

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
BOTTESFORD					
GENERAL					
Frances and John Stapleton	283	<p>Object to all sites in Bottesford for the following reasons:</p> <p>a) additional development will cause chaos on the roads in Bottesford, it is already dangerous because of parked cars and blind junctions</p> <p>b) this is a rural village - not a town</p> <p>If we wanted to live in town we would live in Melton Mowbray.</p>		<p>Bottesford has the best range of local services of all the villages in Melton Borough. It is also served by both train and bus services which provide access to Nottingham and Grantham. The village is served by both a primary and secondary school - both of which have spare capacity. The village is therefore the most sustainable location outside of Melton Mowbray. Bottesford has not been referred to as a town in the draft plan.</p> <p>National planning policy promotes development in the most sustainable locations where residents can choose to access services, leisure and employment opportunities locally.</p> <p>Having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the LHA is satisfied that there are no fundamental outstanding issues from a transport perspective which would require alterations to the strategy/proposed allocations to resolve. More localised, detailed issues arising in relation to specific sites would be expected to be identified and</p>	None in response to this representation.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
				<p>appropriately addressed through the development management process as normal.</p> <p>Site BOT1 is now built out and therefore the site is to be removed from policy C1(a).</p>	
Janette Dillon	63	<p>I object to all 5 sites in Bottesford A minimum of 428 new houses in Bottesford will put extreme pressure on a village with very limited resources Bottesford is not the most appropriate place for this development because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Put pressure on limited resources such as doctors' surgeries, schools and drainage facilities. -high flood risk area - other sites in the Borough are lower risk and should be used first. - public transport is minimal -parking on main road causes congestion - increase in car traffic is inevitable and will increase congestion and hazardous conditions - residents feel comments have been ignored <p>I would appreciate acknowledgement and a response to this comment.</p>		<p>Bottesford has the best range of local services of all the villages in Melton Borough. It is also served by both train and bus services which provide access to Nottingham and Grantham. The village is served by both a primary and secondary school - both of which have spare capacity. The village is therefore the most sustainable location outside of Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>National planning policy promotes development in the most sustainable locations where residents can choose to access services, leisure and employment opportunities locally. Sites which have been allocated in the village have been assessed against flood risk and specific policy requirements are included to ensure that development proposals incorporate measures which protect existing and future residents from increased risk of flooding.</p> <p>Having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations</p>	None in response to this representation..

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
				<p>to specific settlements) at a high-level, the LHA is satisfied that there are no fundamental outstanding issues from a transport perspective which would require alterations to the strategy/proposed allocations to resolve. More localised, detailed issues arising in relation to specific sites would be expected to be identified and appropriately addressed through the development management process as normal.</p> <p>Site BOT1 is now built out and therefore the site is to be removed from policy C1(a).</p>	
Marilyn Robinson	248	<p>BOT1; BOT2; BOT3; BOT4; BOT5; We are Bottesford residents and have read the Pre-submission Draft of the Melton Plan. In principle, we agree that Bottesford should take its fair allocation of the housing needed for the borough, and can most probably take the 428 houses forecast. HOWEVER, this allocation MUST be spread over the 20 year period of the Melton Plan. Our concern is that the (building) vultures are already circling intending to build as many houses as possible over the next 3 years or so, and Bottesford does not currently have the infrastructure in place to cope.</p>		<p>It is extremely unlikely that all of the housing will be built in the next three years. House builders will only build as many homes as they expect to sell each year. An industry norm is for a large site to deliver no more than 50 home per annum, this is rarely achieved, especially where more than one site is being built concurrently, as the local market is unlikely to support that number of sales at any one time. All allocated sites will also have to go through the planning process and on the larger sites may require the provision of significant infrastructure works (eg new access and utilities supply) before homes are constructed.</p>	None in response to this representation..

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
				Site BOT1 is now built out and therefore the site is to be removed from policy C1(a).	
Norman Robinson	249	BOT1; BOT2; BOT3; BOT4; BOT5; We are Bottesford residents and have read the Pre-submission Draft of the Melton Plan. In principle, we agree that Bottesford should take its fair allocation of the housing needed for the borough, and can most probably take the 428 houses forecast. HOWEVER, this allocation MUST be spread over the 20 year period of the Melton Plan. Our concern is that the (building) vultures are already circling intending to build as many houses as possible over the next 3 years or so, and Bottesford does not currently have the infrastructure in place to cope.		It is extremely unlikely that all of the housing will be built in the next three years. House builders will only build as many homes as they expect to sell each year. An industry norm is for a large site to deliver no more than 50 home per annum, this is rarely achieved, especially where more than one site is being built concurrently, as the local market is unlikely to support that number of sales at any one time. All allocated sites will also have to go through the planning process and on the larger sites may require the provision of significant infrastructure works (eg new access and utilities supply) before homes are constructed. Site BOT1 is now built out and therefore the site is to be removed from policy C1(a).	None in response to this representation..
Jacqueline Francis	81	Bottesford is not a town and I wish for the word to be removed from the document. I oppose the plan to build houses, affordable or not within the village because: a) infrastructure and services are already under strain, and out of date. b) Schools are already under strain, more children will tax an already low return.		Bottesford has the best range of local services of all the villages in Melton Borough. It is also served by both train and bus services which provide access to Nottingham and Grantham. The village is served by both a primary and secondary school - both of which have spare capacity. The village is therefore the	None in response to this representation..

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>c) Traffic through the village is already chaotic and dangerous, we need speed bumps to slow vehicles and cameras to catch offenders</p> <p>d) new homes being built are not affordable or bought by local people</p> <p>e) Doctors in this village are already overstretched.</p> <p>f) Flooding has been a problem here, over the last 20 years</p> <p>g) Local services ie bus, train, are under threat, and with more cars on the roads, there will be an increased wear on road surfaces.</p> <p>h)we don't have a police station, or a fuel station.</p> <p>I) no crossing patrol and no safe crossing over the A52 - promised years ago.</p>		<p>most sustainable location outside of Melton Mowbray. Bottesford has not been referred to as a town in the draft plan.</p> <p>National planning policy requires local authorities to make housing provision to meet the needs of the whole Borough and to ensure this development is located in the most sustainable locations where residents can choose to access services, leisure and employment opportunities locally.</p> <p>Having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the LHA is satisfied that there are no fundamental outstanding issues from a transport perspective which would require alterations to the strategy/proposed allocations to resolve. More localised, detailed issues arising in relation to specific sites would be expected to be identified and appropriately addressed through the development management process as normal.</p> <p>Site BOT1 is now built out and therefore the site is to be removed from policy C1(a).</p>	
BOT1					

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
Richard Simon	266	BOT1 This site already has planning consent and is probably about 50% complete. The design and density of the built space is poor and out of keeping with the village, The SuDS scheme lacks amenity value and the route to the outflow on the Winterbeck has increased the flood risk to Belvoir road and the village centre. I hope that the positive policies included in this document prevent such a development ever being repeated.		Comments noted. Site BOT1 is now built out and therefore the site is to be removed from policy C1(a).	The site is removed from policy C1(a) as the site is completed.
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	409	In the majority of cases the sites identified have no specific heritage concern, although several are not without known heritage implications. BOT1 is a site known to have implications. Development management decisions should give careful consideration to the heritage implications as required by national and local planning policy and informed by relevant guidance.		Site BOT1 is now built out and therefore the site is to be removed from policy C1(a). Any heritage issues arising from development of this site were resolved through the detailed planning permission process.	The site is removed from policy C1(a) as the site is completed.
Susan Love	172	I fully support part of the Policies Map for Bottesford - i.e. the rejection of the rejected sites, the designation of the Areas of Separation, and the inclusion of the Rectory Farm site and the Daybells Barns site for housing development. Other housing development sites, now approved, should be removed so that Bottesford's overall housing allocation is reduced to 370 over the Plan period.		Support noted. Site BOT1 is now built out and therefore the site is to be removed from policy C1(a).	The site is removed from policy C1(a) as the site is completed.
BOT2					
Richard Simon		BOT2 The selection of the Daybell's Barns site which provides housing in the centre of the village I would also support. The intention is that some properties suitable for the elderly/disabled would		Support for this site is welcomed. Both the Daybells site and the adjacent plot which are allocated as BOT2 must ensure appropriate access and mitigate any	1. Update to site assessment work has included refinement of site area

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>be included in the development. The adjacent site to the Daybells site I would accept if it was found to be as flood resistant as the Daybells site has proved to be and the development was in line with the anticipated quality design of the Daybells proposal.</p>		<p>potential flood risk issues.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been increased from 35 dwellings to 41. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT2 to BOT1.</p>	<p>calculations and developable areas. The potential capacity has therefore increased from 35 to 41 on this basis.</p> <p>2. Due to the removal of BOT1, the site has been re-numbered and this site is now referred to as BOT1.</p>
Susan Love	172	<p>I fully support part of the Policies Map for Bottesford - i.e. the rejection of the rejected sites, the designation of the Areas of Separation, and the inclusion of the Rectory Farm site and the Daybells Barns site for housing development. However, my support has the following reservations - As stated earlier, with reasons, the full Rectory Farm site should be included as a development area.</p>		<p>Support for this site noted.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been increased from 35 dwellings to 41. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT2 to BOT1.</p>	<p>1. Update to site assessment work has included refinement of site area calculations and developable areas. The potential capacity has therefore increased from 35 to 41 on this basis.</p> <p>2. Due to the removal of BOT1, the site has been re-numbered and this site is now referred to as BOT1.</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
BOT3					
Richard Simon	266	BOT3. Potential Reserve site. This site is a long way from the village centre and there are no current, convenient footpaths. The distance outside the village centre would encourage car use. The Clay Pits site could be considered a reserve with a low density house model offset by a reduced affordable housing ratio. The low density and effective green screening would match adjacent housing and be appropriate for the outskirts of the village. I reject the adjacent site unless this could also be of low density		<p>Comments noted. Policy BOT3 provides detailed criteria to protect the setting and visual impact of new development in this location. Consideration could be given to an additional criterion requiring a extension of the footway to the frontage of the site and connection to the footpath network along the riverside to encourage residents to access village amenities by foot.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been decreased from 102 dwellings to 65. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT3 to BOT2.</p>	<p>1. Update to site assessment work has included refinement of site area calculations and developable areas (this site was reduced in area to remove flood risk zone 3 but the capacity was not initially updated to reflect this). The potential capacity has therefore decreased from 102 to 65 on this basis.</p> <p>2. Due to the removal of BOT1, the site has been re-numbered and the site is now referred to as BOT2.</p>
Pegasus on behalf of Davidson's Development		Davidson's Developments Limited's interests are with the northern part of the site, which is located adjacent to the settlement edge. This part of the site has the capacity to accommodate circa 40 new dwellings, with development being confined to that part of the site that lies within Flood Zone 1. The site is well related to the existing settlement and forms a natural extension to the existing built	We would suggest that the Site Allocations and Policies in Appendix 1 should be included within the main body of the Local Plan. This	Support for this part of the allocation is noted, and the intention to submit a planning application in the near future helps to demonstrate the deliverability of the site. It is considered that it would be more useful if the site allocation plans were included only in one place, within the Local Plan for ease of reference. It is	Suggested that the site allocation plans are included in one place, within the Local Plan for ease of reference and to avoid duplication. Therefore site

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>form.</p> <p>Davidson's Developments Limited are committed to preparing and submitting a planning application which will fully address the criteria set out in policy BOT3 and to providing a development of the highest quality to provide the new housing the village needs in a sympathetic way.</p>	<p>would serve to make the Plan more coherent.</p>	<p>however considered appropriate to leave the text detail about each settlement in Appendix 1, with reference from the relevant policies to this text being clear in the policy text.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been decreased from 102 dwellings to 65. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT3 to BOT2.</p>	<p>allocation plans are to be removed from Appendix 1 and only identified on the Policies Map.</p> <p>1. Update to site assessment work has included refinement of site area calculations and developable areas (this site was reduced in area to remove flood risk zone 3 but the capacity was not initially updated to reflect this). The potential capacity has therefore decreased from 102 to 65 on this basis.</p> <p>2. Due to the removal of BOT1, the site has been re-numbered and the site is now referred to as BOT2.</p>
BOT4					
Richard	266	The use of the full Rectory Farm site is supported.		Support for full use of this site is noted.	1. Update to site

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
Simon		<p>It will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1: facilitate good connectivity with the village centre through cycle and footpaths and provide needed parking space for the Methodist Church. 2. provide publicly accessible green corridor along the north bank of the River Devon linking Devon Lane to a riverbank path from St. Mary's Church to the bridge at Grantham Rd. <p>Using whole site will be more viable and able to meet the criteria of policy D1 "Raising the Standard of design"</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The site is well contained. <p>The proposed reduction in housing numbers to 150 is unjustified and although strip of land has been sold to an adjacent factory there is still space for approximately 200 houses.</p>		<p>The site areas has been reduced because of concerns about impact of development on the heritage assets in this areas. Notably the church and adjacent listed buildings, as well as loss of ridge and furrow.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been increased from 150 dwellings to 163. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT4 to BOT3.</p>	<p>assessment work has included refinement of site area calculations and developable areas. The potential capacity has therefore increased from 150 to 163 on this basis.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Due to the removal of BOT1, the site has been re-numbered and the site is now referred to as BOT3.
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Earl of Rutland and Dr Fleming's Hospital Trust)	382	<p>BOT4 The referencing within Policy C1a is very confusing by using different site and map references.</p> <p>The Earl of Rutland and Dr Fleming's Hospital Trust is the principal promoter and part-owner of site reference MBC/057/13 (BOT4) for 150 houses.</p> <p>However, the allocation only includes a part of the land and the site being promoted. The larger site was included in the Emerging Options Consultation but modified in the Pre-Submission version of the Local Plan following Historic England comments concluding that the size of the allocation is reduced deleting the two closest</p>	<p>Policy C1a and Appendix 2 be modified by extending site reference MBC/057/13 (BOT4) to provide for 250 dwellings as shown on the attached plan.</p>	<p>The referencing in C1 was used to help people to follow a sites progress from SHLAA through the local plan making process. However the map reference is the new policy reference for each site.</p> <p>The additional evidence relating to the significance of the heritage assets referenced in Historic England's previous comments is welcomed and noted. However we do not have an independent assessment of the Historic England objection and the evidence received through the representation to inform whether the site area should be</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update to site assessment work has included refinement of site area calculations and developable areas. The potential capacity has therefore increased from 150 to 163 on this basis. 2. Due to the removal of BOT1, the site has been re-

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>fields immediately to the west of Bottesford together with the two smaller fields below to the north of Riverside Close</p> <p>An archaeological desk-based assessment has been commissioned to clarify the heritage significance and archaeological potential of BOT4. The assessment has been submitted alongside this representation.</p> <p>Cgms have also undertaken a built heritage assessment which has been submitted alongside this representation.</p> <p>The conclusions of these studies is that the land to the east of the site allocated in Policy C1a reference MBC/057/13 (BOT4) should be included within the allocation.</p> <p>It should also be noted that land immediately to the west of the site in the ownership of Railway Paths Ltd, including the area known locally as the 'railway triangle' should also be included within the allocation. Railway Paths Ltd are a specialist organisation which owns and manages a portfolio of former railway land to provide routes, roads and paths suitable for cycling, walking, horseriding and wheel-chair use. It also manages the properties held by its sister charity Sustrans. The inclusion of this land will contribute to the extension of the national cycle network and the sustainability of this housing allocation.</p>		<p>increased to that originally submitted and therefore no suggested changes are proposed.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been increased from 150 dwellings to 163. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT4 to BOT3.</p>	<p>numbered and the site is now referred to as BOT3.</p>
Phyllis McNulty	190	The Rectory Farm development will cause traffic problems if it connects onto Rectory/Normanton Lane.		Concerns noted. Having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a	1. Update to site assessment work has included refinement

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
				<p>high-level, the LHA is satisfied that there are no fundamental outstanding issues from a transport perspective which would require alterations to the strategy/proposed allocations to resolve. More localised, detailed issues arising in relation to specific sites would be expected to be identified and appropriately addressed through the development management process as normal.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been increased from 150 dwellings to 163. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT4 to BOT3.</p>	<p>of site area calculations and developable areas. The potential capacity has therefore increased from 150 to 163 on this basis.</p> <p>2. Due to the removal of BOT1, the site has been re-numbered and the site is now referred to as BOT3.</p>
Mrs Margery Speed	280	I have concerns about the Rectory Farm development. The number of houses has been reduced from that originally proposed by the Neighbourhood plan but careful attention must be made to the access roads. Connecting this into Orston Lane would be the best option but the junction with Nottingham Rd is an issue.		Concerns noted. Having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the LHA is satisfied that there are no fundamental outstanding issues from a transport perspective which would require alterations to the strategy/proposed allocations to resolve. More localised, detailed issues arising in relation to specific sites would be expected to be identified and appropriately addressed through the development management process as	<p>1. Update to site assessment work has included refinement of site area calculations and developable areas. The potential capacity has therefore increased from 150 to 163 on this basis.</p> <p>2. Due to the</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
				<p>normal.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been increased from 150 dwellings to 163. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT4 to BOT3.</p>	<p>removal of BOT1, the site has been re-numbered and the site is now referred to as BOT3.</p>
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	409	<p>In the majority of cases the sites identified have no specific heritage concern, although several are not without known heritage implications. BOT4 is a site known to have implications. Development management decisions should give careful consideration to the heritage implications as required by national and local planning policy and informed by relevant guidance.</p>		<p>The site area for BOT4 has been reduced significantly to take account of previous concerns regarding the impact of development on heritage assets in and around the church, and to respect evidence of ridge and furrow found in this location. Detailed consideration of the impact of a development scheme on heritage assets would be required as part of a planning application in accordance with paragraphs 126 to 141 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been increased from 150 dwellings to 163. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT4 to BOT3.</p>	<p>1. Update to site assessment work has included refinement of site area calculations and developable areas. The potential capacity has therefore increased from 150 to 163 on this basis.</p> <p>2. Due to the removal of BOT1, the site has been re-numbered and the site is now referred to as BOT3.</p>
Eric George	99	<p>My wife and I are concerned with the above policies.</p>	<p>More housing can be accommodated</p>	<p>Concerns noted. Having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed</p>	<p>1. Update to site assessment work has</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>We understand the need for more housing in Bottesford.</p> <p>The reduced numbers at BOT4, Rectory Farm are welcome but traffic congestion along Orston Lane or Rectory lane is our major concern. These are narrow roads that will lead to queues of traffic at peak times.</p>	<p>along the Grantham Road sites particularly at site BOT3 and beyond.</p> <p>The extra traffic in these areas is easily dealt with.</p> <p>We do not accept there are any flooding issues in this part of the village now that the environment agency has improved the flow along the Devon. The Easthorpe view has not had any problems with flooding and is built up to the river edge. The weir improvements at the Old Mill have eliminated flooding problems in the area.</p>	<p>allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the LHA is satisfied that there are no fundamental outstanding issues from a transport perspective which would require alterations to the strategy/proposed allocations to resolve. More localised, detailed issues arising in relation to specific sites would be expected to be identified and appropriately addressed through the development management process as normal.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been increased from 150 dwellings to 163. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT4 to BOT3.</p>	<p>included refinement of site area calculations and developable areas. The potential capacity has therefore increased from 150 to 163 on this basis.</p> <p>2. Due to the removal of BOT1, the site has been re-numbered and the site is now referred to as BOT3.</p>
Susan Love	172	I fully support part of the Policies Map for Bottesford - i.e. the rejection of the rejected sites, the designation of the Areas of Separation, and		Support for full use of this site is noted. The site areas has been reduced because of concerns about impact of	1. Update to site assessment work has included refinement

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>the inclusion of the Rectory Farm site and the Daybells Barns site for housing development. However, my support has the following reservations - As stated earlier, with reasons, the full Rectory Farm site should be included as a development area.</p>		<p>development on the heritage assets in this areas. Notably the church and adjacent listed buildings, as well as loss of ridge and furrow.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been increased from 150 dwellings to 163. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT4 to BOT3.</p>	<p>of site area calculations and developable areas. The potential capacity has therefore increased from 150 to 163 on this basis.</p> <p>2. Due to the removal of BOT1, the site has been re-numbered and the site is now referred to as BOT3.</p>
Beverley Preen	234	<p>BOT 4 I am concerned that policy BOT 4 will lead to traffic congestion onto Orston Lane/Longhedge Lane. This will cause traffic to use Bowbridge Lane causing problems getting into the village and along Nottingham Rd. Moving the access road to Normanton Lane does not improve the traffic situation into the village.</p>	<p>Consider expanding the Grantham Rd sites and any new Nottingham road sites to accommodate the housing required.</p> <p>These sites would have much better access into the village or the A52.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. Having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the LHA is satisfied that there are no fundamental outstanding issues from a transport perspective which would require alterations to the strategy/proposed allocations to resolve. More localised, detailed issues arising in relation to specific sites would be expected to be identified and appropriately addressed through the development management process as normal.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of</p>	<p>1. Update to site assessment work has included refinement of site area calculations and developable areas. The potential capacity has therefore increased from 150 to 163 on this basis.</p> <p>2. Due to the removal of BOT1, the site has been re-numbered and the site is now referred</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
				this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been increased from 150 dwellings to 163. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT4 to BOT3.	to as BOT3.
Susan Love	172	<p>Comments relate to Bottesford</p> <p>Development of the Rectory Farm site in Bottesford could bring money and opportunity to provide a footpath to the new football grounds on the Nottingham Rd. At present it is unsafe for children to access the football grounds unless taken by car.</p> <p>Add to the list of healthy lifestyle that new developments should encourage fruit and vegetable growing by providing gardens that have sufficient light; each new house to have a fruit tree to cut down on food miles.</p> <p>The ridge and furrow on the east of the Rectory Farm site could be used for allotments - a return to its original purpose - Living history!</p>	Encourage initiatives on new developments which help to reduce food miles.	<p>The Local Plan cannot set requirements like these for each house to have fruit trees. The Local Plan is a strategic document. These features are looked at as part of individual planning application's merits. As such, criteria 'c' of Policy C9 does refer to 'high quality local food growing spaces' to be encouraged through development proposals to promote health and well-being.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been increased from 150 dwellings to 163. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT4 to BOT3.</p>	<p>1. Update to site assessment work has included refinement of site area calculations and developable areas. The potential capacity has therefore increased from 150 to 163 on this basis.</p> <p>2. Due to the removal of BOT1, the site has been re-numbered and the site is now referred to as BOT3.</p>
Susan Love	172	<p>Re p.12 of Appendix on Bottesford.</p> <p>The use of the full Rectory Farm site. MBC has failed to challenge Historic England's comments on the Rectory Farm site (MBC BOT 4). The site has no visual connection with the heritage site near Easthorpe Manor and is adjacent to an</p>		Support for full use of this site is noted. The site area has been reduced because of concerns about impact of development on the heritage assets in this areas. Notably the church and adjacent listed buildings, as well as loss of ridge and furrow.	1. Update to site assessment work has included refinement of site area calculations and developable areas. The potential

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>industrial estate on the east side, 20c housing development to south and a railway line to the north. Ridge and furrow is plentiful around Bottesford and on balance with the good of making the most of the site and avoiding over dense development on the rest of the area there is no sound reason for not using the eastern part of the site.</p> <p>What better use for the ridge and furrow in that area than to be used for allotments on the site? This would make the preservation of ridge and meaningful by returning them to their original use for food production.</p> <p>The estimate of the flood risk area does not match what is shown on the Bottesford map on the MLP document, where most of the site is shown as in Flood Zone 1. This accords with the Local Flood Warden's assessment of the area as the most suitable location for development in the village. The Rectory Farm site was selected by the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group following advice from our independent consultants from CABE (Brian Quinn and Professor Colin Haylock*) who walked the village, helped us to establish an idea of the village 'character', and ran several workshops with us.</p> <p>Details of an email from Brian Quinn sent to the Steering Group confirming the consultants' view of Rectory Farm have been included in the response.</p> <p>Understandably, following recent development in Bottesford (see reply to section one on</p>		<p>We currently do not have an independent assessment of the Historic England objection and the evidence received through the representation to inform whether the site area should be increased to that originally submitted and therefore no suggested changes are proposed.</p> <p>Flood zone 2, 3 and 3b run through the site along the water course the rest of the site lies outside the flood zone. The flood risk areas have to be taken account of as a requirement of the NPPF.</p> <p>Comments noted on previous developments.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been increased from 150 dwellings to 163. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT4 to BOT3.</p>	<p>capacity has therefore increased from 150 to 163 on this basis.</p> <p>2. Due to the removal of BOT1, the site has been re-numbered and the site is now referred to as BOT3.</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>consultation) local residents are inclined to be wary of development. Objections from residents on an existing housing estate to the development of another one behind them stirred up by inaccurate information should not be given much weight.</p> <p>Three of the many advantages of the Rectory Farm site are that it is contained, its development will not affect the approaches to the village, and Influence's "Areas of separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study" on LCZ1 concludes that "the larger scale western half of the northern land parcel immediately south of the railway is less sensitive (medium sensitivity) by virtue of its enclosed, settlement influenced character."</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>BOT4 - Change Appendix on Bottesford p. 12 to reflect the actual impact on heritage assets and the Bottesford Flood Zone map in Appendix 12. Use the whole of the site as mapped in the "Emerging Options" documents minus a very small part in the s.e. corner which is in a Conservation Area.</p> <p>Add - The site has no visual connection with the heritage site near Easthorpe Manor. It is adjacent</p>			

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>to an industrial estate on the east side, a large area of 20c housing development to south, and a railway line to the north. Ridge and furrow is plentiful around Bottesford and on balance with the good of making the most of the site and avoiding over dense development on the rest of the area there is good reason for using the eastern part of the site.</p> <p>Change the area of the site to be developed to use the whole SHLAA site submitted. This would avoid the need for over-dense development of the rest of the site.</p> <p>Most of the site is in Flood Zone 1. The Flood Zones to be avoided on the site are along the riverbank which will provide a pleasant green corridor through the site and link to existing river paths in the centre of the village.</p> <p>4.2.21 Housing numbers allocation chart - revise the allocation to Bottesford downwards to 370 over the MLP period. Allocate another 168 houses to Waltham on the Wolds (reserve site) to address the shortfall.</p>			
BOT5					
Richard Simon	266	<p>BOT5 I reject this site. This site is outside a natural boundary to the village and in an Area of Separation.</p>		Comments noted. Policy BOT5 requires sensitive design and boundary treatment in recognition of the location of this site on the approach to the village. In the	1. Update to site assessment work has included refinement of site area

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>It is on the approach to the village and would have a detrimental effect on the view of St Marys Church (the Lady of the Vale) from the Beacon. The land appears to be good quality arable land and is always under crops.</p>		<p>update to the site assessments the land is identified as grade 3a/3b agricultural land. Grade 1, 2 and 3a are considered to be the best and most versatile land.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been decreased from 84 dwellings to 55. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT5 to BOT4.</p>	<p>calculations and developable areas. (this site was reduced in area to limit visual impact but the capacity was not updated to reflect this). The potential capacity has therefore decreased from 84 to 55 on this basis.</p> <p>2. Due to the removal of BOT1 the site has been re-numbered and this site is now referred to as BOT4.</p>
Phyllis McNulty	190	<p>The Normanton Lane development, BOT5 should not go ahead as this will cause traffic problems around the Church and into the village. This is a quiet and peaceful area that I enjoy and I would not want to see it spoiled.</p>		<p>Concerns noted. Having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the LHA is satisfied that there are no fundamental outstanding issues from a transport perspective which would require alterations to the strategy/proposed allocations to resolve. More localised, detailed issues arising in relation to specific sites would be expected to be identified and appropriately addressed through the development management process as</p>	<p>1. Update to site assessment work has included refinement of site area calculations and developable areas. (this site was reduced in area to limit visual impact but the capacity was not updated to reflect this). The potential capacity</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
				<p>normal.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been decreased from 84 dwellings to 55. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT5 to BOT4.</p>	<p>has therefore decreased from 84 to 55 on this basis.</p> <p>2. Due to the removal of BOT1 the site has been re-numbered and this site is now referred to as BOT4.</p>
Mrs Margery Speed	280	The Normanton Lane/Beacon Hill proposal creates a dangerous precedent which will lead to much more development north of the railway line. Rectory lane and Station road would become congested with traffic.		<p>The concern regarding this development setting a precedent for further development north of the railway in the future is recognised, however the topography of this site and its setting within the local landscape means that development can be accommodated here without extending further into the countryside . Land to the north of Normanton Lane and the railway is very flat and the railway line in this location acts as a strong and defensible boundary.</p> <p>Having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the LHA is satisfied that there are no fundamental outstanding issues from a transport perspective which would require alterations to the strategy/proposed allocations to resolve.</p>	<p>1. Update to site assessment work has included refinement of site area calculations and developable areas. (this site was reduced in area to limit visual impact but the capacity was not updated to reflect this). The potential capacity has therefore decreased from 84 to 55 on this basis.</p> <p>2. Due to the removal of BOT1 the site has been re-numbered and this site is now referred</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
				<p>More localised, detailed issues arising in relation to specific sites would be expected to be identified and appropriately addressed through the development management process as normal.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been decreased from 84 dwellings to 55. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT5 to BOT4.</p>	to as BOT4.
Tom Collins on behalf of Richborough Estates	439	<p>We support the allocations being made by policy C1(A), in particular site reference BOT5 Land at Normanton Lane, Bottesford.</p> <p>We note that policy C1(A) allocates only 405 dwellings, against a settlement requirement of 427. In respect of allocation BOT5, the proposed boundary for the allocation has not taken account of the site's topography and specific characteristics. A slightly larger gross development area would yield a higher potential capacity and allow for the incorporation of extensive landscaping and a layout which will be more effective in assimilating the development into the wider landscape. In all 90 dwellings could be accommodated and delivered within the next 5 year period.</p> <p>Initial survey work is being undertaken in preparation for an outline planning application to</p>		<p>Support for this site allocation is welcomed as is confirmation of the technical work which has already taken place to support an application for the site, confirming that the site is deliverable.</p> <p>The site area was reduced to limit the visual impact of the site and whilst the slightly larger site area would provide an additional limited number of dwellings, it is not considered that this outweighs the need to limit the visual impact of the site in this case.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity</p>	<p>1. Update to site assessment work has included refinement of site area calculations and developable areas. (this site was reduced in area to limit visual impact but the capacity was not updated to reflect this). The potential capacity has therefore decreased from 84 to 55 on this basis.</p> <p>2. due to the</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>be submitted Spring 2017. This work has confirmed that there are no technical constraints to delivery of housing on the site. Discussions are ongoing with Network Rail in order to improve safety at the level crossing to the west of the site, and ensure that full consideration is given to all issues related to highways, access and transport.</p>		<p>identified for this site has been decreased from 84 dwellings to 55. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT5 to BOT4.</p>	<p>removal of BOT1 the site has been re-numbered and this site is now referred to as BOT4.</p>
Eric George	99	<p>My wife and I are concerned with the above policies.</p> <p>We understand the need for more housing in Bottesford.</p> <p>The Beacon Hill site makes no sense at all and creates a dangerous precedent for much more development north of the railway line. This again will create traffic congestion into the centre of the village.</p>	<p>More housing can be accommodated along the Grantham Road sites particularly at site BOT3 and beyond.</p> <p>The extra traffic in these areas is easily dealt with.</p> <p>We do not accept there are any flooding issues in this part of the village now that the environment agency has improved the flow along the Devon. The Easthorpe view has not had any problems with flooding and is built up to the river</p>	<p>Comments noted. Policy BOT5 requires sensitive design and boundary treatment in recognition of the location of this site on the approach to the village.</p> <p>Having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the LHA is satisfied that there are no fundamental outstanding issues from a transport perspective which would require alterations to the strategy/proposed allocations to resolve. More localised, detailed issues arising in relation to specific sites would be expected to be identified and appropriately addressed through the development management process as normal.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been decreased from 84 dwellings to 55. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also</p>	<p>1. Update to site assessment work has included refinement of site area calculations and developable areas. (this site was reduced in area to limit visual impact but the capacity was not updated to reflect this). The potential capacity has therefore decreased from 84 to 55 on this basis.</p> <p>2. due to the removal of BOT1 the site has been re-numbered and this site is now referred to as BOT4.</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
			edge. The weir improvements at the Old Mill have eliminated flooding problems in the area.	re-numbered from BOT5 to BOT4.	
Beverley Preen	234	<p>BOT 5</p> <p>Also I do not understand why BOT 5 is required to the north of the railway. This will cause traffic problems along the narrow roads into the village particularly Rectory Lane.</p>	<p>Consider expanding the Grantham Rd sites and any new Nottingham road sites to accommodate the housing required.</p> <p>These sites would have much better access into the village or the A52.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. Having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the LHA is satisfied that there are no fundamental outstanding issues from a transport perspective which would require alterations to the strategy/proposed allocations to resolve. More localised, detailed issues arising in relation to specific sites would be expected to be identified and appropriately addressed through the development management process as normal.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been decreased from 84 dwellings to 55. Due to the removal of BOT1 this site is also re-numbered from BOT5 to BOT4.</p>	<p>1. Update to site assessment work has included refinement of site area calculations and developable areas. (this site was reduced in area to limit visual impact but the capacity was not updated to reflect this). The potential capacity has therefore decreased from 84 to 55 on this basis.</p> <p>2. due to the removal of BOT1 the site has been re-numbered and this site is now referred to as BOT4.</p>
STATHERN					
STAT1					
Anne	277	2 plots in Stathern have been included in the		The planning system cannot be used to	1. An extension to

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
Elizabeth Smith		<p>Melton Local Plan, STAT1 and STAT2. I am dismayed to find that the paddock which borders my home on two sides has been included as part of STAT1 for development of up to 40 houses. I took part in earlier local consultation and this possibility of including the paddock was not mentioned at all. In view of the possible detrimental impact on my enjoyment of my home and the fact that no one has raised this with us, I consider you have failed to consult and cooperate, and so failed to comply legally.</p> <p>There is inadequate access from the highway to plot STAT1 as demonstrated on the interactive map, so I consider its inclusion is unsound.</p> <p>The paddock is prone to flooding in parts and I am concerned at the consequential impact to my home if this land is developed.</p>		<p>protect individual views over open land. This site has been assessed as accessible and suitable for development. The Highways Authority have been consulted and have raised no objection to the allocation of this site on highway safety grounds. It is recognised that part of the site falls within Flood Zone 3 and policy STAT1 makes specific reference to the need to ensure flood mitigation and surface water drainage measures are incorporated into the layout of development to protect existing and proposed properties from flood risk. The proposed allocation has been included in the Pre-submission consultation local plan and therefore satisfies the requirements of Regulations in respect of community engagement.</p> <p>An extended area to STAT1 has been submitted through representations and has undergone a full site assessment. As a result of this the site area of STAT1 has increased and the potential capacity increased as a result.</p>	<p>STAT1 was submitted through the SHLAA process 2017 (MBC/029/17) which has been assessed and is suitable as part of the STAT1 site.</p> <p>2. The capacity has been increased to reflect the inclusion of this additional land.</p>
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	Proposed site STAT1 is adjacent to the conservation area and impact upon these must be assessed to ensure a sound plan.		Site Appraisal methodology gave consideration to the proximity of heritage assets to sites, this includes the boundary of the conservation area. Detailed consideration of the impact of a development scheme on the conservation area would be required as	1. An extension to STAT1 was submitted through the SHLAA process 2017 (MBC/029/17) which has been assessed and is

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
				<p>part of a planning application in accordance with paragraphs 126 to 141 of the NPPF.</p> <p>An extended area to STAT1 has been submitted through representations and has undergone a full site assessment. As a result of this the site area of STAT1 has increased and the potential capacity increased as a result.</p>	<p>suitable as part of the STAT1 site.</p> <p>2. The capacity has been increased to reflect the inclusion of this additional land.</p>
STAT2					
Anne Elizabeth Smith	277	I note that the STAT2 plot was also wholly absent from the original local village consultation. So neither of the 2 plots identified in the current draft of the local plan are as included in our own village consultation, and only one of the 11 possible plots identified in that consultation has been used.		Sites can be suggested through the Local Plan process at any time and the Council should assess their suitability for development and allocation in the Local Plan. This means that sometimes - as is the case in Stathern sites are presented after a consultation has taken place. Regardless of this however the proposed allocation has been included in the Pre-submission consultation local plan and therefore satisfies the requirements of Regulations in respect of community engagement.	No change
Mrs Katerina Smith	272	Object to STAT2 being included in the plan as a suitable site to build 17 houses. The boundary of my land adjoins this field . My house is in a narrow plot with the existing main road from Stathern on one side and the proposed access for this new estate on the other. My reasons for objection are: loss of privacy and light to my property where the access road will be built? Will it mean		The concerns relating to loss of privacy and development blocking light to an existing property would be considered as part of the usual development management process - as residential amenity. The Highways Authority have been consulted and have not raised objection to the site allocation on the ground of highway safety and would	No change

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>our house is between two roads? Currently have open fields to the rear of my house My house is over 200 years old - can you guarantee that I will not suffer from any structural problems during and after the estate is built due to its proximity to my boundary? This land is within conservation area and designated as a "protected open area". Development will have a detrimental effect on the value of my property.</p> <p>Finally, from a "quality of life" and "aesthetic" perspective my happiness in living in this house will cease to exist after the building of this housing estate. We bought the house specifically because it gave us privacy and wonderful views. It has thus far been a beautiful place to live and feel like we are part of the countryside.</p>		<p>require details of a suitable access and visibility splays through any planning application submitted. The heritage assets in Stathern including the conservation area are identified in the update to the site assessments as a constraint identifying that sensitive design and layout would be required in this location. This would be dealt with during a planning application when detailed information is put forward.</p> <p>Under policy BE12 of the Adopted Local Plan 1999 (policy BE12 was saved on the 21st September 2007 under the procedures set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) that this plan seeks to replace, part of site STAT2 is identified as a Protected Open Area.</p> <p>The Melton Borough Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study identifies that 'the existing settlement edge is not prominent in the approaches from the west and northwest by virtue of the landform combined with existing hedgerow boundaries on this settlement fringe. Any development should be of an appropriate scale, contained by existing landform and landscape features, and should not encroach on the character of the open, vale landscape'. The layout and design in this location would therefore need to be designed to reflect</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
				<p>the settlement edge character and this would be considered through the planning application process. The site was assessed by the study to see if it met the criteria of a Protected Open Area and whether it should be protected as a Local Green Space however it did not meet the criteria and is therefore not protected by such a designation.</p> <p>The planning system does not protect individuals from loss of views or changes in property values. The potential capacity of the site is provided as indicative, based on an average site capacity of 30 houses to the hectare. The site has been assessed as having development potential using the standard assessment criteria which considers the impact of development on highway safety, flood risk, landscape and character of a settlement and the potential impact on heritage assets.</p>	
Caroline Chave	43	The landowner of site allocation Stathern (2) supports Policy C1(A). Site allocation Stathern (2) is a deliverable site at a sustainable settlement.		Support from the landowner stating this site is deliverable is welcomed.	No change
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	Proposed site STAT2 is partly within the Conservation Area and impact upon these must be assessed to ensure a sound plan.		Site Appraisal methodology gave consideration to the proximity of heritage assets to sites, this includes the boundary of the conservation area. Detailed consideration of the impact of a development scheme on heritage assets would be required as part of a planning application in accordance with paragraphs 126 to 141 of the NPPF.	No change

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
WYMONDHAM					
WYM1					
None.					
WYM2					
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	The proposed site is adjacent to the Conservation Area and other heritage assets, including Grade II* Wymondham Windmill to the north east of WYM2. Impact upon these must be assessed to ensure a sound plan		Site Appraisal methodology gave consideration to the proximity of heritage assets to sites, this includes the listed windmill and the boundary of the conservation area. Detailed consideration of the impact of a development scheme on heritage assets would be required as part of a planning application in accordance with paragraphs 126 to 141 of the NPPF.	No change
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	409	In the majority of cases the sites identified have no specific heritage concern, although several are not without known heritage implications. In the latter context are BOT1, BOT4, CROX1, HAR1, HOS2 and 3, WAL1 and 2, WYM2, EAS1 and FRIS2. Development management decisions should give careful consideration to the heritage implications as required by national and local planning policy and informed by relevant guidance.		Noted. Detailed consideration of the impact of a development scheme on heritage assets would be required as part of a planning application in accordance with paragraphs 126 to 141 of the NPPF.	No change
WYM3					
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	The proposed site is adjacent to the Conservation Area and other heritage assets, including Grade II* Wymondham Windmill to the north east of WYM3. Impact upon these must be assessed to ensure a sound plan.		Site Appraisal methodology gave consideration to the proximity of heritage assets to sites, this includes the listed windmill and the boundary of the conservation area. Detailed consideration of the impact of a	Update to site assessment work has included refinement of the site area calculations and developable areas.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
				<p>development scheme on heritage assets would be required as part of a planning application in accordance with paragraphs 126 to 141 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The site assessments have been refreshed and updated and as a result of this refinement work, the capacity identified for this site has been decreased from 30 dwellings to 22.</p>	<p>The potential capacity has therefore decreased from 30 to 22 on this basis.</p>
THORPE ARNOLD					
THOR1					
Andrew Russell-Wilks (on behalf of Stephen Vickers, Buckminster)	370	Buckminster is owner and promoter of the draft allocated site in Thorpe Arnold THOR1 / 27 units and the Reserve Site THOR2 /48 units. It supports the allocation of these two sites with THOR2 to be held as a reserve site.		<p>Support for allocation of THOR1 and reserve allocation of THOR2 noted.</p> <p>Consultation responses received from Historic England and LCC Archaeology have raised heritage constraints that had not previously been identified. This has given rise to a reduction in the potential capacity of the site and therefore the site capacity is reduced from 27 to 13 on this basis.</p>	<p>Reduce the potential capacity of the site from 27 to 13.</p>
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	There is the potential for impact upon the significance of the Grade II* Church of St Mary the Virgin, together with other heritage assets. The appraisals and assessments are again not sufficiently detailed to allow for comprehensive assessment (the Sustainability Appraisal does not mention the Church for example).		<p>Site Appraisal methodology gave consideration to the proximity of heritage assets to sites. The church at Thorpe Arnold is located within the village with existing development between it and the proposed allocation. Detailed consideration of the impact of a development scheme on heritage assets</p>	<p>Reduce the potential capacity of the site from 27 to 13.</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
				<p>would be required as part of a planning application in accordance with paragraphs 126 to 141 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Consultation responses received from Historic England and LCC Archaeology have raised heritage constraints that had not previously been identified. This has given rise to a reduction in the potential capacity of the site and therefore the site capacity is reduced from 27 to 13 on this basis.</p>	
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	409	Development management decisions should give careful consideration to the heritage implications as required by national and local planning policy and informed by relevant guidance. A number of sites poses greater concern including THOR1, these latter sites have significant and outstanding heritage implications potentially warranting objection in principle to their development.		<p>Site Appraisal methodology gave consideration to the proximity of heritage assets to potential development sites. Detailed consideration of the impact of a development scheme on heritage assets would be required as part of a planning application in accordance with paragraphs 126 to 141 of the NPPF. The Archaeologist has confirmed that currently they cannot categorically confirm that no development could take place on THOR1 but that there will be constraints which may limit the site that will need further investigation.</p> <p>Consultation responses received from Historic England and LCC Archaeology have raised heritage constraints that had not previously been identified. This has</p>	Reduce the potential capacity of the site from 27 to 13.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
				given rise to a reduction in the potential capacity of the site and therefore the site capacity is reduced from 27 to 13 on this basis.	
THOR2					
Andrew Russell-Wilks (on behalf of Stephen Vickers, Buckminster)	370	Buckminster is owner and promoter of the draft allocated site in Thorpe Arnold THOR1 / 27 units and the Reserve Site THOR2 /48 units. It supports the allocation of these two sites with THOR2 to be held as a reserve site.		Support for allocation of THOR1 and reserve allocation of THOR2 noted. As site THOR1 has had a reduction in the potential capacity there is further requirement to be met in Thorpe Arnold. THOR2 is now therefore reduced in site area and identified as an allocation under Policy C1(a) for 11 dwellings and removed from Policy C1(b) and is no longer identified as a reserve site.	Identify the site as an allocation under policy C1(a). Reduce the site area so it has a better relationship with the settlement, reduces encroachment on the open countryside and provides for a small development to meet the residual requirement, whilst limiting the impact on the settlement.
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	There is the potential for impact upon the significance of the Grade II* Church of St Mary the Virgin, together with other heritage assets. The appraisals and assessments are again not sufficiently detailed to allow for comprehensive assessment (the Sustainability Appraisal does not mention the Church for example).		Site Appraisal methodology gave consideration to the proximity of heritage assets to sites. The church at Thorpe Arnold is located within the village with existing development between it and the proposed allocation. Detailed consideration of the impact of a development scheme on heritage assets would be required as part of a planning application in accordance with	Identify the site as an allocation under policy C1(a). Reduce the site area so it has a better relationship with the settlement, reduces encroachment on the open countryside and

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
				<p>paragraphs 126 to 141 of the NPPF.</p> <p>As site THOR1 has had a reduction in the potential capacity there is further requirement to be met in Thorpe Arnold. THOR2 is now therefore reduced in site area and identified as an allocation under Policy C1(a) for 11 dwellings and removed from Policy C1(b) and is no longer identified as a reserve site.</p>	<p>provides for a small development to meet the residual requirement, whilst limiting the impact on the settlement.</p>

WALTHAM ON THE WOLDS

WAL1

George Machin on behalf of Davidsons Development	392	<p>(WAL1,2) My client's land interest at Bescaby Lane should also be allocated within Waltham-on-the-Wolds, owing to its highly sustainable location and the contribution that an additional Site could make to the delivery of the strategic objectives for Melton Borough. The allocation of this Site would not conflict with the overall strategy for the Borough.</p> <p>Our client wishes to stress and reiterate the availability, deliverability and suitability of the identified Site off Bescaby Lane, Waltham-on-the-Wolds for housing development and would urge the allocation of this Site for residential development. This is demonstrated through the recent Outline Planning Application submitted to the Council, for a development of up to 45 no. dwellings, which is supported by a range of technical assessments and reports in respect of</p>		<p>The site (MBC/055/13) referred to did form part of the initial site assessments and was identified as being potentially suitable and was ranked 6th out of 6 sites that were found to be suitable or potentially suitable. It is therefore accepted that the site did offer some potential, however in meeting the requirement set out for Waltham on the Wolds it was not required, due to other sites ranking higher accommodating the full requirement. In particular WAL1 and part of WAL2 both have the benefit of planning permission in place. There is no new information in the representations received that indicates that the draft housing allocations and reserve site should be amended or replaced with others.</p>	No change
--	-----	---	--	--	-----------

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>the following key matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. - Traffic and transportation 2. - Access 3. - Flood Risk and Drainage 4. - Ecology 5. - Trees 6. - Landscape and Visual Impact 7. - Archaeology 8. - Agricultural Land Quality <p>There are no fundamental constraints to the development and that a range of housing options, including a policy compliant amount of affordable housing, could be delivered to meet local needs in the short term. In addition, a dialogue has been opened with Waltham-on-the-Wolds and Thorpe Arnold Parish Council to discuss this Site and to establish the views and specific requirements of the village in respect of housing delivery.</p>			
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	<p>WAL1-3 The size of the sites to the south of the settlement (WAL1-3) would potentially impact upon the character of the Conservation Area and great care would be required to manage this impact through design, layout and detailing. There is survival of ridge and furrow contributing to historic landscape character and the setting of designated assets and losses should be minimised. Impact upon the Grade I listed Church of St Mary Magdalene and The Old Mill (Grade II) to the north of WAL3 requires careful assessment. In particular in relation to WAL3 development should avoid compromising views of the Church of St Mary</p>		<p>Site WAL1 has full planning permission. Detailed consideration of the impact of a development scheme on this heritage asset would have formed part of the assessment through the Development Management process.</p>	No change

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>which contribute to its and the Conservation Area's significance. It is noted that WAL1 benefits from planning permission; if it was outline only reserved matters will allow for the design to take into account nearby heritage assets.</p>			
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	409	<p>In the majority of cases the sites identified have no specific heritage concern, although several are not without known heritage implications. In the latter context are BOT1, BOT4, CROX1, HAR1, HOS2 and 3, WAL1 and 2, WYM2, EAS1 and FRIS2. Development management decisions should give careful consideration to the heritage implications as required by national and local planning policy and informed by relevant guidance.</p>		<p>Site WAL1 has full planning permission. Detailed consideration of the impact of a development scheme on this heritage asset would have formed part of the assessment through the Development Management process.</p>	No change
WAL2					
George Machin on behalf of Davidsons Development	392	<p>(WAL1,2) My client's land interest at Bescaby Lane should also be allocated within Waltham-on-the-Wolds, owing to its highly sustainable location and the contribution that an additional Site could make to the delivery of the strategic objectives for Melton Borough. The allocation of this Site would not conflict with the overall strategy for the Borough.</p> <p>Our client wishes to stress and reiterate the availability, deliverability and suitability of the identified Site off Bescaby Lane, Waltham-on-the-Wolds for housing development and would urge the allocation of this Site for residential development. This is demonstrated through the recent Outline Planning Application submitted to the Council, for a development of up to 45 no.</p>		<p>The site (MBC/055/13) referred to did form part of the initial site assessments and was identified as being potentially suitable and was ranked 6th out of 6 sites that were found to be suitable or potentially suitable. It is therefore accepted that the site did offer some potential, however in meeting the requirement set out for Waltham on the Wolds it was not required, due to other sites ranking higher accommodating the full requirement. In particular WAL1 and part of WAL2 both have the benefit of planning permission in place. There is no new information in the representations received that indicates that the draft housing allocations and reserve site</p>	No change

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>dwelling, which is supported by a range of technical assessments and reports in respect of the following key matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. - Traffic and transportation 2. - Access 3. - Flood Risk and Drainage 4. - Ecology 5. - Trees 6. - Landscape and Visual Impact 7. - Archaeology 8. - Agricultural Land Quality <p>There are no fundamental constraints to the development and that a range of housing options, including a policy compliant amount of affordable housing, could be delivered to meet local needs in the short term. In addition, a dialogue has been opened with Waltham-on-the-Wolds and Thorpe Arnold Parish Council to discuss this Site and to establish the views and specific requirements of the village in respect of housing delivery.</p>		<p>should be amended or replaced with others.</p>	
Barwood Homes	373	<p>it is unclear if a developer is committed to WAL2 which raises questions surrounding its deliverability.</p>		<p>Discussions have taken place with the agents acting on behalf of site WAL2 through the Update to the Site Assessments. The Local Plan team have been advised that the site is deliverable and the timescales have been set out for delivery within the first five years. There is no new information in the representations received that indicates that the draft housing allocations and</p>	<p>No change</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
				reserve site should be amended or replaced with others.	
Michelle Galloway, Pegasus Group (on behalf of K & A Watchorn & Sons)	416	<p>Pegasus Group act on behalf of 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. The site's allocation for residential development of 106 homes in the Pre-Submission Local Plan is fully supported. Of the 9 sites assessed by the Council in Waltham on the Wolds for potential residential development, the north and south parts of the site were ranked respectively as number 2 and number 3, with number 1 being land off High Street which already has consent for 26 new homes. This ranking exercise clearly demonstrates the site's performance against others in terms of suitability for development.</p> <p>Part of the site is fully committed under planning permission reference 15/01011/OUT, with the balance of the site subject to a live planning application (reference 16/00847/OUT). The landowners have clearly demonstrated their commitment to bringing forward the site forward for development with the considerable investment they have made in the preparation and submission of two outline planning applications. Sale of the consented site for 45 new homes has been agreed with a house builder and contracts are currently being drawn up.</p>	We would suggest that the Site Allocations and Policies in Appendix 1 should be included within the main body of the Local Plan. This would serve to make the Plan more coherent.	Support for this allocation is noted, and the current status of the site in terms of part having consent and a pending application on the remainder are useful in identifying deliverability. It is considered that it would be more useful if the site allocation plans were included only in one place, within the Local Plan for ease of reference. It is however considered appropriate to leave the text detail about each settlement in Appendix 1, with reference from the relevant policies to this text being clear in the policy text.	Suggested that the site allocation plans are included in one place, within the Local Plan for ease of reference and to avoid duplication. Therefore site allocation plans are to be removed from Appendix 1 and only identified on the Policies Map.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>The northern part of the site has outline planning permission for up to 45 new homes (planning application reference 15/01011/OUT). The applicant has signed up to a Section 106 Agreement that makes provision for contributions to making various improvements to existing facilities, including a contribution towards a new zebra crossing on Melton Road.</p> <p>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 proposes up to 60 new homes, together with access, landscaping and open space. Access is to be taken from the south of the site, via an upgrade to the existing Fair Field Industrial Park access road. The layout has been designed to assimilate with the design proposals for the land to the north, providing for a cohesive and high quality design solution for the site. Consideration has been given to the amenity of existing residents on Melton Road, with proposals for boundary treatment of 5 metres wide planting along the site's western boundary. The proposals provide for areas of surface water balancing and new areas of public open space. Existing footpath F1 is to be retained and enhanced within the layout. Further details can be found in the submitted Design and Access Statement (enclosed). The site performs well on sustainability assessment criteria and its development would not have an adverse impact on the local highways network. The site's location on the southern edge of Waltham on the Wolds</p>			

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>avoids the need for a significant volume of traffic to pass through the middle of the village along High Street.</p> <p>The planning permission and the pending planning application proposals conform fully with the requirements of draft allocation Policy WAL2. There are no technical or environmental issues that would preclude development of the site for housing. Pegasus Group has engaged with the Parish Council and the local community in formulating the development proposals for the site. The proposals have, where possible, taken into account residents' comments to formulate a layout that is appropriate for the site and its edge of village location.</p> <p>The Ecology Assessment submitted with the planning application identifies a small population of Great Crested Newts within ponds located to the west of Melton Road. Given the distance of the application site from the known population (over 100 metres), the site is considered unlikely to form a proportion of the terrestrial habitat which the small population requires in order to maintain its favourable conservation status. The presence of Great Crested Newts on the application site is therefore unlikely.</p> <p>It is recommended that this policy requirement be amended to: "The final layout and design of the site incorporates biodiversity enhancements and provides necessary mitigation for any loss of habitat on the site for the local great crested newt population."</p>			

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>The consented and pending application proposals for the site are fully in accordance with the other criteria set out in Policy WAL2 which refer to giving consideration in the proposals to the existing footpaths and providing appropriate mitigation based on flood risk and drainage assessments.</p> <p>We would suggest that the Site Allocations and Policies should be included within the main body of the Local Plan, and not as an Appendix. This would serve to make the Plan more coherent.</p>			
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	<p>WAL1-3 The size of the sites to the south of the settlement (WAL1-3) would potentially impact upon the character of the Conservation Area and great care would be required to manage this impact through design, layout and detailing. There is survival of ridge and furrow contributing to historic landscape character and the setting of designated assets and losses should be minimised. Impact upon the Grade I listed Church of St Mary Magdalene and The Old Mill (Grade II) to the north of WAL3 requires careful assessment. In particular in relation to WAL3 development should avoid compromising views of the Church of St Mary which contribute to its and the Conservation Area's significance. It is noted that WAL1 benefits from planning permission; if it was outline only reserved matters will allow for the design to take into account nearby heritage assets.</p>		<p>Melton Borough Council have engaged with Historic England and have agreed that Historic England and MBC will liaise and add an additional criterion to be provided by Historic England to be added to the policy.</p>	<p>Additional bullet point to be provided by Historic England shortly.</p>
Leicestershire	409	In the majority of cases the sites identified have no		Part of site WAL2 has outline planning	No change

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
County Council (Archaeology)		<p>specific heritage concern, although several are not without known heritage implications. In the latter context are BOT1, BOT4, CROX1, HAR1, HOS2 and 3, WAL1 and 2, WYM2, EAS1 and FRIS2.</p> <p>Development management decisions should give careful consideration to the heritage implications as required by national and local planning policy and informed by relevant guidance.</p>		<p>permission for 45 dwellings and another application is pending consideration on the remainder of the site. Detailed consideration of the impact of a development scheme on heritage assets would be required as part of a planning application in accordance with paragraphs 126 to 141 of the NPPF.</p>	
WAL3					
George Machin on behalf of Davidsons Development	392	<p>The assessment of this Reserve Site highlights that it is potentially out of scale with the current village and furthermore, “that appropriate flood and drainage assessments proposing mitigation effective to deal with the scale of the impacts identified” are required in support of any future proposal. There is no additional evidence to demonstrate that these technical issues, together with the scale of the site lead to this site being identified as the reserve site. In particular there is no evidence that the concerns highlighted by the Council in its own assessment of the Reserve Site, relating to the scale of this site in relation to Waltham itself would not result in a development which would undoubtedly impact detrimentally upon the existing village, by changing the fundamental character of the settlement and by overstretching its facilities and services.</p> <p>The allocation of this Site does not appear to offer a realistic development prospect for the future and actually appears to present a potentially damaging option, which has not been assessed in sufficient detail to determine its deliverability or</p>		<p>The site was ranked 3rd out of 6 sites that were considered suitable or potentially suitable. The limited visual impact as a result of this site being developed weighed in its favour and identified the site as 3rd preference. It was considered that a scheme could be developed for the site to mitigate any detrimental impacts. The impact of this site is currently being tested through the Development Management process as a planning application is pending consideration at the present time. There is no new information in the representations received that indicates that the draft housing allocations and reserve site should be amended or replaced with others.</p>	No change

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
		its possible impacts upon local facilities and infrastructure.			
Barwood Homes	373	<p>In respect of the proposed site allocations, we submit that more development should be allocated to Waltham on the Wolds. WAL3 should be a preferred site for development alongside the two already identified preferred allocations. This flexible approach would be more consistent with the overarching aims of national planning policy and the comments made in respect of the various SCRHS as identified above.</p> <p>WAL3 has a number of factors in support of its allocation as a preferred site for development over and above the currently proposed WAL2. WAL3 is being promoted by Barwood Homes and the site should thus be considered deliverable. A planning application for the development of WAL3 is in preparation and a pre-application enquiry is being considered by Melton Borough Council's Development Management team.</p> <p>In addition, the number of houses that could be achieved on WAL3 is higher than that which could be achieved on WAL2. In light of the Borough's deficit in housing land supply, development of WAL3 could meet the village's housing requirement in its entirety (and also make up for some of the shortfall from other villages) whilst also providing the opportunity to secure community benefits that other smaller developments in the village might not be able to deliver.</p>		The site was ranked 3 rd out of 6 sites that were considered suitable or potentially suitable. However in meeting the requirement set out for Waltham on the Wolds it was not required to be allocated and therefore was identified as a reserve site should other sites that are allocated fail to come forward in the future. In particular WAL1 and part of WAL2 both have the benefit of planning permission in place and therefore are ranked higher in terms of deliverability. There is no new information in the representations received that indicates that the draft housing allocations and reserve site should be amended or replaced with others.	No change

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	<p>WAL1-3</p> <p>All proposed sites are adjacent to the Conservation Area, as noted within the village assessment. The size of the sites to the south of the settlement (WAL1-3) would potentially impact upon the character of the Conservation Area and great care would be required to manage this impact through design, layout and detailing. There is survival of ridge and furrow contributing to historic landscape character and the setting of designated assets and losses should be minimised. Impact upon the Grade I listed Church of St Mary Magdalene and The Old Mill (Grade II) to the north of WAL3 requires careful assessment. In particular in relation to WAL3 development should avoid compromising views of the Church of St Mary which contribute to its and the Conservation Area's significance. It is noted that WAL1 benefits from planning permission; it was unclear if it was outline only; if so, reserved matters will allow for the design to take into account nearby heritage assets.</p>		<p>Site Appraisal methodology gave consideration to the proximity of heritage assets to sites. Detailed consideration of the impact of a development scheme on heritage assets would be required as part of a planning application in accordance with paragraphs 126 to 141 of the NPPF.</p>	No change
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	409	<p>Policy C1(B) The majority of the sites identified have no specific heritage concern, however WAL3 is likely to pose significant heritage concerns due to its known proximity to recorded heritage assets.</p>		<p>Further information has been requested from LCC Archaeology as to the potential impact and more detail on the heritage concerns raised as there is insufficient information or evidence currently to demonstrate that the whole site would be impacted upon. No further information has been received at this point. The Development Management process would deal with this in</p>	No change

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
				accordance with paragraphs 126 – 141 of the NPPF and identify any archaeological works and recording required in order to deal with the constraint. A current planning application is pending consideration and MBC are awaiting comments from LCC Archaeology at the present time.	
Martin S Herbert (Brown & Co) on behalf of M Hill, P Hill, Mrs M Hyde & Mrs P Pickup	413	We object to most of the reserved sites suggested on the basis that they are not sustainable and will not help to deliver the infrastructure as much as the site which we are promoting Site MBC/049/13. To advocate, for example, a further growth of 168 houses in Waltham (Site MBC/192/15), for example, and some of the other village locations is inappropriate and would not be in accordance with the Spatial Strategy given the predominance of sites proposed within the villages. The only proposal for Melton site MBC/153/15 is in alternative use and there are other more sustainable locations generally for the growth to occur.		The spatial strategy set out the Local Plan looks to provide sustainable growth across the Borough, directing growth of around 65% in the town and the remaining 35% across the Borough in the more sustainable villages which have been identified in the Settlement Roles study as either Service Centre or Rural Hubs. A proportionate approach to the requirement for each of these settlements was identified. In settlements where there were more suitable sites than were required, one site in these villages, the next ranked was identified as a reserve site in order to provide flexibility in the Plan so should another site in a Service Centre or Rural Hub fail to deliver, reserve sites would be there to bridge the supply gap. The NPPF requires that flexibility is built in to the Plan to respond to changing circumstances. There is no new information in the representations received that indicates that the draft housing allocations and reserve site	No change

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed Change or Suggested modifications (MBC)
				should be amended or replaced with others.	
Maurice Fairhurst	73	It is not clear when planning permissions will be granted on these sites. These sites have been chosen from a consideration of SHLAA submissions rather than an analysis of the capacity of each settlement. As a result, some sites have not been fully evaluated or even considered. Certain reserved sites are too large or are poorly related to the built structure of the settlement and will have serious damaging impacts on their character and rural setting. (eg in Old Dalby, Long Clawson, Frisby, Somerby, Harby and Waltham)		<p>Policy C1b states that proposals for new housing development on the reserve sites listed which help to meet the development needs of the Borough and secure the sustainability of the settlement, will be approved where the proposal helps to meet the identified housing target for the settlement, and it is demonstrated that allocated sites and existing permissions are unable to do so.</p> <p>All sites identified as reserve sites have been through the same level of assessment as allocated sites including calculations relating to net developable areas and potential capacities. All reserve sites were assessed as either being suitable or potentially suitable and once the allocation requirement was met, the next site in the ranking was identified as the reserve site. One of the benefits of site WAL3 was that it had less visual impact than other sites that didn't perform as well in the ranking of the sites in Waltham on the Wolds. There is no new information in the representations received that indicates that the draft housing allocations and reserve site should be amended or replaced with others.</p>	No change