7 Reference to SRRO Report 2016 ? Does this exist, as the Key evidence still refers to 2015 report.</p> <p>Para 4.2.11 Whilst identifying the background to the 2015 SRRO Report and desire to place an increased focus of development on Melton town and at the same time allowing some growth in rural settlements, it does not specifically spell out why a 65%-35% split better fulfils the strategic objectives of the Plan, as opposed to the 70%-30% split.</p> <p>The latter would the achievement of sustainable objectives of the Plan and the realisation of the specific objectives for MM itself, including the realistic completion of a outer relief road. At 65% - 35 % split, this reduces the opportunities to secure a greater overall sustainable pattern of growth, linked to the provision of services, employment, affordable housing and infrastructure, as well as the enhancement of MM town centre (e.g. through consolidation of growth and developer contributions).</p>	<p>Increase the proportion of new housing development in Melton to 70%, which could be met by various (currently) non-allocated sites which were examined in the SHLAA exercise and deemed to be 'acceptable'. The resulting reduction to 30% housing provision in the rural areas would reduce the need to 're-allocate' a quota of housing development from those Service Centres/Rural Hubs lacking opportunities for growth to other settlements, where the subsequent increased 'quota' (para 4.2.21-22) bring forward less appropriate and sustainable options, including the more likely need for 'reserved' sites to be released.</p>	<p>he 'Settlement Roles, Relationships and Opportunities Report 2015' assessed the relative merits of maintaining, reducing or increasing the proportional split of historical house building rates in Melton Mowbray and the villages. The study also considered increasing the proportion of the Borough's housing requirement located in Melton Mowbray, to 65% or 70%, with the remaining 35% to 30% being located in the villages and 65/35 was concluded as the optimum balance to achieve the objectives of the Plan and improve sustainability and travel patterns etc. This evidence is considered to remain valid and the quantum allocated to Melton Mowbray the most appropriate approach.</p> <p>The Council considers the 65/35% split between the town and the villages to be the most appropriate to provide a choice of development sites of different sizes and in different locations. This strategy will also ensure the appropriate number of homes are delivered in the town to support a sustainable pattern of growth and deliver the distributor road. At the same time this strategy will support and maintain the services and facilities within villages in the rural area.</p>	<p>Proposed minor modification to correct para 4.2.5 to read 4 settlement roles not 5. A minor modification is required to the Key Evidence section to reference the 2016 reports on settlement roles and relationships, and correct 4.4.2 to reflect the correct percentage for 1700 homes (28%)</p> <p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>
Colin Love	<p>4.2.18 et seq: The proposal to develop 'a proportionate' approach to housing allocation is open to question and challenge in the case of Bottesford - a village that is recognised by the EA as the lowest point within the Borough and thus highly susceptible to the risk of flood. The historic growth of Bottesford was originally based on local organic growth and recently it was allowed to grow without the current urgent considerations for sustainability. The past growth of Bottesford to its present size must NOT and cannot be the basis of justification for the proportionate allocation of houses. Such 'proportionality' will have the inevitable consequence of promoting rather than minimising daily travel requirements.</p>	<p>The wording should refer to a policy of a ' proportionate approach' applied only when and where it is considered appropriate to the existing settlement's capacity to absorb the additional numbers without detriment to its present village character and local internal infrastructure along with identified and potential flood risk.</p> <p>The housing allocation for Bottesford should revert to the 300 residual figure as originally set out in the Issues and Options document and to which the Draft Neighbourhood Plan is working in accordance with the wishes of the Parish residents.</p>	<p>Concern for the increased housing proposed for Bottesford is recognised. However the assessment of the capacity of the village - both existing facilities such as the school, and the local landscape and flood risk has concluded that there is capacity to accommodate the scale of development and sites proposed in the plan albeit several sites were affected by one or more factor. Flooding is present in and around Bottesford, but the entire village is not affected. Bottesford has strong transport links and is in close proximity to several larger centres which will assist in reducing travel distances..</p>	<p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and additional sites.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>Additionally, because a village is already relatively 'large' and has a range of facilities does not, by definition, mean that it can 'absorb' a further substantial number of houses. Bottesford can be considered to be already at its optimum functional size. Further substantial development, such as that proposed, would seriously damage this. Hence in the case of Bottesford, the application of a 'proportionate' approach across the Borough without further evaluation of other specific planning features is an inappropriate and unacceptable process of housing allocation.</p> <p>Bottesford is a thriving village community. However, WITH THE PROPOSED SCALE OF GROWTH within this draft Melton Plan, BOTTESFORD WILL BEGIN TO LOSE ITS ESSENTIALLY VILLAGE CHARACTER THROUGH DETRIMENTAL URBANISING INFLUENCES contrary to the wishes of the residents of the Parish who have made it clear through the processes of extensive consultation on a neighbourhood plan, that they want Bottesford to remain a village.</p> <p>Such a substantial growth (by more than a third) section on Delivering the Vision, it states that MBC will 'Respect the individual character and distinctiveness of Melton Borough's villages'. Growth by a third would radically alter the character of Bottesford.</p> <p>It has to be appreciated that even at the figure of 300 houses, as originally proposed in the Issues and Options document, this number of houses, if placed in the wrong areas of Bottesford, would have a very detrimental urbanising effect on the character and approaches to the village. It was this consideration that led the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to engage CABE as consultants to advise on the location(s) that would do least harm and even enhance the character of the village. Without qualification, they recommended the use of the full Rectory Farm SHLAA site as mapped in the Emerging Options document.</p> <p>This site is contained, so will not encourage the village to sprawl or spoil the main approaches to the village. Its topography, with its winding river, encourages an</p>		<p>An updated site assessment has resulted in proposed changes to Policy SS2 , C1 and associated Appendix 1 that reduces the capacity of allocated housing sites, 325 down from 425. Allocations are not based on past build rates by the disaggregation of overall needs to locations identified as sustainable on a proportionate basis, relating to their population size .It is not accepted that the level of growth proposed would remove Bottesford's status as a village nor would its historic character be affected because sites are located towards the periphery of the village some distance from its historic core.</p>	

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>unregimented layout. It can be well connected to the centre of the village by footpaths and cycle routes and also form part of the projected Sustrans route to Kilvington.</p> <p>Further, it could provide much needed parking for the adjacent Methodist Church.</p> <p>Perhaps surprisingly, maybe uniquely, the land agent for the site has engaged a design consultant, Stefan Kruckowski (the author of Building for Life 12) who, at the agent's expense, has organised a series of design workshops with the participation of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to draw up a site Master Plan that would, inter alia, take advantage of the topography and respect the proximity of the existing mid-20th century housing estate. This site would bring areas of Public Open Space and play areas to the existing housing development in the west end of the village that currently has no such facilities.</p> <p>Such is the potential of this site to enhance the village that it is essential that as much of the site area as possible is confirmed as suitable for house building. This will require the challenging of Historic England's submission relating to heritage.</p> <p>I SUPPORT THE REJECTION OF ALL OF THE SITES WITHIN BOTTESFORD PARISH THAT MBC HAS IDENTIFIED AS 'REJECTED' AND THE GROUNDS ON WHICH THEY HAVE BEEN REJECTED.</p>			
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Asfordby Parish Council)	<p>Paragraph 4.2.4 : Paragraph 28 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires local plans to promote a strong rural economy and lists facilities considered important to achieving this, however the Melton Local Plan's settlement hierarchy has no regard to the availability of local shops, sports venues, public houses or places of worship.</p> <p>Similarly, National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 35 advises that plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of goods or people. The failure of the Melton Local Plan's settlement hierarchy to have regard to the availability of public transport, especially bus services,</p>	<p>The Melton Local Plan (Publication version) settlement hierarchy should take account of the availability of local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses, places of worship and public transport services.</p> <p>The identification of Asfordby Hill as a Rural hub should be dependent upon the provision of a local shop and meeting place for the settlement in accordance with the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The categorisation of Asfordby Hill as a Rural Hub is considered appropriate.	<p>A suggested modification to paragraph 4.2.5 to include reference to consideration also having been given to the presence of other "desirable " facilities within each settlement - as set out in the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report</p> <p>Amend Policy SS2 and the associated reasoned justification as a focussed change to reflect the housing allocation assessment in the light of new information and</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
	<p>is contrary to the Framework but furthermore:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. has the potential to disadvantage people without access to a private car; 2. fails to provide for the necessary development that will guard against the unnecessary loss of public transport services. <p>Paragraph 4.2.7</p> <p>The identification of Asfordby as a Service Centre is supported.</p> <p>Asfordby Hill should not be identified as a Rural Hub unless there is specific provision for a local shop and meeting place for the settlement.</p>		<p>The Local Plan references the 4 services and facilities considered to be essential. These were determined in consultation with the Reference Group and a workshop with the Parish Councils. The presence of other facilities such as a place of worship, local shop and sports facility is considered desirable. These have been registered for each settlement in the detailed settlement assessment. Reference is made to the presence of other desirable facilities in the table explaining the settlement roles in Figure 6 of the Plan. The availability of public transport is considered important for a minority of residents in rural communities. The future maintenance of such service to rural communities is unpredictable and is not considered to be a reliable means of assessing the future sustainability of a settlement.</p>	<p>additional sites.</p>
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Belvoir Estate)	<p>The village of Redmile has been incorrectly classified as a 'Rural Settlement'. Redmile has a primary school, two pubs and superfast broadband. The village is well located in relation to employment areas in Bottesford and Langar airfield. The village is served by the hourly Centrebus 24 route linking Melton Mowbray - Stathern - Plungar - Bottesford / Bingham.</p>	<p>Plungar should be identified as a 'Rural Hub'</p>	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attract a share of housing.</p> <p>Redmile does not have a village hall. It has is not agreed that or good access to employment opportunities. At the time the hierarchy of settlements was identified (2016), there was no superfast broadband. Plungar has a village hall but no primary school and the same circumstances as Redmile for employment and superfast broadband.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Craig Petch	I believe Sewstern has been incorrectly categorised and is in fact a rural settlement. The village itself has very little of no services.		<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The categorisation of Sewstern as a Rural Settlement is considered appropriate.</p> <p>Sewstern is included as a Rural Settlement to reflect the lack of local services and facilities. Appendix 3 shows this. This categorisation is base on evidence collected during preparation of the local plan.</p>	None proposed.
Richard Vincent	Sewstern has been included in the wrong category, as the village has 'very little or no services' and should be included in Rural Settlements.	See comments above relating to not compliant or sound Sewstern will be producing its own plan for future development.	<p>The Review of the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report (May 2016) and approach to allocation contained within the CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS (1st September 2016) reviewed the approach and identified that 4 key services would be applied to establish the 'category' of the village. These were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contribution to sustainability which in turn are those best placed to attracted a share of housing. The categorisation of Sewstern as a Rural Settlement is considered appropriate.</p> <p>Sewstern is included as a Rural Settlement to reflect the lack of local services and facilities. Appendix 3 shows this. This categorisation is base on evidence collected during preparation of the local plan.</p>	None proposed.

Name	CH4PSS2Q3: Response	CH4PSS2Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Richard Simon	Church Lane, Muston - Supported. Site on the SHLAA list but not included in the site options in the DMLP presumably because it exceeds the planned numbers for Rural Settlements (3 houses). From initial drawings this shows a development of 10 houses in a near linear arrangement matching the existing properties. On the basis that the drawing reflected the intended build this would be a good option. There is a possibility of increasing it to 11 and gaining some affordables which might be useful in this rural settlement. An element of windfall development will complete Bottesford's requirement to meet the target of 300 dwellings set in the Emerging Options document. I reject the other sites that were rejected by MBC in the Emerging Options and now in the DMLP.		Muston is not a service centre or rural hub, and so there is no planned development other than that which may come forward through the operation of Policy SS3. Windfalls have already been accounted for, before the calculations were undertaken to work out the residual housing requirement and how these should be apportioned to villages. The other sites identified in Bottesford have emerged from a site assessment methodology, the latest version of which will be published alongside an addendum of focused changes. Changes are proposed to Policy C1(a), C1(b) and the associated Appendix 1 to reflect the findings of this updated and enhanced site assessment exercise.	Policy SS3 so as to delete the strict application of size limits of 3, 5 and 10 and allow the appropriateness of proposals to be a matter of judgement based on the location concerned. Changes are proposed to Policy C1(a), C1(b) and the associated Appendix 1 to reflect the findings of an updated and enhanced site assessment exercise. The changes now propose sites with a capacity for 324 new homes in Bottseford.