

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
<u>Chapter 1</u>				
A.Thomas	4.2 Most residents of surrounding villages do not want vast housing estates unilaterally imposing upon their surroundings. The sensible answer is to build a new village at either Great Dalby or Six Hills which will answer the housing needs and requirements for many decades and the next generation.	The vast majority of the residents of surrounding villages do not want vast housing estates unilaterally imposing upon their surroundings. The sensible answer is to build a new village at either Great Dalby or Six Hills which will answer the housing needs and requirements for many decades and the next generation.	The reasons for distributing new housing development as outlined in Policy SS2 is to achieve the vision and strategic priorities of the plan in a sustainable way. The option of a new settlement was considered at early stage of the plan making process but did not perform as well against a sustainability appraisal.	None.
Andrew Gore obo Mary A Donovan	Concerned that there appears to be no evidence that previous representations on the plan have been considered or even read.		Consideration of comments made at previous stages of plan preparation were reported and published as appendices to Council reports at the time. A record of this is including in the Council's Community Consultation and Engagement Statement.	None.
Anthony Maher	Town residents have not had fair representation as no Neighbourhood Plan exists for it, even though much of the proposed development and changes are likely to happen within the town and consequential effect on the town.	A Town Plan be formed be formed to represent the Town as a whole as the smaller towns and villages have.	Neighbourhood Plans are community led initiatives, thus if there is desire for one for the town, people and businesses within the town must advance it. This is the case for all of our Neighbourhood Plans. Information can be sought online or by contacting MBC.	None.
Anthony Paphiti	There is disconnect between the visions for the future (satellite, industrial, historic/tourism) and the transport facilities needed to cope with any significant growth flowing from the vision.	This is answered in other comments made	New transport infrastructure is planned for in Policies IN1 and IN2.	None.
Canal and River Trust	The Trust does not have any comments to		Noted	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	make at this stage.			
Colin Love	Typo identified - use of consistent where 'consistent' meant. Overall, this Melton Plan is a very thorough document and should be approved.		Typing errors will be rectified with minor modifications suggested to the Inspector. Overall support noted and welcomed.	Minor modifications to replace 'consistent' with 'consistent' where it occurs.
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Asfordby Parish Council)	Paragraph 1.9.3: MBC has consistently failed to meet its statutory role in supporting neighbourhood planning in respect of the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan (APNP), and has not actively sought to work with the community to align timetables and aspirations. Consequently, the submitted APNP and the emerging Melton Local Plan are significantly misaligned in numerous respects. MBC has failed to take the APNP into account when preparing the Local Plan strategy and policies, duplicated neighbourhood plan policies and created confusion and delay. Paragraph 1.9.4 : MBC should set out clearly its strategic policies, as per para. 184 of the NPPF and provide details of these to a qualifying body and to the independent examiner. MBC has said all policies in the Local Plan up to Chapter 8 are regarded as strategic policies. However, many are not strategic in nature. For example, Policy C1 identifies site allocations which are peripheral to achieving the vision and aspirations of the Local Plan. It would be quite reasonable for a neighbourhood plan to propose allocating alternative sites to those in Policy C1. Figure 2 : fails to reflect the up-to-date position with respect to neighbourhood	Paragraph 1.9.3 : should be modified to take the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan fully into account. Paragraph 1.9.4 : should be modified to ensure that only those policies that are genuinely of a strategic nature are identified as such. Figure 2 should be deleted.	The Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan area was designated in 2012. Pre-submission consultations on the APNP ran in February 2015 and January 2016, with greatly altered content including a strategic allocation in Asfordby Hill. The plan was only submitted to the Borough Council late 2016, after work was completed on the Council papers that recommended the draft MLP be published. Because of this, it has been very difficult to align the Melton Local Plan with the APNP. MBC has worked extremely quickly however within these timescales and at a time of such great strain on staff undertaking simultaneous heavy local plan workload, to turn the Neighbourhood Submission Consultation around to allow it to conclude before Christmas, and has quickly and proactively engaged with an examiner to arrange an examination for early February. MBC hopes the position on APNP will be sorted in advance of Local Plan	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	plans being prepared in the Borough and is always likely to be out-of-date.		examination and that differences can be aligned.	
David Adams	<p>Refers to Inspectors letter (11/04/13) on the earlier MBC Core Strategy (CS), and the guidelines it contained about matters the Council should address to get a sound plan. These matters do not seem to have been addressed, and the Council is in denial about it. MBC continues to use evidence than underpinned the core strategy. Refers to views expressed at council meeting after the letter was received, and refers to a review of the process of CS preparation that has not been published. The new local plan is again an unsound and unsustainable proposition. The process of making representations has been made complex (refers to the length of guidance notes and then need to fill multiple forms in, whilst noting this representation is made in the traditional format), suggesting they do not want to have representations from the public. Refers to Council meeting proceedings as a disgrace and an affront to the democratic process. Goes on to refer to an inference that matters were not quite finalised, and in respect of summary sheets, questions availability and possibly misleading content, concluding these debase the integrity and legality of the process. Comments on the timing and content (specifically, misinformation and blinkered views to do with the proposed bypass) of a video about the local plan on the Council's website, and</p>		<p>The draft MLP is not based on the withdrawn Core Strategy but some of the evidence used to inform it may have been used to inform the MLP if there is no more recent up to date evidence. The MLP strategy and reasonable alternatives have been subject to sustainability appraisal and the MLP strategy is the one that delivers the most sustainable development. The representation forms and guidance notes used are based on the templates provided by the Planning Inspectorate to help ensure respondents understand that comments should be made that relate to tests of soundness and legal compliance. The community engaging activities (reference group, launch event, website, video, etc.) carried out were all in excess of the Council's regulatory requirements, and was undertaken to help people understand the issues and process. The Council considers what it has done to be at least legally compliant. Regarding neighbourhood plans, it is for the community to lead the preparation of these, not the Council.</p>	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>questions its integrity and legality. Refers to the launch event and felt a warning to residents to consider the implications of negative comments as outside the spirit of democracy and jeopardises the legal process of consultation, making the plan non compliant legally.Paragraph 1.7. : questions relevance of how reference groups were run and the village bias of their make up. Page 5 paragraph 1.9 : There is no Neighbourhood plan for the town, suggesting bias. There are numerous other examples of contradictions and/or anomalies and much of the document is just a well intentioned wish list based on hope, rather than evidence and with little underlying understanding of the borough and particularly the town. The plan fails on many counts due to it not being sound or sustainable. Hopefully it will be third time lucky but perhaps like the proposed plan that is wishful thinking.</p>			
Debbie Caroline Adams	<p>1.7 (page 3): The reference group was dominated by people from villages and topics regarding villages. 1.9 (page 5) There is no commitment on the part of town members to complete a neighbourhood plan nor get residents interested in the Local Plan. Lack of attendance by members at town committee. It is only since 2013 the work has seriously started on a bypass. This has worsened congestion and made townspeople apathetic. The Consultation process was daunting. I was also disgusted by the officer's statement at the launch event that those present needed to</p>		<p>The Community Consultation and Engagement Statement and its addendum set out all the opportunities local people have had to comment on what they would like to see in the local plan. The draft MLP is significantly different to the Core Strategy that was examined in 2013, in 3 main ways as it relates to the matters raised for MM - deliverability of the Northern SUE, the need now for both a Northern and Southern SUE, and proposals for</p>	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>think very hard before they submitted any opposing views to the Draft Local Plan as this could jeopardise the Plan being accepted by an Inspector The representation quotes sections from the 2013 Core Strategy Inspector regarding the shortcomings of the Northern SUE in respect of -Enhancing existing access to sustainable transport mode to an acceptable level -Existing and proposed areas of employment, the town centre and the railway station -That is had the highest value landscape around the town, included substantial amounts of Grade 3A, and would cut off from the open countryside the Country Park, adversely affecting biodiversity. -Lack of viability information of the northern SUE. -His conclusion that the Core Strategy is flawed because of no certainty that the Northern SUE can be delivered.</p>		<p>the MMDR being at a far more advanced stage of preparation. The promoters for the northern SUE have set out the deliverability of their scheme including intended timescales for submitting planning applications and the delivery of housing. Regarding neighbourhood plans, it is for the community to lead the preparation of these, not the Council. The representation forms and guidance notes used are based on the templates provided by the Planning Inspectorate to help ensure respondents understand that comments should be made that relate to tests of soundness and legal compliance.</p>	
Derek Stone	Encourages housing on flood plains.	Avoid any support for the above and select areas not at risk from flooding	Land allocated for development has been identified with reference to a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that areas of greatest flood risk are avoided. A sequential test has also been undertaken and is documented.	None.
Dermot Daly	SOUNDNESS OF PROCESS : Previously rejected development (SHLAA) sites in the Emerging Options and earlier phases, for reasons of Flooding or Separation, have now resurfaced as acceptable. This irregularity indicates the process to be inconsistent and therefore not sound. The needs and impact relating to traffic, schools, health facilities, shopping,	All responses received from members of the public should not only have their receipt confirmed but the authority should indicate for each point whether the point is valid or invalid; they should also identify their reasons behind that validity decision. Without this confirmation there is a legal challenge as	The SHLAA assessment is a preliminary assessment of sites' 'suitability', 'availability', 'achievability', 'deliverability/developability in accordance with Government guidance. These sites are primarily sent or submitted through 'Call for	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>leisure and employment, associated with the population growth have not been properly investigated. It is not sound and not based on robust evidence. Bottesford residents have received no indication that their earlier comments have been taken into account, and they seem to have been ignored. This is unacceptable. The representation forms are over-complex and expect a certain level of planning knowledge, and is not therefore all-inclusive, nor sound. The Bottesford Forum asked MBC for copies of the paper response form so that they could be distributed to every household in the parish, but the request was rejected, indicating a level of digital exclusion for an ageing population in the parish, and so is not sound. No consultation event in Bottesford, nor were paper copies provided for all members of Parish. The allocation of housing in a proportion of 65% to the town of Melton and 35% to rural areas is completely arbitrary and does not reflect any logic, in fact the sustainability elements of employment, leisure, services, transport and communications indicate the need for a higher proportion of housing in and around the town of Melton.</p>	<p>to whether the public has been consulted in a proper manner.</p>	<p>Sites' process. To identify site allocations, a more rigorous assessment takes place including SHLAA sites and any others that have been brought to our attention, based on a list of parameters and taking into account better information about deliverability of sites, from engagement with the community and stakeholders. A SHLAA assessment is therefore only a part of all the information considered in the site allocation assessment. The reasons for the 65:35% split of the spatial development strategy are set out in Chapter 4 and in more detail in the Settlement Roles and Relationships Study 2016. All comments received at earlier stages of consultation were reported to Councillors as appendices to Council papers at key stages of plan preparation. The representation forms and guidance notes used are based on the templates provided by the Planning Inspectorate to help ensure respondents understand that comments should be made that relate to tests of soundness and legal compliance. Paper copies of the forms were available in Bottesford at the community library, and the public events that were held during the six week publication period were</p>	

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
			<p>over and above what the Council needed to do to meet its regulatory requirements. The representation forms and guidance notes used are based on the templates provided by the Planning Inspectorate to help ensure respondents understand that comments should be made that relate to tests of soundness and legal compliance. All those responding this time have received and acknowledgment and the Council's responses to the comments will be published in Appendices alongside the Council's consideration of the submission local plan at its meeting on the 9th March.</p>	
Diane Orson	<p>There are a number of neighbourhood plans being developed within the borough that should dovetail into the local plan. The draft NP's have not been reflected in the draft local plan in the identification of potential development sites</p>	<p>There should be consultation with the draft NP's to reflect a consensus of local opinion that meets the councils requirements and doesn't destroy the historic environment</p>	<p>It was confirmed on two separate occasions that the methodology for delivering site allocations would be led by the Local Planning Authority through the Local Plan Process, with the caveat of those reaching an advance stage may take the lead (The two cited at sufficiently advance stage where Asfordby and Wymondham). Neighbourhood Planning as been around for over five years, however for the most parts plans have only been in development for the past one to two years. Only one Neighbourhood Plan has completed Reg 16 consultation. The Local Plan must plan actively and</p>	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
			<p>positively to deliver both the Boroughs housing requirement and deliver economic growth. The planning system does not allow plans nor applications to stall to allow Neighbourhood Plans to catch up. The Council has used a consistent methodology across its site allocations, which may not always reflect localised opinion, though all neighbourhood plans were encouraged to submit representations to the Local Plan process.</p>	
<p>Dilys Shepherd</p>	<p>Previously rejected sites in Bottesford e.g. Clay Pits have now appeared as acceptable. The marking scheme may have changed BUT the reasons why they were denied has not. Infrastructure: We barely have enough school, health and transport provision as it is and any proposed provision would undoubtedly lag well behind and cause considerable problems for residents. A52 is still in the 10 most dangerous roads isn't it? The additional traffic (2 cars per house and employment in Grantham, Nott and wider) would be horrendous. We may be in Leicestershire and meeting a Govt target for houses but these would not be filled by Leicestershire residents. Sites nearer to Melton would offer more 'local' employment and access to employment and education to Leics families. Also developments such as the proposed Clay Pits are suggesting 5 bedroom</p>	<p>I do not see a justification for this huge number of houses in this rural location. it will change - and ruin - the entire nature of this area. Govt targets can be challenged or can be fulfilled in a manner that is more environmentally friendly (transport links, potential flooding and spoiling the countryside) and where there are better levels of infrastructure to support new homes.</p>	<p>A proportionate and appropriate process of site assessment has been carried out, taking into account the best and most up to date information available. Policy IN2 allows the Council to collect developer contributions to pay for the infrastructure, such as school places, required to support new development. Neither the local highway authority nor Highways England have raised concerns about traffic - mitigations can be sorted out at the development management stage. The plan includes Policy C2 and C4 which are to help secure a mix of dwellings. All comments made to earlier consultations were summarised and the responses to each reported to Council at each</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	houses in spaces that would take several more reasonably sized family homes if developed on the same footprint thereby meeting targets. But presumably the 5 bedrooms homes make the developers more profit - otherwise why? Not clear that previous comments and concerns been taken into consideration.		step of the plan making process - as outlined in the Council's Community Consultation and Engagement Statement and addendum.	
Dr James Philip Clifford Harding	The proposed large increase in housing in Bottesford would overwhelm the village infrastructure with regard to traffic, parking, sewerage, schools, health facilities, shopping and leisure. Bottesford is in a high flood risk area totally unsuited to further disproportionate development which would put many more people at risk of flooding and increase the runoff that often causes the flash flooding. Bottesford is far away from the main centres of employment and a ludicrous choice for extra housing: there are several other more suitable brownfield sites well known to the planners far away in Melton Mowbray. Last but not least such irresponsible development will destroy the character of a beautiful Leicestershire village.	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. 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.	Proportionate evidence was collected to underpin the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report 2016 which sets out the rationale for the distribution of development, and to underpin the site assessment work that informed site allocations. This was published for Full Council meeting on the 1st September 2016 . As much suitable, available and deliverable brownfield land as possible was identified, and things like flood risk taken into account in allocating sites and working out how many dwellings could be developed on each.	None.
Gareth Evans	Of the 12 Neighbourhood Plans, none have been completed and only one has been submitted in Draft Form. Planning applications for significant rural housing developments have been approved without the consideration of Neighbourhood, Parish or Villagers' approval. It will be difficult to integrate Melton Plan 2016 with Neighbourhood Plans given the timescale for submission. One developer (Gladman) in a recent High Court Case heard in		It was twice confirmed that the methodology for delivering site allocations would be led by the LPA through the Local Plan Process, with the caveat that those NP groups reaching an advanced stage may take the lead (Asfordby and Wymondham). However, despite neighbourhood Planning being possible for over five years, most	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>Birmingham is said to have stated "we normally only target local authorities whose planning is in a relative disarray and vulnerable to a quick planning application for a suitable site". Since the 2016 Draft Plan, MBC has a record of approving planning applications for significant number of houses in villages, rejecting local villagers' opposition or Parish Council objections e.g. Waltham on the Wolds, Gaddesby, Long Clawson and Frisby. No figures have been provided by MBC in this plan to justify housing needs in the settlements. MBC do not appear to understand the limited infrastructure and available transport of rural settlements, and financially they will be unable to solve these problems.</p>		<p>have only been in preparation in the last 1-2 years. Only one Neighbourhood Plan has completed Reg 16 consultation. The Local Plan must plan actively and positively to deliver both the Boroughs housing requirement and deliver economic growth. The planning system does not allow plans nor applications to stall to allow Neighbourhood Plans to catch up. The Council has used a consistent methodology across its site allocations, which may not always reflect localised opinion, though all neighbourhood plans were encouraged to submit representations to the Local Plan process.</p>	
Gurbachan Kaur	Gaddesby Community Group Representations - please refer to group response.		Noted	None here.
John Coleman	I am not qualified to judge whether it is legally compliant or not.		Noted.	None.
K Lynne Camplejohn	<p>Much of the data used to justify the actions/decisions is old (2001 census for example) and therefore results in inappropriate judgements made.</p>	<p>Revise the plan in accordance with more recent data, if necessary conduct surveys to collect the missing data.</p>	<p>Sometimes the 2011 Census data is the most up to date and robust evidence available and it would be disproportionate for local plan making purposes for the Council to commission specific work to update this - National planning practice guidance specifically advises against this.</p>	None.
Lori King	<p>1.9.1: as not all Neighbourhood Plans have been completed, there is non-compliance with Duty to Co-Operate, and the Localism Act. For</p>	<p>The 2011 Census, the Somerby Housing Needs report of June 2016, the Melton Local Plan meeting notes of 3rd March</p>	<p>it is the responsibility of local communities not the Council to prepare neighbourhood plans. The</p>	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>example, the lack of proper roads to carry future development in the village of Somerby, in addition the Sustainability Assessment is far too subjective, after land identified in SHLAA as not deliverable and not developable is now Potentially suitable.</p>	<p>2016 and the Somerby Community Engagement Drop In of 18th June 2016 all present the needs of the village, which have not been thoroughly addressed. Per the Localism Act, this evidence must be taken into account.</p>	<p>views and information provided by residents has been considered alongside all other information and views the Council has collected, and is reported to Council at each key stage of local plan preparation. Details of this is given in the Council's Community Consultation and Engagement Statement and its Addendum.</p>	
Melanie Steadman	<p>The criteria for being a Primary Rural Location is based purely on amenities and facilities available in the villages. No consideration has been given to the infrastructure or sustainability of growth within these villages. The plan is not "positively prepared" to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements - the infrastructure requirements of many of the villages has been ignored for decades, with flood defences and bypasses allocated to sites in and around Melton. We have presented MBC with "evidenced" proof of the unsustainability in our village, meeting with Mr P Reid on 29th May 2016. To date it has been ignored. It is not "Justified" - based on proportionate evidence and is not the most suitable strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. A reasonable alternative is a site at Six Hills. It would have the capacity for a total of 3000 houses, built over the plan period. It's own, custom built school, shop, post office and infrastructure to cope. This would be a reasonable alternative</p>	<p>Melton Borough Council should pause, consider the Six Hills development which would be wholly sustainable and could, if handled correctly, become a national example of garden village design. The need to re-visit their sustainability appraisals, and base this study on more than just facilities and amenities. They need to engage with the residents and listen to what they have said and facts that they have already presented.</p>	<p>Primary rural locations is not a term used in the draft Local Plan. The rationale for the spatial strategy is set out in the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report 2016 and is underpinned by proportionate evidence and analysis. Consideration has been given to infrastructure as well as development - e.g. see Policy IN1 and IN2, and the provision of new homes in villages can help to sustain and improve viable local services over the longer term. A sustainability appraisal of reasonable alternatives found that a new settlement was a less sustainable option than the plan strategy, and would not achieve as many of the plan wider strategic objectives and priorities, or vision for the Borough. A step change in housing delivery is needed nationally and locally to meet identified housing needs. It should also be noted that not all</p>	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>which would allow the villages to grow at their historic rate or as requirement demands. This plan is not "effective", it is not deliverable over the plan period - some villages have already got their 20 year allocation of houses passed by the Council and therefore this is not "appropriate growth". Our village has historically grown by 4 - 6 houses a year. This rate of growth has now caused our village to be unsustainable on our current infrastructure. Sites are being put forward by MBC of 55, 45 and 30 in our village. We, and other villages like us, cannot absorb this level of development in one hit. The plan is being developer-led in the villages, where they are only interested in large scale conurbations, tacked on to historically linear villages.</p>		<p>planning permissions granted get built out, and those that do can take many years to complete.</p>	
<p>Melton North Action Group MNAG</p>	<p>Para 1.9: how can a balanced plan be prepared when there is no Neighbourhood plan for the largest community, Melton Mowbray? As no efforts have been made, the Melton Local Plan is unsound due to not being justified or effected. Para 1.11: heh Melton Local Plan has apparently not considered previous consultation feedback from the failed Core Strategy and yet has still retained some of the evidence base on the presumption that it is valid albeit that the Inspector did not appear to think much was valid at all. We believe that due to this absence, the Plan is unsound since it is not justified and will not be effective.</p>		<p>It is for the community to lead the preparation of a neighbourhood plan, not the Council. Some of the evidence used to inform the Core Strategy may have been used to inform the MLP if there is no more recent up to date evidence. This does not make it unsound. It is a new plan and has been subject to all the consultation required to meet regulatory requirements for a new plan - see the Community Consultation and Engagement Statement and Addendum.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Mr and Mrs E</p>	<p>Congratulate everyone in creating this</p>		<p>Comments noted and welcomed.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
Exton	<p>important document. Great care has been taken to involve the public and keep them informed at every stage of development. We were particularly impressed when every household in the Borough received a copy of the Melton Mail in January 2016 in which the Chairman of Melton Borough Local Plan Working Group devoted over two pages to explaining the Draft Plan and almost begging people to Get Involved! If they didn't get involved at the time, they have no cause for complaint now. Only one part of the Housing and Planning Development Strategy left us a little uncertain. We are concerned that the community led strategy may need a little fine tuning at a later date to make sure the unelected community does not substitute our elected members. We realise how much hard work has gone into the Plan and hope that it passes through its final stages without issue.</p>		<p>The plan will be reviewed as necessary in the future. Policy SS6 sets out some of the triggers for that.</p>	
Mr Don Pritchett	<p>Makes comments about the neighbourhood plan process for Bottesford and how it could be done better, for example, asking who wants land to be built on does not seem sensible without having a model of a theoretical ideal, NP consultation questionnaire shallow and lacking in transparency. Concludes that the neighbourhood plan is high risk, citing U turns on sites by nearby Keyworth Parish Council. Suggest that loose MBC criteria for development could allow successful challenges by developers on sites excluded from allocations, meaning there could be more than 427 proposed.</p>		<p>The process and content of a NP is for the group preparing it to decide, within the parameters set out in National Planning Policy, guidance, regulations and Acts. The Council considers that the draft policies in the local plan, together with the NPPF will form a robust framework for making decisions on planning applications once the Melton Local Plan is adopted</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
Mr Richard Ling on Behalf of the Bottesford Forum	None of the representations made by the Bottesford Forum in January 2016 and at a public meeting in Bottesford seem to have been taken into account - indeed the amount of new housing for the village and Easthorpe has gone up whilst the view was it should go down, for sound planning and highway reasons. Little evidence supports the draft Local Plan allocation for the Parish. There is no evidence of detailed development constraint assessments, particularly for Rectory Farm. No consultations on the Pre-Submission Draft Plan were held in Bottesford despite the proposed housing allocation increase and this allocation being the largest for any settlement in the Borough after Melton. Bottesford is more within the housing market area of Nottingham and the settlement has greater links with Nottingham and Grantham along the a52 corridor and the train line than it does to Melton. A consultation event should of been held in Bottesford. The forum therefore considers that the consultation arrangements have been inadequate and this inadequacy affects the legal compliance and soundness elements of the Pre-Submission Draft that those making representations are asked to examine and consider. The forum notes that the views expressed above are in great measure shared by the Parish Council, the main difference being that the Parish Council supported the scale of housing -c 300 for the settlement at the Draft Plan Stage earlier this year, while the Forum had concerns that this	The Public Consultation meetings on the Draft Plan should have included a meeting at Bottesford. There should be a clear evidence base to support the Council's allocation of residential development and clear responses to the points raised by local residents at the Draft Plan Stage in the earlier part of 2016.	At pre-submission stage, consultation events were focussed on communities where no land was previously allocated for new housing, and a drop in held at Melton Council offices as the most accessible location for most people. Notwithstanding that, the Council has carried out several rounds of consultation in which it has listened to the views of residents - these are set out in the Community Consultation & Engagement Statement and its addendum - and it indicates that all comments made were publicly reported to Council through appendices to Council reports at each stage. It considers its work in this area has complied and exceeded regulatory requirements. It has to balance these views against the need to accommodate new development somewhere and ensure that the Borough is sustainable in the longer term. Other considerations included the findings of site assessment work (GD - Initial Site Assessments were published for Full Council meeting on the 19th September 2016 with associated appendices. Update to Site Assessments will be published in March 2017), for every site allocated and some that were considered, but	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	total was to high.		not suitable or needed as allocations. A HEDNA has now been published for the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area, and as more up to date evidence, it will underpin the plan. This identifies the whole of Melton as being within the HMA for the purposes of establishing objective housing need.	
Mrs Elaine Exton	Justified: Prepared over many years with due diligence exercised by the Local Authority to comply with the requirement to encourage Public Participation at every stage of its development. Media coverage, questionnaires, public hearings and consultations held at various times to suit all. A bulletin "Melton Mail" was sent to every household in the Borough in January 2016 in which the Chairman of the Local Plan Working Group devoted over two pages to the Draft Plan explaining its stages of development, targets and timescales almost begging people to "get involved". More detail given in supporting documents.		Comments noted and welcomed	None.
MRS NICOLA MORLEY	The impact of more housing on locals and local services has not been understood.		The Council has carried out several rounds of consultation in which it has listened to the views of residents - these are set out in the Community Consultation & Engagement Statement and its addendum. It has to balance these views though against the need to accommodate new development somewhere and ensure that the Borough is	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
Norman Hoskins	<p>The decision to allocate 65% of future development to Melton, and 35% to rural settlements, is unreasonable, particularly when brownfield sites such as the Dalby and Normanton airfields are available for what could amount to completely new, comprehensive satellites. Since some of the 'secondary villages', originally designated for 5% of the new housing, do not appear to have provided sufficient available or suitable sites, a disproportionate allocation of development appears likely in those villages where speculative landowners grasp the opportunity to exploit both local and national government policy. In Frisby for example, the allocation for new housing should stay at 48 new homes on the ONE site off Great Lane. This particular village cannot reasonably be expected to accommodate or sustain any more units.</p>		<p>sustainable in the longer term.</p> <p>The rationale for the distribution of housing is set out in the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report 2016, and reflects the most appropriate and sustainable strategy for delivering the plan objectives. The development of a new settlement instead of development in the villages would not achieve things like early delivery of new houses, helping to sustain rural communities, delivering infrastructure, etc.</p>	None.
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	<p>WHOLE PLAN: Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan SG object particularly to the methodology of allocation of houses and apparent contradictions as to how MBC is intending to achieve its house building target. PROCESS Consultation not sound– particularly on the increase in number of dwellings for Bottesford between Emerging Options and draft Plan stage. The draft NP Group has shared all their ongoing thoughts with MBC over two and a half years and based its draft NP on the Emerging options figure shortly before the draft LP was published, and got no indication,</p>		<p>Community engagement events at pre-submission draft stage were focussed on communities where no housing land was allocated at the Emerging Options stage but is allocated in the draft plan. A drop in event was also held at the Council offices as the most accessible location for most people. The redevised spatial hierarchy was only finalised at the Full Council meeting on the 01st September, 2016 with papers available 7 days before. This</p>	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>forewarning or consultation from MBC that the number in the LP was going to increase substantially. 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'. The BPNPSG has held work on the NP in abeyance until the housing number is reduced. There has been a lack of consultation, even though Bottesford has been allocated the largest number of houses of any village in the Borough. Consultation could have avoided errors, such as Historic England's on BOT4. The Reference Groups were held in Melton, so there is no guarantee that rural areas were adequately represented, and the influence of builders at the Group was unclear and possibly excessive. The Chair and Mayor are both Bottesford Ward Councillors so unable to represent views and interests of constituents. The Draft Plan also allows for windfall developments, which could result in even more homes being built in Bottesford.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.10.1, 1.10.2 and 2.2.3 of the Draft Plan states that, for housing, Bottesford relates more closely to Nottingham and Grantham than Melton and Leicestershire, and the SHMA 2014 placed Bottesford explicitly in the Nottingham Strategic Housing Market Area.</p> <p>Duty to Co-operate: Appendix 2 of the Draft Duty to Cooperate Statement November 2016 shows no contact with South Kesteven Council, and minimal consultation with Rushcliffe</p>		<p>was quickly turned around by the Council into allocations on the 19th September, 2016. The Pre-Submission Plan went to full council on the 20th October. Again with papers available 7 days before. The final revisions of the Spatial Hierarchy were finalised very shortly before the full council meeting. During the Pre-Submission Consultation all Neighbourhood Plan Groups were invited for special one to one meetings to discuss the plan and its implications. Prior to this however, all Neighbourhood Plan groups were warned on a number of occasions that housing numbers could change throughout the Local Plan process. The recommendations of the Reference Groups were only one source of information that was inputted into decisions about the distribution of new housing across the Borough. Windfalls are in addition to allocations and an allowance was made for these and taken account of before the residual amount for which housing land needed to be identified was calculated. The HEDNA is now the more up to date evidence on housing needs within the housing market area, and it refers to the whole of Melton Borough being within the</p>	

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>Council. Though a verbal report from Mr J Worley of MBC indicates that South Kesteven and Rushcliffe Councils could not foresee any need to cross in to our Borough to meet housing need, it is not documented. Housing taking place/planned there in more sustainable settlements should alleviate the need for so many homes in Bottesford. The lack of active consultation with the District Councils means that the Plan is unsound and not legally compliant. Neighbourhood plan: there is no mention of the evidence-based and consultative process and findings drawn together by the residents of Bottesford Parish in developing their emerging NP. Without mentioning this evidence, e.g. Bottesford Housing Needs Survey carried out by Midlands Rural Housing (with the assistance of local volunteers) which found 42% affordable housing needs (not the 37% in the draft Plan), the plan is partly unsound.</p>		<p>HMA. The Duty to Co-operate statement will be updated to correct any earlier errors and omissions, and to record engagement that has taken place since the last version was prepared. Comment needed from Celia re: rural housing study</p>	
Richard Simon	<p>Duty to co-operate: this must be undertaken fully to understand the implications of the development in neighbouring LPA areas in relation to those planned for Bottesford. 1.10.2 Indicates that ‘Melton Borough forms part of the Leicestershire and Leicester Housing Market Area’ and this is reinforced by Fig 3 in the DMLP, but the SHMA 2014 places Bottesford in the Nottingham Strategic Housing Market Area, and indicates that while Bottesford is clearly in Leicestershire and Melton Borough, the remoteness of Bottesford Parish to Melton Mowbray means that the</p>		<p>The Council's engagement with adjacent local planning authorities is set out in its published Duty to Co-operate Statement. The duty also works in reverse, so MBC will be engaged by neighbouring LPAs and have the opportunity to comment on their emerging local plans. The HEDNA is now the more up to date evidence on housing needs within the housing market area, and it refers to the whole of Melton Borough being within the HMA. The</p>	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	contribution that can be made to the Melton Borough objectives will be limited.		local plan is where the Borough's contribution to meeting those needs is set out, and its spatial strategy includes a role for Bottesford in this, as one of 12 service centres.	
Robert Galij BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI, Planning Director - Barratt David Wilson Homes North Midlands	The Local Plan is "unsound" as it does not meet the 4 tests outlined in Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in the context of planning for and delivering the requisite scale and distribution of housing.	The scale of housing in the Local Plan is too low and the distribution across the Borough is inappropriate with insufficient provision being directed towards Primary Rural Service Centres and Bottesford in particular.	The scale of new housing in the local plan exceeds the objectively assessed needs identified by the HEDNA, as it is to support economic, infrastructure and other ambitions as well. The draft local plan does not identify primary rural service centres, only 12 service centres, of which Bottesford is one. The Council considers its allocation for Bottesford appropriate and justified. The rationale for distribution is set out in the Settlement Roles and Relationships Study 2016.	None.
Robert Ian Lockey	Developers were not required to state their affiliation or financial interest when they participated in the reference groups. Consultation was essentially one way; no response was given to points raised during the consultation, and major changes were introduced without consultation		The opportunities for local people to get involved and how their comments have been considered is outlined in the Community Consultation and Engagement Statement 2016 and Update Addendum, 2017. The involvement of developers in Reference Group discussions provided a more balanced view, but the recommendations of that Group were not the only consideration in finalising housing distribution and site allocations.	None.
Russell Collins	The plan does not ensure the vitality of Melton	To ensure the vitality of Melton Town	Section 6.15 and Policy IN2 set out	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	Mowbray town centre (NPPF Paragraph 182, 23 - 37). The plan contains no specific proposals to promote sustainable transport (NPPF paragraph 182, 29 - 41).	centre the plan needs to remove through cross town traffic from the southern half of the town centre by proposing a town centre relief road to the south of the town. Measures need to be incorporated in the plan to promote sustainable transport. Safe cycling routes need to be established in the town to link residential areas with employment, schools and the town centre.	policies to help ensure vitality of the town centre and improve sustainable transport as part of the Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy.	
South Kesteven District Council	Duty to Co-operate: satisfied that the relevant strategic cross boundary issues which relate to this authority have been appropriately addressed throughout the plan preparation process, in accordance with the duty to co-operate. This Council therefore supports the policies and proposals included within the Melton Local Plan which make sufficient provision to meet the Borough's housing and employment development needs for the plan period to 203, and meet the Borough's need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches to 2026 . Notes and supports that no request has been made for this District to accommodate any of the Borough Council's development needs during this plan period, and considers the draft MLP to be broadly in accordance with the adopted policies of this authority and are unlikely to have a significant effect upon South Kesteven's current Local Plan Review.		Comments noted and welcomed	None.
Sproxtton Parish Council	The Parish Council has no comments to make on the Local Plan.		Noted	None.
Susan E Green	Duty to Co-operate and soundness Not		MBC are considering the findings of	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>enough has been done with other local planning authorities within the housing market area to sort unmet housing needs after 2028. HBF consider that the D2C has been complied with, but the lack of HMA wide plan to meet unmet needs beyond 2028 throws into doubt the soundness of the Melton Local Plan. Note the HEDNA is in preparation, and that a revised Memorandum of Understanding may/ have to be negotiated and signed. Point out the SHMA 2014 is out of date, and so no up to date OAHN. Also points out the MLP does not reference the emerging non- statutory Leicester & Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan. To conclude the Melton Local Plan is considered unsound because of a potential under estimation of OAHN which is not based on most up to date evidence available ; 5 YHLS which defers dealing with existing shortfalls as soon as possible; unjustified housing standards including policy requirements on energy efficiency and carbon emissions standards exceeding existing Building Regulation, higher optional standards for accessible / adaptable homes and the nationally described space standard ; and an unviable affordable housing policy including inappropriate site thresholds. The Plan is inconsistent with national policy, not positively prepared, unjustified and ineffective. It is also understood that the HMA authorities and Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) are working on a non- statutory Leicester & Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan for which a Draft Plan</p>		<p>the HEDNA and a Housing Requirement Report published by Melton Borough Council alongside HEDNA. These will be up to date evidence underpinning the local plan. A further MoU will be developed across the HMA to set out how the LPAs will work to distribute any identified unmet needs. The 5YHLS seeks to meet needs as soon as possible , and reflects a realistic assessment of the degree to which the market can be expected to make an upward step change in housing delivery in the early years of the plan. The Strategic Growth Plan is referenced in paras. 4.7.7 and 4.7.8. Response to other matters are dealt with in responses to the specific representations made to those policies.</p>	

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>consultation is expected in Summer 2017. It is proposed that this strategic framework will be taken into account by Local Plans which will include an agreed spatial distribution, a housing land strategy to boost the speed of housing delivery and a refresh of the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) incorporating the Midlands Engine for Growth proposals.. At this time in a signed Memorandum of Understanding the Leicester & Leicestershire HMA authorities have individually committed to meeting their own OAHN within their own administrative areas up to 2028.</p>			
Susan Harding	<p>Previously rejected development sites such as flooding or separation have now been deemed acceptable. Investigations in to the needs and impact to traffic, schools, health facilities, shopping etc. have not been carried out</p>		<p>Site assessment work was updated for the draft Local Plan, and allocations made where needed, where constraints such as flood risk or impact on areas of separation could be mitigated in the development of an overall scheme. The proposed site areas and densities reflect the need for schemes to accommodate mitigations. The assessment of community facilities and infrastructure has been carried out at an appropriate level for a local plan - more detailed assessment will be required by developers alongside planning applications in due course if/when the local plan is adopted.</p>	None.
Susan Love	<p>Reference Group members contained developers and residents who didn't have to identify themselves. The final recommended</p>		<p>The Reference Group discussions were a key input to the final draft Local Plan but not the only one, so</p>	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>number of dwellings for Bottesford from the Ref Group was well below what has emerged, but that an excellent Policy D1 reflects the concerns raised at the groups. Also notes that few developers attended the 'Design' event, even though sometimes it is not development, in itself, that is the problem, but the fear of lack of sensitivity to neighbouring properties and poor design. Poor design of the Wickets in Bottesford in contrast to BOT4, Rectory Farm, the Bottesford Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group have worked with an urban designer Stefan Kruckowski and 2 residents of adjacent, or nearly adjacent properties on a concept master plan and design for the site which will meet local needs, in consultation much exceeding normal developer activity. This seems to be a much more promising route to securing sensitive development.</p>		<p>deviation from the Reference Group recommendations may well have occurred in some instances. The positive comments on Design and pre-app process to establish good design are noted and welcomed</p>	
Terence Joyce	<p>Overall the plan has not paid enough attention to the actual needs of the communities or the valued experience of people who live within (I have lived in Somerby for about 25 years). The changes to the 'interactive policies map" during the consultation - 29th November 2016 - due to alleged inaccuracies, questions the validity of the plan and the consultation period, and could disadvantage people who had submitted comments before this amendment. Therefore I question "Complies with Duty to Co-operate " Mentions inaccurate map references re: SOM2 ("Jubilee Way), and inaccurate comments on SOM2 and SOM3 , leading to a wrong ranking of the site. More</p>	<p>To Satisfy. "Complies with Duty to Co-operate " Amendments to the map - 29 November 2016 due to alleged inaccuracies, begs the question should the whole of the local plan be scrutinised for any other possible errors. Also sites such as SOM2 should be taken out of allocation to satisfy NPPF and NPPG, With reference to Sound: To make it sound The only realistic site to build on is SOM1, South side of village for following reasons: 1: Well outside conservation area. 2: Very close to surgery. (It is reasonable to assume some residents of social housing may have health related</p>	<p>The opportunities for local people to get involved and how their comments have been considered is outlined in the Community Consultation and Engagement Statement 2016 and Update Addendum, 2017. The amendment to the interactive policies map was made in response to feedback received. That matter is dealt with in responses to comments on the Policies Map. Comments about SOM2, SOM3 and EN3 are dealt with in responses to representations in those sections. A bypass is not</p>	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>detailed comments about the Somerby equestrian centre, the play area, right of way, access problems and landownership of SOM2 are made, and the loss/increased problems arising for all these if new housing were to take place. A bypass would not solve anything. Therefore our rural identity should be protected.</p>	<p>issues).3: Commuter access to Oakham (A1 bypass) Melton, and Leicester without the need to go through already congested high street.And to pre-empt, any problems with drainage can be sorted with the will and money.Also with careful build it could well bring this part of Somerby up to better standard.The number of units on SOM1 (27) together with 12 planned for Church lane and 3 in build on Manor lane gives grand total 42 units, more than enough in my opinion to satisfy Somerbys overall contribution to the Melton plan. This would also ensure sensitive sites such as SOM2/3 are protected and again satisfy NPPF and NPPG.Also the plan should get the balance right between protecting the whole of Melton borough's rural status when looking to attract more industries.</p>	<p>proposed for Somerby.</p>	
The Coal Authority	<p>I have reviewed the Melton Local Plan – Pre-Submission Draft and can confirm that the Coal Authority has no further comments to make.</p>		<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
Tracey Watts	<p>The local plan period is too long as it is impossible to forecast many important factors such as population growth, the impact of BREXIT etc. ,and it is folly to create a plan for this time period based on land that may be available now. 15 years would be better. In Somerby, planning applications in the pipeline could see the village increasing its population by 50% within one or two years, not 20. We originally moved to Somerby to enjoy the tranquil setting and the heritage of the village -</p>		<p>By the time the plan is adopted (likely to be early 2018), there will only be 18 years left to run. National Planning Practice Guidance indicates plans should look forward at least 15 years. The plan will have to be reviewed well before 2036 to take account of new information and toll it forward. The timing of development in Somerby will depend on developers and is very unlikely to</p>	<p>None</p>

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	the proposed development . will destroy the very reason many people came to live here in the first instance.		be all completed within 2 years.	