

**FOCUSED CHANGES RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED: Focused Change 2**

Representor Name	Focused Change /Policy Ref	Summary of Representation	MBC Response
Michelle Galloway (obo Davidsons)	FC2.1	The reduction in the provision of affordable housing to 15% in the SSN should be stated as a maximum, not a minimum.	The evidence does not support this proposal.
Shout 4 Residents	FC2	Doesn't there have to be a masterplan for the sustainability of the project?	The policy requires the submission of a masterplan in support of planning applications .
David G. Adams	FC2, FC11	New housing in Melton Mowbray should not come forward before the MMDR is built, because of the exacerbation of existing traffic and congestion problems that would arise during the housebuilding programme, which would continue if the funding for MMDR is not secured.	The MMDR would ideally be constructed in its entirety ahead of housing delivery and LCC are actively exploring opportunities to achieve this. However, given the MMDR's scale and nature, it is necessary to adopt a flexible approach to achieving this due to uncertainties about timing of public and/or developer funding. The scheme may be delivered in phases aligned to housing delivery. If so, any necessary interim measures to mitigate traffic impact would be secured through the planning process.
Brown & Co (Martin Herbert) (obo Hill Family)	FC2, SS4	Support. Mention that Spreckleys Farm could be an extension to this in due course.	Noted
Laurence Holmes (obo NMLC) (ANON-7VBY-7HER-X)	FC2, SS5	<p>Policy SS5 should be amended to reflect the areas true capacity (2,200 dwellings by 2032) and to match evidence supporting the allocation. Otherwise, it would not achieve full potential and may not generate all the funding to support planning requirements. Suggest the build out trajectory could be more optimistic – provide evidence supporting deliverability, and suggests the LP one omits affordable housing. Wants flexibility of AH provision off site if necessary for viability.</p> <p>Revise Policy SS5 to reflect requirement for 420 pupil school on a 1.0 ha site.</p> <p>Local centre wording needs revising to reflect flexibility to accommodate market demand and mix.</p> <p>Alignment of MMDR should reflect the northern SSN boundary.</p> <p>Support requirement for a frequent bus service.</p> <p>En6 of policy not compliant with para 009 of NPPF.</p> <p>Do not want PPs for parts of site held back until entire masterplan is in place.</p> <p>Reiterates pre submission draft comments on h1,c1, c2, t1, t1(a), en6 and masterplanning &amp; delivery.</p>	<p>While this optimism is welcomed do not propose to amend the figure in the plan, which is not a maximum.</p> <p>Dealt with in other responses to this representor.</p> <p>Primary school wording not the subject of a focussed change .</p> <p>Local centre wording not the subject of a focused change.</p> <p>Alignment of MMDR is the subject of current recommended route consultation by LCC.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>En6 was not the subject of a focused change.</p> <p>Noted. Not the subject of focussed changes.</p> <p>Noted. Not the subject of focused changes.</p>

<p>MNAG</p>	<p>FC2, SS4, SS5</p>	<p>Plan shouldn't advance before road funding secured. Building MSSN without adequate infrastructure is unsound. Concerned that other planning requirements , e.g. AH have been slashed to accommodate road. Contrary to NPPF 174. MNSN plans have lack of clarity. Issues with MCP. Without MMDR plan is unsound, unviable and unsustainable. As LCC is a part landowner there are conflicts of interest for LCC. Want road before housing and Six Hills to be considered instead of SUEs. Suggest a loan to cover MCP section of MMDR, to be repaid as development come forward. Support protection zone between MCP and new development. Suggest an additional GP surgery at hospital site. Masterplan needed due to multiple land ownerships.</p>	<p>As development will be funding sections of the Distributor Road, it would not be viable to require the section referenced to be completed prior to all development. Policy SS4, part t1B requires appropriate mitigations through the development period. The Local Plans seeks to deliver the MMDR in its entirety from the A606 Nottingham Road to the A607 Leicester Road around the east of the town over the course of the plan period (by 2036). As part of the Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy (MMTS), Leicestershire County Council and Melton Borough Council are committed to bringing forward each section of the distributor road as soon as possible, and are investigating all appropriate funding opportunities to do so. Notwithstanding the provision of the distributor road, individual developers will still be required to identify and mitigate specific transport impacts arising from their developments through the planning process. This includes identifying and agreeing suitable construction traffic routeing arrangements, secured through planning conditions. The plan ensures that adequate infrastructure will be provided as sites are developed. See also detailed responses in FC11 and FC12. See comments above and in responses to FC11 on MMDR. Public transport in Melton Mowbray provides good connectivity and the sustainable neighbourhoods provide an opportunity to increase and enhance provision. There will be opportunities to improve cycle and pedestrian accessibility over the plan period ,supported by policies SS4,SS5 ,C9 and IN1. Noted, does not affect policies aimed at maintaining and improving accessibility in this area. Policy SS5 recognises and protects the biodiversity of Melton Country Park. Policy IN2 ensures that CIL or developer contributions will provide future infrastructure requirements ,including healthcare and education.</p>
<p>Mike and Elaine Maffei</p>	<p>FC2</p>	<p>There is a reference to wild life preservation in SS5 (Northern) and I would expect a similar reference in SS4 in relation to the unmade section of Kirby Lane (close to Burton Rd). This Lane needs to be preserved in its current form for the continued enjoyment of walkers, dog walkers and cyclists and to protect the hedgerows and wildlife.</p>	<p>The general protection of biodiversity and wildlife corridors is addressed in policy SS4. There is no evidence to specifically protect Kirby Lane ;if this is produced at a later stage the details can be addressed through the masterplan.</p>
<p>R F Hoyland (Mr)</p>	<p>FC2</p>	<p>The conflict between Areas of Separation and areas approved for development has not been addressed. CPRE consider that FC2 fails to satisfy the requirements of NPPF paras 154 &amp; 157. The zig zag line used on policy maps to 'define' Areas of Separation is unacceptably vague. The substitution of fig. FC13.1 for the earlier fig.7 in the Pre submission Draft is easily overlooked and NOT transparent. As a result, the conflict between policies EN4 &amp; SS4 which seek to preserve Areas Of Separation between Melton and neighbouring settlements (Burton Lazars &amp; Eye Kettleby) is further highlighted, increasing the threat of coalescence. The objections of English Heritage concerning the adverse effect on the setting and preservation of a Scheduled Ancient Monument remain disregarded. There is also a conflict between policy SS4 (Alternative Development Strategies) and EN4 regarding the Area of Separation between Melton &amp; Asfordby Hill. With regard to SS6 provisions for a possible housing development at Six Hill, CPRE consider that this proposal is totally unsustainable and must be withdrawn. Please see prior concerns regarding the Focused Changes Consultation recorded in the response to FC1</p>	<p>The Areas of Separation are not designed to prevent development ,unless it leads to coalescence between settlements or results in the loss of highly tranquil landscape. This is consistent with the NPPF.</p>

Martin Lusty. WOTWTA NP Group	FC2	We support these policies.	Noted
Carl Powell	FC2	<p>Reducing the affordable requirement from 37% to 15% (even 5-10% as I understand it in Melton Town itself) is unsound. MBC has evidence that housing in the Borough is becoming unaffordable, citing the cheapest 25% of homes requiring an income in excess of national average. I do understand that affordability (or CIL) requirements can render development financially unviable for developers, so such an extreme reduction is unnecessary. House-building is extremely profitable. It is even more profitable in the countryside where developers benefit from the 'rural premium'; presumably this is why a 40% affordable element is still 'viable' there - because developers will still profit to the extent they require. All evidence however is that employment opportunity - particularly in comparatively low-paid manufacturing - is concentrated in Melton Town. It is irrational to place the presumably lower-income people furthest from employment where they will need to drive long distances not only to work (average miles travelled to work 26 one-way in Somerby) but for shopping, school and recreation.</p> <p>I do not oppose a 40% affordable element in my Parish of Somerby. I SUPPORT that, including social rented. What I oppose is the reduction to 15% in Melton because it fails to address objectively identified need. It favours developers and disfavors those in society who need the most help. It is unethical.</p> <p>Furthermore - affordable housing in an area of 'rural premium' tends not to remain affordable for long. Market forces prevail in the long run. There is incentive to buy then sell on for profit at market rates. Right to buy exacerbates this problem.</p>	<p>Yes, evidence that affordable housing in the Borough is needed is available and was used in the plan making (HEDNA, 2017 and Melton BC Housing Needs Study, 2016). However, when setting policy requirements, the viability of development needs to be considered. The Revised Local Plan and CIL Study, May 2017 found that any more than 15% affordable housing on eligible residential developments in both the northern and southern sustainable neighbourhoods and 5% - 10% is not viable. However, the targets are set as a minimum and can be increased having regard to market conditions and demonstrable economic viability evidence. The support of a 40% affordable housing requirement on eligible residential developments in the Somerby parish is noted. There is intention to develop affordable housing in rural areas which will be held in perpetuity. The details of this will be set out further in a Supplementary Planning Document, which will be formulated and implemented post Local Plan adoption.</p>
Mr Maurice Bell	FC2	<p>Number of comments regarding MMDR, including information about proposed junctions. Suggests further pedestrianisation of town centre and proposes routes for vehicles to use and exception.</p>	<p>As development will be funding sections of the Distributor Road, it would not be viable to require the section referenced to be completed prior to all development. Policy SS4, part t1B requires appropriate mitigations through the development period. The justification for the eastern route of the MMDR is addressed in responses to FC11.</p>
Steve and Rachel Jackson	FC2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal increases the number of houses from 1700 to now 2000, 1700 of which must be delivered before 2036.</li> <li>2. If 1700 are delivered by 2036 alone that would represent excessive building work disruption and work traffic issues for the immediate vicinity and Melton itself for 18 years.</li> <li>3. Assuming the balance of 300 are delivered as well there is no deadline or cap for that further building work to be complete, ensuring ongoing disruption for an undefined period.</li> <li>4. There is no clear evidence produced to date that demonstrated Melton Mowbray requires or has the demand for such a huge scaled development</li> <li>5. Taking points 2. and 3. and 4. together, the proposal is excessive and is unjustified.</li> </ol>	<p>Policy SS4, part t1B requires appropriate mitigations through the development period. There is clear evidence and justification for Melton's housing requirement within the Local Plan evidence base.</p>

Mrs Debbie Adams	FC2	Infrastructure (Highways) currently inadequate without development of further housing. No guarantee of govt funding for MMDR. Plan cannot be effective, justified or nppf compliant without guaranteed mmdr. Most of the working population of Melton Mowbray work outside the borough with a large proportion working in and around Leicester. Poor public transport. Unsafe to cycle. . There is no way that the MNSN could be remotely described as "self-contained". Latham House Medical Practice is the ONLY doctors' surgery in the town. No Guarantee masterplan for NSN will come before individual planning applications. LCC are landowners in the north of the town and their land forms part of the proposed siting of the MNSN. I believe that LCC and the LCC Highways Authority are conflicted and they will push to have their land developed first as they need the money from the sale of the land to improve their financial situation.	As development will be funding sections of the Distributor Road, it would not be viable to require the section referenced to be completed prior to all development. Policy SS4, part t1B requires appropriate mitigations through the development period
Susan Love	FC2	Pleased to see that subject to 'viability' has been erased, but 15% seems a low percentage of affordable housing.	No evidence provided to support the 20% figure suggested. The 15% sought in this policy is the result of in depth viability work, which concludes that this is the highest percentage the development can deliver whilst remaining viable.
Colin Love (Professor)	FC2	Affordable housing should be put ahead of the delivery of the MMDR, ensuring higher percentages of affordable housing.	The MMDR is a key infrastructure project which unlocks development in the town, without it, the town could not absorb the levels of growth anticipated. Failure to deliver the MMDR would mean far fewer houses being built in the town, and even at a higher percentage, this could equate to even less affordable housing provision.
Yvonne Rowe	FC2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The increase in traffic that would be caused by the siting of the proposed housing development and the Southern Relief Road would be a disaster for the residents of Burton Lazars</li> <li>• The Corridor of Interest (C of I) and planned housing development along Kirby Lane threatens urban creep which will damage Burton Lazars.</li> <li>• Previous plans have identified and supported the view of many village residents that an Area of Separation between Melton and Burton Lazars should be protected.</li> <li>• The C of I and planned Southern Development threatens the open rural nature and character of the landscape it proposes to develop</li> <li>• There is currently inadequate Health/Social care and quality employment opportunities to sustain the recent increase in residences that have been imposed along the Leicester Road and at the edge of the Melton Country Park.</li> <li>• Melton Mowbray (historic market town) and its beautiful rural setting and heritage are valuable assets as an attraction for visitor/tourists/scholars.</li> </ul>	<p>The purpose of the COI is to ensure that any proposed developments within the vicinity of the MMDR do not present a barrier to achieving its delivery, by ensuring that appropriate engagement takes place over this.</p> <p>The Council considers that it has robust evidence relating to the provision of infrastructure ,traffic generation and the impact of development upon the character and setting of the town.</p> <p>The purpose of the COI is to ensure that any proposed developments within the vicinity of the MMDR do not present a barrier to achieving its delivery, by ensuring that appropriate engagement takes place over this.</p> <p>The Melton Mowbray Areas of Separation ,Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study ( evidence produced by Influence) states that the physical and visual separation of the settlements should be retained and that topography and historic features should be taken into account when planning new development . Moving the boundary of the SSN would marginally change this relationship from the original proposal . The situation of Burton Lazars on rising land and the remaining undeveloped land immediately to the north of the village would continue to define the sense of separation . Any perceived adverse impact must be balanced against the need to provide a viable SSN.</p>

Anthony Maher	FC2	The road infrastructure delivery depends upon government funding for a distributor road as without it any further development becomes unsustainable. This funding should be in place before any further development takes place. The bus services in to town are not regular enough to make it a viable part of a 'Melton Park Greenway' Using the Melton Park as a route in and out of town creates many concerns for the conservation of wildlife and biodiversity and other problems of practicability.	Any adverse impacts on the AoS or the scheduled ancient monument would be as part of the wider development of the area. The Council's evidence (technical note prepared by Cotswold Archaeology) indicates that the proposed southern SUE land does not appear to have formed an important part of the setting of the SAM and that separation is not a key aspect of the SAM.
Terence Joyce	FC2	MBC attention to "Green Infrastructure" should go beyond Melton town and villages on the outskirts, Green infrastructure is also very important for "Green Field " sites such as SOM2 in Somerby which is within the path of "Primary Green Infrastructure " corridor known as Jubilee way (6). SOM 2 good example of green infrastructure.	On the basis of evidence, specified routes are identified to be protected.
Laurence Holmes	FC2	Please refer to paragraphs 3.6 to 3.33 of attached representations.	As the representation raises no substantively different issues to those raised at PSD stage, and there is no new information and/or changed national (or local policy) to consider, the Councils has no further comment.
Laurence Holmes	FC2	Please refer to paragraphs 3.6 to 3.29 of the attached representations.	The Local Plans seeks to deliver the MMDR in its entirety from the A606 Nottingham Road to the A607 Leicester Road around the east of the town over the course of the plan period (by 2036). As part of the Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy (MMTS), Leicestershire County Council and Melton Borough Council are committed to bringing forward each section of the distributor road as soon as possible, and are investigating all appropriate funding opportunities to do so.
Janet Simpson	FC2	Policy SS4, FC2.1 + mapFC13.1 The outline development as proposed would seriously diminish the critical area of separation and cause great harm to the character and identity of Burton Lazars and diminish the significance of the St Mary and St Lazarus hospital Scheduled Ancient Monument and its setting. Conflict with policy EN1, EN2, EN3, EN4, EN6 and EN13.	The Council's evidence (technical note prepared by Cotswold Archaeology) indicates that the proposed southern SUE land does not appear to have formed an important part of the setting of the SAM and that separation is not a key aspect of the SAM.
Gavin Simpson	FC2	The outline development as proposed with the changes, would reduce the area of separation and cause harm to the character and identity of Burton Lazars and greatly reduce the significance of the St Mary and St Lazarus hospital Scheduled Ancient Monument and its setting. The area of separation between Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars will be reduced by at least half, to around 180 meters, and would have the appearance of joining it up with the town from the views that are available.	The purpose of the COI is to ensure that any proposed developments within the vicinity of the MMDR do not present a barrier to achieving its delivery, by ensuring that appropriate engagement takes place over this.
Adam Murray (obo The Lomas family)	SS4	Consider that the proposal would have a severe and adverse impact upon their land holdings and business interests and consider that employment development would not fund the provision of a new road. Ask that their land is removed from the local plan.	It is disappointing that agreement has not been reached with these land owners. The LPA will use CPO powers if necessary to deliver the proposed road .

<p>Laurence Holmes (obo Richborough Estates &amp; LCC) (ANON-7VBY-7HEF-J)</p>	<p>FC2</p>	<p>Policy SS5. The Developers reaffirm their support for the North Sustainable Neighbourhood allocation. Allocation does not represent true capacity of the site which is 2200. Clients section could deliver 720 dwellings. This would deliver 48% of the allocation as currently identified, or 33% of an allocation of 2,200 dwellings as sought for the total NSN. On the basis of the evidence put forward to the Council, Policy SS5 as drafted would not achieve the full potential housing delivery of the NSN. Leicestershire County Council's Education team have advised that a two-form entry primary school with capacity for 420 pupils should be provided on a 1.7 ha site within the NSN. However, this is not addressed by the Focused Changes and the wording of Policy SS5 should therefore be revised to reflect this requirement. It is imperative that the alignment of the link road is consistent with the northern boundary of the NSN as defined on the Policies Map.</p>	<p>See response to comments for FC1. The quantum specified is positively prepared to meet identified needs and the role of the NSN to achieve this. It is recognised there may be further capacity within the NSN which may be acceptable and/or come forward as part of a plan review under SS6 or beyond the Plan period. No changes to the provision of schooling within Policy SS5 were presented in the Focused Change. Other sites are subject to requirements for contributions to education within FC4 and as a material consideration in their own right. Re: timing of the road, the Plan has not made this prescriptive and considered it would be premature to do so until full investigation of the ability to do so have been completed, as there may be practical reasons why, in parts, it is not possible. These will be explored by the design work currently underway. The masterplanning requirements in policy SS5 allow for phasing. Support for bus service clause noted.</p>
<p>Laurence Holmes (obo Richborough Estates &amp; LCC) (ANON-7VBY-7HEF-J)</p>	<p>FC2/SS5 cont/d</p>	<p>Specific reference to the North Sustainable Neighbourhood should be inserted into the Draft Charging Schedule, explicitly stating that a £0 CIL rate applies. The Council's aspiration to establish local energy standards is not compliant with paragraph 009 of the NPPG. The Council should not set a policy which requires Building Regulation requirements to be exceeded. Requirements under m1 to m6 should be treated as indicative details for areas of the NSN falling outside the red line boundary of an application site.</p>	<p>It is not considered appropriate or necessary as CIL is a separate exercise and subject of regular review which may not coincide with the LP. Inclusion in a permanent LP policy would conflict with the required approach. Energy Standards within the NSN were not the subject of a Focused Change consultation. These criteria relate to the masterplanning requirement and will be relevant to individual application solely insofar as they relate to the site concerned.</p>
<p>Sharon Wiggins (Leicestershire County Council)</p>	<p>FC2</p>	<p>Policy SS4+ SS5 Primary provision: The Council is pleased to note that a new primary school is included in both development areas. A 420 place school would be required in each location, the cost of each school is currently in the region of £6.64million, and each site would need to be a minimum of 1.7ha. Secondary provision: In view of the proposed development to the North and South of Melton and the surrounding villages, there is a need to ensure that secondary provision is planned in response to the overall growth across the district. The Authority's preferred option would be to expand both existing Melton secondary schools to accommodate the additional pupils. However in the event that the number of dwellings approved goes above that indicated in the document it may be more appropriate to consider building a new secondary school. Whilst this is not considered necessary based on the current information, if required, it would cost in the region of £16.6million and require a site of 5ha.</p>	<p>The authority has been working closely with the Education Authority and the promoters of these sites to ensure that the future educational capacity is provided.</p>

Janet Simpson	FC2	<p>The extended boundary of the SSN would have an adverse impact upon the landscape and Area of Separation (AOS) between Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars. This is contrary to the technical evidence which has been produced in support of the Local Plan and a series of draft policies designed to protect and enhance the environment.</p> <p>The proposal would diminish the significance of the St Mary and St Lazarus hospital Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) and its setting, contrary to the advice of Historic England.</p>	<p>The Melton Mowbray Areas of Separation ,Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study ( evidence produced by Influence) states that the physical and visual separation of the settlements should be retained and that topography and historic features should be taken into account when planning new development . Moving the boundary of the SSN would marginally change this relationship from the original proposal . The situation of Burton Lazars on rising land and the remaining undeveloped land immediately to the north of the village would continue to define the sense of separation . Any perceived adverse impact must be balanced against the need to provide a viable SSN.</p> <p>The Council’s evidence (technical note prepared by Cotswold Archaeology) indicates that the proposed southern SSN land does not appear to have formed an important part of the setting of the SAM and that separation is not a key aspect of the SAM.</p>
Gavin Simpson, Appendix 1(b)	FC2	<p>The extended boundary of the SSN would have an adverse impact upon the landscape and Area of Separation between Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars. This is contrary to the technical evidence which has been produced in support of the Local Plan .The proposal would diminish the significance of the St Mary and St Lazarus hospital Scheduled Ancient Monument and its setting, contrary to the advice of Historic England.</p>	<p>The Melton Mowbray Areas of Separation ,Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study ( evidence produced by Influence) states that the physical and visual separation of the settlements should be retained and that topography and historic features should be taken into account when planning new development . Moving the boundary of the SSN would marginally change this relationship from the original proposal . The situation of Burton Lazars on rising land and the remaining undeveloped land immediately to the north of the village would continue to define the sense of separation . Any perceived adverse impact must be balanced against the need to provide a viable SSN.</p> <p>The Council’s evidence (technical note prepared by Cotswold Archaeology) indicates that the proposed southern SUE land does not appear to have formed an important part of the setting of the SAM and that separation is not a key aspect of the SAM.</p>
Geoff Platts, Environment Agency	FC2	Sound	Noted.
The Friends of Melton County Park	FC2	<p>To protect biodiversity and the rural nature of the park a 500m buffer is requested between the Country Park and future development. Alternatively, a narrower buffer of 100m-200m would provide some mitigation for increased noise and light pollution.</p> <p>Supported by reference to a wildlife buffer elsewhere in the UK and to the Bingham – Melton wildlife corridor.</p>	<p>Policy SS5 satisfactorily addresses the relationship between new development and Melton County Park. The focussed changes included a minor amendment to the wording of paragraph en3A of this policy ,to emphasise the significance of the country park.</p> <p>The buffer which is referred to is not an example which is comparable with the country park. A buffer could not be justified in this case. There is no evidence to support such protection, which would threaten the viability and deliverability of the sustainable neighbourhood.</p> <p>Paragraph en3A of Policy SS5 is compatible with the aims of the wildlife corridor project.</p>