

Chapter 4, Policy SS1

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Proposed Change or Suggested Modifications
A.Thomas	304	1.10 There may be a 'Duty to Cooperate' but the powers that be do not appear to be listening to opinions of local residents, (at least not in Long Clawson anyway)	There may be a 'Duty to Cooperate' but the powers that be do not appear to be listening to opinions of local residents, (at least not in Long Clawson anyway)	The bodies to which the Duty to Co-operate applies are set out in regulations, and does not include local residents. The regulations setting out the minimum requirements for community engagement are set out separately and complemented by the Council's own Statement of Community Involvement. The MLP Community Consultation and Engagement Statement sets out what the Council has done. The Council considers that this is sufficient and exceeds regulatory requirements and any commitments set out in the SCI.	None.
Andrew Granger & Co Ltd	368	In respect of Policy SS1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, we strongly support the inclusion of this policy within the new Melton Local Plan in line with Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework. We propose that the proposal for the erection of 15 dwellings should be considered in light of this policy in that it will deliver new homes on a site where the principle of development has been accepted and in a location where local services are readily available. On behalf of our client, we are seeking to work with Melton Borough Council in promoting the subject site Land off Canal Lane, Hose (Appendix 1), for a residential development scheme.		Support noted. Site specific comments have been dealt with under the appropriate part of Policy C1 elsewhere.	None.
Carl Powell	231	This policy says the council will 'always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible'. This is a deliberate policy to maximise enterprise opportunities for developers whilst making it harder for existing people to object. It is biased to the advantage of commercial developers. Pre-determination in advance of due process is illegal. Not every development that is 'possible' is necessarily good. Our Council exists only partly to implement policies from central government; it also exists to represent local opinion to central government. In the rural areas (perhaps in Melton Town as well, I don't know) this policy is unrepresentative of local opinion.	Rewrite as '[The Council} will always work proactively with applicants and residents, giving equal weight to both, jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible'. This would remove any possible perception of pre-determination and provide more sound basis for planning decisions.	The inclusion of this policy in the plan is to reflect national best practice in plan making. The wording reflects and in some parts repeats the presumption in favour of sustainable development that is at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework.	None.
Christopher Noakes	208	Reference should be included in the Policy that proposals which do not accord with it will be refused (as indicated in NPPF)	Policy SS1: insert wording between 'delay' and 'unless', namely: 'whereas proposals which conflict with these policies will be refused'.	The NPPF and supporting Planning Practice Guidance indicates that policies should be framed positively. The wording suggested would be negatively framed. The wording suggested would also not be appropriate because in determining planning applications there can be other material considerations to take into account, as well as considering adopted development plan policies.	None.
Colin Love	173	Whilst acknowledging the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development, sustainability is, in itself, is an inadequate consideration. The Melton Plan must make sure that, however 'sustainable' a development might promise to be, it should not be granted permission unless it also meets all of the high quality design criteria including appropriateness to the local setting, referred to in other sections of this document, for example Policy D1.		Policy D1 and the whole of Section 9.4 of the draft local plan reflects the importance attached to good high quality design in the local plan. Once adopted, the policy will need to be considered in determining all planning applications, alongside all other relevant adopted development plan policies and other material considerations. The Council's LDS also indicates that a SPD will be prepared to provide more detailed advice and guidance about what is considered to be good design in a local context.	None.
David Adams	1	There is some contradiction between the final sentence on this page		Policy SS1 and the Jacobs report are in accord with one another	None.

		and the comments made in "Jacob's Impact Study 13/10/14" which suggests that "mitigation needs to be of demonstrably sufficient magnitude.....growth strategy for the town" "If this is not achieved.....the development cannot be considered sustainable"		- they both confirm that benefits have to outweigh any harm that cannot be mitigated.	
Diane Orson	214	The policy does not reflect the wishes of those in the community where the application is put forward. It does not take into account the neighbourhood plan of that area Surely where neighbourhood plans are encouraged they should be taken into account when considering the future of that community		The views of local people were taken into account during plan preparation, and the efforts to do this and the outcomes are documented in the Council's MLP Community Consultation and Engagement Statement, 2016 and 2017 refresh addendum. There are no 'made' neighbourhood plans in the Borough yet. It would not be sensible for the Council to rely on the contents of draft NPs in its local plan as for a variety of reasons, e.g. absence of evidence of deliverable sites, these may not ultimately become part of a 'made' NP.	None.
Hazelton Homes	396	In respect of Policy SS1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, we strongly support the inclusion of this policy within the new Melton Local Plan in line with Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.		Support noted. Site specific comments have been dealt with under the appropriate part of Policy C1 elsewhere.	None.
LCC (Highways, Education, Early Years, Waste, Property Assets, LLFA, Libraries & Culture, LRERC)	405	Spatial Strategy 25. Policy SS1 is supported as it is seen to embrace the core principles at the heart of the NPPF as set out at paragraph 14.		Noted and welcomed.	None.
Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	407	we strongly support the inclusion of this policy within the new Melton Local Plan in line with Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.		Noted and welcomed.	None.
Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance,	408	we strongly support the inclusion of this policy within the new Melton Local Plan in line with Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.		Noted and welcomed.	None.
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	409	Policy SS1 - Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development We support the recognised need to improve environmental conditions including factors affecting the historic environment. We also affirm the need to take account of material considerations when determining applications.		Noted and welcomed.	None.
Lance Wiggins (on behalf of G S Developments (Leicester) Ltd	411	Page 24 paragraph 4.2.1 outlines the Objectively Assessed Housing Need for Melton Borough (245 new dwellings per annum). This figure is used as a basis for the housing targets and allocations in the Draft Plan. It is recognised later in the document that should this figure increase (as is likely taking into account higher migration and current demographics) then the Plan could be subject of later review. Whilst it is accepted that this is a reasonable approach, an alteration to policy SS6 (Alternate Development Strategies and Local		Policy SS6 does not preclude the consideration of locations other than those mentioned should the need for a local plan review be triggered. The 65%:35% split between new housing development in Melton Mowbray and the rural areas achieves the best outcomes overall when assessed against the local plan priorities and sustainability objectives, and has a reasonable prospect of achieving the rate of housing delivery that is needed to support growth.	None.

		<p>Plan Review) whereby, in addition to, or instead of, reference to land west of Melton Mowbray would be a more positive approach. This alternative approach would give encouragement to the identification and promotion of other potential sites (over and above the allocated sites in Policy C1) in the most sustainable location in the Borough, including previously developed land.</p> <p>Page 28 paragraph 4.2.11 - the provision of a 70%/30% split in favour of Melton Mowbray would achieve a greater focus on the settlement with the greatest number and range of services and facilities whilst, at the same time, avoiding use of some greenfield sites in less sustainable locations (including rural hubs). It is noted from Tables 4 - 7 inclusive that the number of dwellings being envisaged in the Service Centres and in some Rural Hubs is significant and however well-chosen the final sites are in these settlements, the proposed distribution will give rise to a degree of harm to the character and appearance of these settlements. This could be mitigated by a revised distribution as described above.</p>			
Melanie Steadman	284	<p>As previously mentioned, the Neighbourhood Plan group had a meeting with Mr P Reid on 29th May 2016. He was presented with a "fact pack" on Long Clawson. Within this was documented proof (from Melton Borough Council's own records) that both the culverts in the village were unfit for purpose and unsustainable. These surveys were done some 10 years ago. With the advent of creep development within the village, land drainage issues on development sites requiring land drainage and bad planning decisions, this situation has worsened and the property flooding still continues. This situation is worsening and we still have 30% climate change to look forward to.</p> <p>Raw sewerage now bubbles up into the main road after heavy rainfall. This has happened 3 times this year already. The surface water drain take an overland route to The Sands as their capacity is insufficient.</p> <p>Our school, a capacity of 105 pupils, currently has 109 pupils. The Education Authority's projection for 2021 is that there will be a deficit of 14 place - this is without further development. The school is on a restricted site, sits in the middle of the conservation area and is unlikely to get the £1.4m needed for an extension from S106 contributions. One suggestion is that the children are bussed to nearby villages, this would fragment our community, it would mean that 4 year olds would be put on school busses and is not a "sustainable" solution to this problem. With the 127 houses we are assigned in the Melton Plan, this would take our pupil figures of 149. The hard standing in the playground (which is all they can use in winter as the grass is too boggy) would mean that each child had a play-time outdoor space of 4.6 m2.</p>	<p>In my opinion, from a sustainability point of view, Melton Borough Council need to start again, right back at the beginning. They should have had greater consultation within the villages and listened to the input of residents, and residents' groups.</p> <p>If they are not prepared to take the time to do this then they should consider other, sustainable, custom made sites, preferably south of Melton nearer to the industry base that they have planned, which would make the transport aspect more feasible from a sustainable view point.</p>	<p>The issues of drainage, traffic, availability of school places, car parking and access for people with disabilities are noted. Any existing problems of infrastructure capacity are not for new development to resolve - the Council can only seek contributions that are fairly and reasonably related to the development and mitigate impacts arising from the development. It is for the responsible infrastructure bodies to assess and address existing problems. With the exception of the LEA and the CCG, no infrastructure constraints were identified by the infrastructure providers either when the Infrastructure Delivery Plan was first drafted in October 2016 not again during its Spring 2017 refresh. Potential approaches to both the health and school places issues arising from any new planned development have been identified.</p>	None.

		<p>In addition to this, we presented our speed watch survey results which indicate that our road system is already beyond capacity. The doctor's surgery is situated within the centre of the village together with the school, pub, shop and crèche. There are some 25 - 35 cars that appear every morning, parking over the dropped kerbs, village greens, footpaths and junctions to service these industries. In addition to this there are the patients and customers. Although the surgery may have capacity to take on further patients from the 24 villages that it services, our village does not. This is a pedestrian hazard, as we cannot use the pavement and have to cross the main road from between parked cars. For wheelchair and pushchair users, they are forced to use the road. This is causing isolation within the village for our more vulnerable residents.</p>			
<p>Melton North Action Group MNAG</p>	<p>414</p>	<p>Policy SS1 Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development In Jacob's "Cumulative Development Impact Study 13/10/2014" on the subject of development within the town it said</p> <p>"Given the limited spare capacity, and amount of development proposed, this mitigation needs to be of demonstrably sufficient magnitude to not only mitigate the impacts of the development itself, but also contribute to a wider benefit for residents and as part of the overall growth strategy for the town."</p> <p>"If this is not achieved, then the evidence within this document shows that the development cannot be considered sustainable."</p> <p>Page 3: submission by Melton North Action Group to the Melton Local Plan Pre-Submission Draft (November 2016)</p> <p>Given that this report was prepared on the basis that the "current year" used by Jacobs in this report was 2011, and that the "primary year" for cumulative impact assessments for Melton was 2031, and taking into account that for the purpose of this report a projected</p>		<p>The Jacobs 2016 transport modelling was for more than the amount of new development that is being planned in this local plan period. The prospects for securing Government funding for parts of the MMDR have much improved since the draft local plan was prepared and a new draft policy specifically dealing with the Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy is now being proposed as a change to the draft local plan. The draft policy also indicates that compulsory purchase powers will be used to deliver the MMDR if development and/or funding does not materialise as envisaged. Alternatives, such as Six Hills were considered as options early in the plan preparation period, but did not perform as well when assessed against the local plan priorities and sustainability objectives as the spatial strategy that forms part of the draft local plan.</p>	<p>A change is proposed to include a new policy specifically dealing with then Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy in the draft local plan.</p>

		<p>figure of 2,550 new homes in and around the town was used, surely that begs the question</p> <p>as to how the council can now consider between 4,000 and 5,000 new homes in and around</p> <p>the town. The report clearly states that with only half the current projected figure for new</p> <p>homes, the impact on the town would be so severe as to deem the development of 2,550</p> <p>new homes unsustainable without major investment in infrastructure. The 4,000 to 5,000</p> <p>(figures seem to vary depending upon which document you read) new homes planned for</p> <p>the town in the Draft Local Plan account for 65% of all new homes for the borough of Melton.</p> <p>If, as is clearly indicated, the two Sustainable Neighbourhoods cannot be considered</p> <p>sustainable unless appropriate road and other infrastructure is in place, and IF (and</p> <p>it is a big IF) the council manages to secure Central Government funding for a fully</p> <p>connected Distributor Road, building of the links to join up the various sections of the road to</p> <p>make it a viable Distributor road is not likely to start until 2022 at the earliest. This makes the</p> <p>Draft Local Plan unsound as the Sustainable Neighbourhoods are potentially unsustainable;</p> <p>unjustified as insufficient consideration has been given to alternative sites e.g. Six Hills,</p> <p>and the west of Melton (as proposed by the Inspector in 2013); and ineffective as it relies</p> <p>on Central Government funding some six years down the line which can be neither</p> <p>predicted nor assumed particularly as there will be by then a new Government in power.</p>			
Mrs Elaine	69	Local Green Spaces convenient to village amenities should be		Are Buckminster and Sewsteern Rural Hubs or rural	

Exton		<p>released for development or villages will become stifled and not allowed to grow during the term of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Previous restrictions have led to an increase of only 5 dwellings in the last 70 years in Sewstern alone. Property does not often come to the market as 40% are let in Sewstern and most of Buckminster.</p> <p>[See Supporting Documents - No 56]</p>		settlements? If so it is the SS3 answer.	
MRS NICOLA MORLEY	204	<p>the whole ethos -</p> <p>of Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the national planning policy framework taken as a whole; or Specific policies in that framework indicate that development should be restricted</p> <p>by increasing somerby so greatly it will destroy everything it as a SMALL village offers, the village high street main through road is a nightmare to navigate and on a daily basis people's vehicles are damaged as it is, there's always traffic jams and through out every day there's always chaos as it is. The area is a hub of tourism due to riding and the countryside, these developments are especially detrimental to that</p>	see above	The local highway authority has not indicated it has any problems with the overall growth and spatial strategy set out in the draft plan, and has not indicated that the capacity of highways puts any particular constraints on new development in Somerby. It has indicated that it is content to deal with highway issues through the development management process when any planning applications for new development are submitted.	None.
Mrs P J Marshall	187	<p>I feel that development in Bottesford has been left to get out of control with no thought to the impact on the existing amenities in the village (and this being the main thrust of the whole plan) to turn the village into a town while there is no development nearer to Melton which is in fact the town. We have no great travel service from our village and so cars would be used thus a great impact on our environment and the surrounding roads.</p> <p>Our drainage system that is already under strain will be more so, also the fact that a vast majority of our village is on flood plain does not seem at all to be taken in consideration. we have had a development approved recently that sits on flood plain and is being built on now with no adjustment to the plans for this just having them raise up the ground level by several feet with no thought for the surrounding properties and the impact on the environment. how this was allowed to go through with no adjustment is amazing.</p>		The amount of new development land that has been identified for Bottesford has been arrived at, by the same means as it has for all other settlements identified as 'service centres'. The methodology is set out briefly in the reasoned justification to Policy SS2, SS3 and to C1(A), and in more detail in evidence documents, such as the Settlement Roles and relationships study and the housing site assessment study. These take account of site constraints, and access to services and facilities and infrastructure. A proposed change to C1(A) in response to new information reduces the amount of allocated land at Bottesford.	None in response to this representation.
Norman Hoskins	138	See previous comment	See previous comment	Noted.	None.
Peter Bailey	8	NHS centralisation issues as identified in Chapter 2.	NHS centralisation issues as identified in Chapter 2.	NHS centralisation is a national policy that the local plan cannot challenge. The local plan has a role in making sure that the plans of health providers to meet the health needs of the local population can be delivered, if new land or premises, or intensification of use is needed.	None.

Peter Wheeler	348	<p>1. Rural hub or settlement?</p> <p>In the original draft plan Gaddesby was deemed to be a “rural supporter”. A rural supporter is identified by a clear scoring methodology. Attached is a copy of the scoring methodology, role and function of settlements, roles and spatial analysis together with the scores themselves taken from the Melton Local Plan Settlement Roles and Relationships of April 2015 (MLPSRR).</p> <p>It will be seen that the criteria used were much more extensive and sophisticated than the four used in the latest draft plan and that Gaddesby was very much at the lower end of the rural supporter range of 10 to 20 points with 12. Why the change?</p> <p>Not only therefore has Gaddesby been “upgraded” but also it is proposed to assign to Gaddesby a greater proportionate increase in housing than any other village (see 4 below).</p> <p>Of the four current criteria comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary school – agreed • Access to employment opportunities – not agreed for the reasons set out in 8 and 9 below • Fast broadband – not accepted – see 10 below • Community building – agreed <p>Therefore Gaddesby does not enjoy the requisite three of the four criteria to qualify as a rural hub and should therefore be classed as a rural settlement. The methodology now proposed is unacceptable as being simplistic and unsound.</p> <p>The criteria should include more day to day facilities in the methodology such as a food shop, GP surgery, library, post office, primary school and pub. Not many rural villages will have employment facilities, those that do should be higher up the hierarchy and receive more development, and that facilities such as a food shop and doctors surgery are just as important as broadband in reducing the need to travel. There should also be more</p>	<p>Provision of fibreoptic cable to each extant home is currently required for good service. BT, who now monopolize the service, should be required to put this in place before the copper wire service is further challenged through extending demand.</p>	<p>Comments about the role of Gaddesby are dealt with in responses under Policy SS2. Regarding broadband, the Council cannot demand this through the local plan. Policy IN3 sets out how the local plan is seeking to ensure that there will be superfast broadband in new housing developments.</p>	None.
---------------	-----	--	---	--	-------

differentiation between the settlements, perhaps a return to the Primary and Secondary Services Centres previously proposed.

2. Housing needs survey

A housing needs survey has not yet been carried out by Melton Council. Apparently the Council are to carry this out in the New Year (2017). If so how can it be said that there is a need for housing in Gaddesby?

3. Existing permissions currently un-built

The Council have taken into account the 14 permitted dwellings at GADD1 but have not taken into account the 5 houses for which permission has been granted on Ashby Road (12/00530/FUL) and the one further dwelling at The Hall (15/00826/FUL). Accordingly, in reality Gaddesby has already been allocated 6 houses which, when added to the 55 houses allocated in the daft plan, takes the total allocation to 61 new houses. This cannot be sustained or justified for the reasons set out in there representations.

4. Natural growth

At Appendix 2 of MLPSSR it will be seen that over the period 1994 to 2014 on average one new house was built in the village every year. On the assumption that this continues and additional 20 houses will be built over the life of the Plan.

5. Percentages

If one looks at paras 4.2.21 and 22 of the draft Plan it will be seen that Gaddesby has markedly higher percentage of proposed housing than any of the other villages. There are currently 158 houses in the village itself. An increase of 61 would be a 38.6% increase and would clearly change the nature of the village. When the additional 20 houses likely to be built from "natural growth" are included, this pushes the figure up to an increase of 51.2%. The calculation by estimated population of the villages at 4.2.21 and 4.2.22 of the draft plan is unsound. It is the number of houses which is material.

6. Highways

The A607 is already a very busy road as it leads to the Hobby Horse roundabout and the A46. Both these roads are over capacity certainly. It is not unusual to be queuing from Syston/Queniborough/East Goscote all the way to the Hobby Horse. The junction between Gaddesby Lane and the A607 is very dangerous and one sometimes has to wait minutes to join the A607.

In addition, Rearsby Lane (which connects Gaddesby Lane to Ashby Road) is a busy, narrow and winding road with is already unsuitable for the existing traffic burden placed on it. If the 61 (or more) houses were built this is likely to add another 120 plus cars to the mix. This impact has not been assessed by the Plan.

7. Weight limit

There is a weight limit throughout Gaddesby of 7.5 tonnes, which demonstrates how minor the roads are into the village.

8. Buses

The suggestion that the 100 bus service can be used to get to work is incorrect. The 100 bus service runs very infrequently and does not run at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Gaddesby is the closest settlement in the Borough to Leicester and it is there that most people go to work rather than to Melton. We called a village meeting to discuss the plan and 74 villagers attended, when we asked for a show of hands not one indicated they work in Melton. The only suitable bus to Leicester leaves Gaddesby at 07.49 and the last bus leaves Leicester at 17:10. In other words it is impossible to use the bus to attend work full time in Leicester. Further Leicestershire County Council will review the contract next year (2017) and there is a risk that it will be withdrawn.

9. Employment

The suggestion that there is access to employment opportunities is incorrect and requires re-assessment because of the lack of public transport. There is minimal employment within Gaddesby itself.

		<p>10. Broadband</p> <p>Gaddesby's phone exchange has been "upgraded" in 2016 as part of the "super-fast" Leicestershire program. It has added support for Fibre to the Cabinet broadband. There isn't a lot of choice of provider; the majority of residents are using BT.</p> <p>This broadband service is sold as "up to" 56Mbps download speed, which is more than adequate for an average modern home. The actual delivered speed of writing is 20Mbps or 40% of the advertised maximum, which is the same as the pre-upgrade ADSL offering. Given this failure to perform under the existing load of the village and surrounding areas, any additional load is likely to make the service deteriorate further. Many existing residents have not yet upgraded to fibre broadband, which means that when they do, this would increase the load further thereby reducing the actual delivered speed further.</p> <p>In the neighbouring village of Queniborough, the broadband speeds can be over double the delivered speed in Gaddesby.</p> <p>11. The School</p> <p>Only in 2014 did the school intake increase to 25 each year from 15. Years 2, 1 and reception are therefore already at capacity. The catchment area for the school includes Barsby, South Croxton, Ashby Folville and almost to Queniborough and attracts pupils from further afield. Within 4 years the school will be at capacity and therefore there is no requirement to fill spaces with new families coming into the village. Having only recently been substantially extended, it is unrealistic to suggest that the school will be capable of further expansion in the short/medium term.</p>			
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	429	<p>The adoption of a policy such as this makes it imperative that the proposals in the MLP are correct at the outset.</p> <p>The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment, June 2014 table 85 p186 showed a range of possible housing needs for Melton Borough of between 195 and 245 homes per year (4875 and 6125 respectively over the Plan period). The Plan, in 4.2.1, claims that the higher build rate was 'objectively assessed' to cover maximum growth. This decision was at a time when adequate land for building at this rate and meeting the 5 year</p>		The 2014 SHMA has been replaced by the 2017 HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement for Melton Report (2017) as the evidence base for the local plan housing requirement. Higher and lower housing requirements were considered but performed less well against the key local plan and sustainability objectives, and in complying with national policy. Updated housing site assessment work has established that a five year housing land supply can be achieved with the spatial strategy and housing land allocations proposed, and as amended by the proposed change to Policy C1.	None.

		land supply target was not available The figure of 6125 over the plan period is a maximum at the moment but could have been reduced for the first 5 years so that there was a reduced 5 year land supply figure until there was some clarity about development sites, their constraints and deliverability.			
Richard Simon	266	<p>Overview</p> <p>I wish to object to some of the contents of this Draft Melton Local Plan. This objection relates to the methodology of allocation of houses with particular reference to the Urban-rural split and the distribution of houses in the rural settlements.</p> <p>As I live in Bottesford the proposals as set out in the Draft Melton Local Plan have a particular significance for me.</p> <p>If the proposed allocation for Bottesford plus those houses built since 2011 and an element of the windfall construction are taken into account, the total build within the Parish could reach 500 dwellings and increase the size of the Parish by 33%.</p> <p>The location of Bottesford in relation to Melton and in particular, the flood risk to the Parish seems to have been largely ignored.</p> <p>I fully accept that an element of house building is necessary and was content with the figure of 300 new dwellings up to 2036. However, this increase to 447 is unacceptable. Reducing the number to that which has been put forward by Melton Borough Council in the Emerging Options, namely a residual requirement of 300 dwellings to be built in the Plan Period to 2036 would be acceptable. This figure is higher than the number allocated to any other village in the Borough. Given the flood risk to the Parish this is a more than reasonable maximum number.</p> <p>I fully recognise that it is in the interest of Melton Borough Council and all Parish Councils in the Borough that a Local Plan should be successful and the ramifications should it fail. I am not a Planner so I hope you will not think this presumptuous of me but would be happy to discuss the contents of this with you if that would be helpful.</p> <p>I have looked at each chapter of the Draft Melton Local Plan and comments made where appropriate. There is a lot of good in the Plan and I have made clear where I support the proposals but the area of my objection cannot, on balance, be consoled by those points.</p> <p>I object to the plan on Soundness alone:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Process of Allocating Housing (Soundness) 2. Inadequacy of Consultation (Soundness) 		<p>The 65%:35% urban:rural split was one of several spatial strategy options tested. It was selected because it gave the best outcomes for achieving the local plan priorities and sustainability objectives. Flood risk has been taken into account in all the site assessments and a Flood Risk Sequential and Exceptions Test document, which sets out how flood risk has been considered throughout site selection. Proposed change to Policy C1(A) reduces the residual requirement to 324 dwellings. Positive comments about sections of the plan noted and welcomed. The process of allocating housing reflects population and the presence/absence of key services in each of the villages, as well as the spatial strategy. The range and choice of sites included in the allocations also helps to ensure there will be a five year supply of deliverable land. The Proposed Change to Policy C1 now includes allocations in Scalford and Graeat Dalby so no reallocation of numbers from those areas is now needed. The spatial strategy achieves a balance between several sustainability factors and LP objectives, and takes account of deliverability and the requirements of national planning policy. Reducing the need to travel is part of that mix, as is sustaining village schools. The population for each settlement was arrived at on a consistent basis. The consultations carried out by the Council during all stages of local plan preparation are detailed in its published consultation statement. It shows that the consultation undertaken exceeds significantly the requirements for plan making set out in regulations. Residents of Bottesford did attend the Reference Groups and it was explained at the outset that there were a range of interests at the meetings. There have been many other ways to comment or find out more about the plan, e.g. via www.meltonplan.co.uk other than attending a public meeting, and these have been widely used by others. The Council has engaged with neighbouring local authorities regarding planned growth and this engagement is detailed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement. The increased demand for public transport services arising from new housing development can only help to secure improvements. None of the service or utility providers have indicated a lack of capacity in Bottesford, and the local highway authority has not indicated that there are any traffic issues that need to be resolved for Bottesford as a whole. The SHMA referred to has now been replaced by the HEDNA and Towards a Housing Requirement for Melton as the key documents underpinning the Borough's overall housing requirement, and a Proposed change to the reasoned justification of Policy SS2 sets this out.</p>	<p>Proposed changes to Policy C1(A) and to the reasoned justification to Policy SS2 may satisfy some of the matters raised in this representation.</p>

3. Service Inadequacy in Bottesford (Soundness)

Process of allocating housing

The process used in allocating houses across the Borough lacks the strategy that one would expect over a 20 year Plan.

The numbers split between Melton Mowbray and the rural areas seems arbitrary and without foundation. The numbers allocated to Melton Mowbray are inadequate to complete the infrastructure that is required. Additional housing in the town will not only allow the improvement in facilities but will allow MBC to meet their objectives and make the town more competitive with surrounding larger towns. A minimum of 70% of housing development should be in Melton Mowbray town.

The allocation of new homes to each village needs refining and is again largely arbitrary. Villages are classified into service centres, rural hubs and rural settlements on the basis of the simple existence of services regardless of their adequacy. Bottesford has a number of constraints not least Flood Risk and the allocation does not appear to recognise this fact.

The allocation of housing to only 19 of the 74 villages in the Borough without a thorough investigation of the adequacy or utilisation of the facilities is not in line with sustainable development. Moreover allocating such small numbers to windfall developments will be insufficient to fund any improvements to facilities in order to make those locations more sustainable. With extra houses through windfall they will become less sustainable.

In the initial allocation based on population it was discovered that 5 villages did not have enough sites identified in the SHLAA to deliver their allocation. The deficit of 162 homes was reassigned to other villages, again on the basis of population. There is a reserve site at Melton and this should have been considered for use rather than re-allocate to the rural areas which are far less sustainable than Melton Mowbray.

There are reserve sites for over 540 dwellings identified in Policy C1(B) It is unclear why some of these sites should not be used to address any shortfall.

There is certain logic to putting all the rural housing at the larger villages but there is also a need for smaller communities to grow to maintain services, for example, to prevent the loss of a village school. In effect, the process prevents the emergence of new

	<p>sustainable communities. It must include a recognition that some communities are already near to their optimum size and others could grow more in order to attract more services and facilities.</p> <p>There is no strategy to minimise car miles by concentrating building at locations closer to Melton Mowbray which is by far the most sustainable location in the Borough. This would also support the plan to provide more employment opportunities in the area where all the business expansion in the Borough is to take place. Some villages close to Melton have reserve sites which could be used.</p> <p>In addition, Bottesford is remote from Melton Mowbray, and apart from taxation it contributes little to the Borough's economy. Bottesford residents use Grantham, Bingham, Newark and Nottingham for employment, leisure and retail rather than Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>Bottesford has seen an increase in the allocated housing of almost 50% from 300 dwellings as the residual amount calculated from the Emerging Options document (January 2016) to a figure of 447 in the November 2016 Draft Melton Local Plan. In addition the numbers on the Rectory Farm site at Bottesford were reduced without real justification and contributed to the increase in the number of sites necessary in the Parish from 2 to 9. (BOT2 and BOT3 are each comprised of two separate sites)</p> <p>If the 147 additional homes proposed for Bottesford were reallocated to Melton Mowbray Town it would have far less impact on the Borough and would actually help in funding the infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>There is an error in the population figure for Bottesford. Whereas each of the four villages is considered separately the total population of the Parish has been credited to Bottesford village and this used for the allocation of houses. This is almost an 18% increase in the housing allocation and needs to be rectified.</p> <p>A number of sites rejected at the Emerging Options stage have reappeared as potential sites spread across Bottesford and Easthorpe. As an example, sites located in Areas of Separation between Bottesford and Easthorpe and Bottesford and Normanton have been proposed for development in the Draft Plan. Given the sound principles in the Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 these proposals are difficult to understand and I object to the erosion of the Areas of Separation in this way.</p> <p>The SHLAA process is too coarse to allow villages to grow in a planned way rather by what land is available and deliverable. Greater assessment in terms of village planning needs to be carried out on SHLAA sites and this should be a role for MBC.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

I have contributed to the Bottesford Parish Neighbourhood Plan and I know that some of the sites put forward in the DMLP have found little favour in the village. It is a shame that more attention had not been paid in this DMLP to local views and wishes.

I find the above process NOT SOUND

Inadequacy of Consultation

The process of consultation during the development of the Draft Plan was lacking or inadequate in the ways listed below.

The Emerging Options (published January 2016) indicated that the residual number of houses allocated to Bottesford was 370 over the Plan period, the residual being 300 new dwellings. When the Draft Plan was published this number was increased to 447 without any consultation.

The Draft Plan also allows for windfall developments and these could result in even more homes being built in Bottesford.

There will be no public consultation meeting on the Draft Plan scheduled for the Parish during the consultation period. This is totally unacceptable given that Bottesford was allocated the largest number of houses of any village in Melton Borough. Failure to give people a local meeting, to help them understand the reasons for the Plan contents, weakens the consultation process.

Reference Groups met in Melton Mowbray this made it was easier for town residents to be involved in them; was there an adequate check that rural areas of the Borough were adequately represented?

At later meetings of the Reference Groups, Developers and landowners attended and were not required either to identify themselves and/or to declare any financial interest. This is unacceptable. The influence of builder and developer interests was unclear and might have been excessive. There was a Barratts' manager there who had already expressed a particular interest in building at Bottesford and he was even allowed to speak for his table!

The two Bottesford Ward Councillors, one as Chair of the Melton Plan Working Group and the other as Mayor, were unable to represent the views and interests of their constituents. The Working Group Chairman has fervently expressed her desire for more housing in Bottesford, contradicting the views of residents as expressed in responses to the November 2015 Survey/Questionnaire carried out by Bottesford Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering

Group. Bottesford Parish therefore had no objective representation at the Working Group or Full Borough Council. Perhaps that is why Bottesford ended up with so many extra houses.

Paragraph 2.2.3 of the Draft Plan states that, for housing, Bottesford relates more closely to Nottingham and Grantham than Melton and Leicestershire. Building at Bottesford is therefore likely to contribute far less to MBCs strategic objectives than places closer to Melton Mowbray.

There are substantial housing developments planned for Bottesford's neighbouring Districts. Both Grantham and Newark have very large schemes near the A1 and Rushcliffe has a large house building program to the west of Bottesford. The reports of meetings with these authorities seem sparse in the supporting information but I would hope that contrary to this adequate consultation has taken place otherwise I would have to find this not legally compliant. However on this you have the benefit of the doubt.

I find the consultation process NOT SOUND

Service Inadequacy and constraints in Bottesford.

I find the Draft Melton Local Plan 'Melton Centric'. There is a lot of work identified with infrastructure at Melton Mowbray but when half of the Borough's population live in the villages there appears to have no attempt to identify what facilities are necessary to ease the proposed increase in housing in each of the rural settlements.

Although Bottesford is the second largest settlement in the Borough the sustainability of an enlarged Bottesford is questionable. The possibility of the services in the centre of Bottesford is severely restricted by land availability, the historic street pattern and the Conservation Area. Meeting the needs of an increased population would be difficult in the village centre and I suspect a lot of the new residents would shop elsewhere.

Flooding is the major constraint to development in Bottesford, much of the village being in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3. There was a major flood in 2001. Flooding affects the centre of Bottesford, and has a serious effect on village services. Bottesford is one of the lowest areas of the Borough and has a number of waterways through the villages and is also affected by the two large reservoirs at Knipton and Denton. Paragraph 7.22.3.of the Draft Plan states: "sites at risk of flooding can only be allocated for development if there is insufficient land available in areas with lesser or no flood risk". There are many other sites in Melton Borough with a lower flood risk than Bottesford.

		<p>The location of the schools and no direct access from the A52 causes substantial congestion and appreciable pollution from the queued elderly buses at the narrow Barkestone Lane / High St crossroads. This can only get worse with the proposed increase in population, can something be done to alleviate it?</p> <p>The two Doctors' Surgeries are confirmed as being at full capacity. Both have outgrown their current premises. One surgery does not offer open appointments, and the other has had to restrict the number that can be seen on an open appointment. In the Emerging Options there were plans for 180 square metres of building space for a GP Surgery. I could not locate this in the DMLP or the supporting information.</p> <p>Bottesford is predominantly a commuter village with a high proportion of the residents being employed at locations outside of the Parish. Increased population in the village will result in more people travelling to work. This is not consistent with the sustainability objectives of the Plan.</p> <p>Public transport within the Parish, and connecting the Parish with larger centres, is poor. The train service for Bottesford is inadequate at present, and would not support the level of growth being proposed, being two-hourly for much of the day and no trains in late evening. Other Local Authorities on the Grantham to Nottingham line, which are also required to provide additional homes in their local plans, are in discussion with the rail franchise holder, East Midlands Trains, on improving their service. Has Melton Borough Council undertaken similar discussions to enhance the service for Bottesford, the only station in Leicestershire on this line. The danger is that other communities on the line will get an improved service at the expense of Bottesford, where fewer trains may stop. There is already a reluctance of train operators to permit more trains to stop at Bottesford because of timetabling difficulties.</p> <p>Bus services are also deficient and would not support the level of growth being proposed; the route to Melton is tortuous and takes so long that it would not be preferred to the car option. Former routes to Bingham, Nottingham and Newark are virtually non-existent. The bus service to Grantham is reasonable, but is limited in the evening and does not run on Sundays. The situation is unlikely to improve because of the unavailability of additional County Council subsidies for rural bus services.</p> <p>At the public meeting in April 2016 in Bottesford Village Hall, MBC stated that constraints and service issues, absent in Emerging Options, would be considered before, and included in the Draft Plan. This has not occurred.</p> <p>Easthorpe, Muston and Normanton do not have the retail and other</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>facilities to support sustainable housing development.</p> <p>I find the process NOT SOUND</p> <p>The adoption of a policy such as this makes it imperative that the proposals in the MLP are correct at the outset.</p> <p>The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment, June 2014 table 85 p186 showed a range of possible housing needs for Melton Borough of between 195 and 245 homes per year (4875 and 6125 respectively over the Plan period). The Plan, in 4.2.1, claims that the higher build rate was 'objectively assessed' to cover maximum growth. This decision was at a time when adequate land for building at this rate and meeting the 5 year land supply target was not available The figure of 6125 over the plan period is a maximum at the moment but could have been reduced for the first 5 years so that there was a reduced 5 year land supply figure until there was some clarity about development sites, their constraints and deliverability.</p>			
Ros Freeman	84	<p>The policy is good but the decisions made on certain sites are not in compliance with them.</p> <p>Som 1,2 and especially 3 go against "sustainable development" in every way, to develop som 3 is so adverse that no benefits from doing so could possibly outlay the harm that would be caused to the character (being on the attractive entrance to the village) harm to the setting of grade II listed building and the edge of the conservation area.</p> <p>No assessment has been made available for consultation of som2 before it was included in the SHLAA submission.</p>	Remove som3 from plan altogether, it is not enough that it is a reserve site, it is not an appropriate site for development, and conduct thorough assessment on Som 2 and make results available for consultation.	Support for policy noted. The allocation and ranking of sites was carried out according to a consistent site assessment methodology, taking account of a range of sustainability and suitability factors alongside evidence of deliverability. The site assessments have been published as local plan evidence on the website www.meltonplan.co.uk . The latest assessment was finalised in May 2017 and is reflected in a proposed change to Policy C1 of the local plan.	None,
Susan Harding	120	<p>The existing services in the village will not sustain the increased number of houses planned for Bottesford</p> <p>Shops and parking in particular are a great problem in the village</p>	Carry out sound and published investigations into the needs and impact on Bottesford relating to flood risk, traffic, parking, sewerage, schools, health facilities, shopping and leisure. Provide feedback to those Bottesford residents who have heard nothing from MBC in response to their comments on the	The matters raised in this representation are dealt with in response to representations to Policy SS2.	None here.

		<p>already. Cars are parked all along the High Street and Queen Street to enable people to shop. An increase in traffic would make travelling through the village impossible and make life for those living in the village centre a nightmare.</p>	<p>earlier emerging options and draft plan.</p>		
<p>Chapter 4, Policy SS1</p>					
Susan Knapp	166	<p>Doctors and schools are also under great pressure in the village as new housing has already caused an increased population. This is also unsustainable</p> <p>In the original draft plan Gaddesby was deemed to be a “rural supporter”. A rural supporter is identified by a clear scoring methodology. Attached is a copy of the scoring methodology, role and function of settlements, roles and spatial analysis together with he scores themselves taken from the Melton Local Plan Settlement Roles and Relationships of April 2015 (MLPSRR).</p> <p>It will be seen that the criteria used were much more extensive and sophisticated than the four used in the latest draft plan and that Gaddesby was very much at the lower end of the rural supporter range of 10 to 20 points with 12. Why the change?</p> <p>Not only therefore has Gaddesby been “upgraded” but also it is proposed to assign to Gaddesby a greater proportionate increase in housing than any other village (see 4 below).</p> <p>Of the four current criteria comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary school – agreed • Access to employment opportunities – not agreed for the reasons se out in 8 and 9 below • Fast broadband – not accepted – see 10 below • Community building – agreed <p>Therefore Gaddesby does not enjoy the requisite three of the four criteria to qualify as a rural hub and should therefore be classed as a rural settlement. The methodology now proposed is unacceptable as being simplistic and unsound.</p>	<p>brownfield sites closer to employment and facilities in the borough.</p>	<p>The matters raised in this representation are dealt with in the responses to Policy SS2. se to object</p>	<p>None here.</p>

The criteria should include more day to day facilities in the methodology such as a food shop, GP surgery, library, post office, primary school and pub. Not many rural villages will have employment facilities, those that do should be higher up the hierarchy and receive more development, and that facilities such as a food shop and doctors surgery are just as important as broadband in reducing the need to travel. There should also be more differentiation between the settlements, perhaps a return to the Primary and Secondary Services Centres previously proposed.

2. Housing needs survey

A housing needs survey has not yet been carried out by Melton Council. Apparently the Council are to carry this out in the New Year (2017). If so how can it be said that there is a need for housing in Gaddesby?

3. Existing permissions currently un-built

The Council have taken into account the 14 permitted dwellings at GADD1 but have not taken into account the 5 houses for which permission has been granted on Ashby Road (12/00530/FUL) and the one further dwelling at The Hall (15/00826/FUL). Accordingly, in reality Gaddesby has already been allocated 6 houses which, when added to the 55 houses allocated in the daft plan, takes the total allocation to 61 new houses. This cannot be sustained or justified for the reasons set out in there representations.

4. Natural growth

At Appendix 2 of MLPSSR it will be seen that over the period 1994 to 2014 on average one new house was built in the village every year. On the assumption that this continues and additional 20 houses will be built over the life of the Plan.

5. Percentages

If one looks at paras 4.2.21 and 22 of the draft Plan it will be seen that Gaddesby has markedly higher percentage of proposed housing than any of the other villages. There are currently 158 houses in the village itself. An increase of 61 would be a 38.6% increase and would clearly change the nature of the village. When the additional 20

houses likely to be built from “natural growth” are included, this pushes the figure up to an increase of 51.2%. The calculation by estimated population of the villages at 4.2.21 and 4.2.22 of the draft plan is unsound. It is the number of houses which is material.

6. Highways

The A607 is already a very busy road as it leads to the Hobby Horse roundabout and the A46. Both these roads are over capacity certainly. It is not unusual to be queuing from Syston/Queniborough/East Goscote all the way to the Hobby Horse. The junction between Gaddesby Lane and the A607 is very dangerous and one sometimes has to wait minutes to join the A607.

In addition, Rearsby Lane (which connects Gaddesby Lane to Ashby Road) is a busy, narrow and winding road with is already unsuitable for the existing traffic burden placed on it. If the 61 (or more) houses were built this is likely to add another 120 plus cars to the mix. This impact has not been assessed by the Plan.

7. Weight limit

There is a weight limit throughout Gaddesby of 7.5 tonnes, which demonstrates how minor the roads are into the village.

8. Buses

The suggestion that the 100 bus service can be used to get to work is incorrect. The 100 bus service runs very infrequently and does not run at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Gaddesby is the closest settlement in the Borough to Leicester and it is there that most people go to work rather than to Melton. We called a village meeting to discuss the plan and 74 villagers attended, when we asked for a show of hands not one indicated they work in Melton. The only suitable bus to Leicester leaves Gaddesby at 07.49 and the last bus leaves Leicester at 17:10. In other words it is impossible to use the bus to attend work full time in Leicester. Further Leicestershire County Council will review the contract next year (2017) and there is a risk that it will be withdrawn.

		<p>9. Employment</p> <p>The suggestion that there is access to employment opportunities is incorrect and requires re-assessment because of the lack of public transport. There is minimal employment within Gaddesby itself.</p> <p>10. Broadband</p> <p>Gaddesby's phone exchange has been "upgraded" in 2016 as part of the "super-fast" Leicestershire program. It has added support for Fibre to the Cabinet broadband. There isn't a lot of choice of provider; the majority of residents are using BT.</p> <p>This broadband service is sold as "up to" 56Mbps download speed, which is more than adequate for an average modern home. The actual delivered speed of writing is 20Mbps or 40% of the advertised maximum, which is the same as the pre-upgrade ADSL offering. Given this failure to perform under the existing load of the village and surrounding areas, any additional load is likely to make the service deteriorate further. Many existing residents have not yet upgraded to fibre broadband, which means that when they do, this would increase the load further thereby reducing the actual delivered speed further.</p> <p>In the neighbouring village of Queniborough, the broadband speeds can be over double the delivered speed in Gaddesby.</p> <p>11. The School</p> <p>Only in 2014 did the school intake increase to 25 each year from 15. Years 2, 1 and reception are therefore already at capacity. The catchment area for the school includes Barsby, South Croxton, Ashby Folville and almost to Queniborough and attracts pupils from further afield. Within 4 years the school will be at capacity and therefore there is no requirement to fill spaces with new families coming into the village. Having only recently been substantially extended, it is unrealistic to suggest that the school will be capable of further expansion in the short/medium term.</p>			
Terence Joyce	159	I question the Soundness in respect to SOM2/3 (Somerby) as build on these sites will not improve economic, social and environmental conditions	To satisfy soundness in respect to this policy take sites such as SOM2/3 out of housing allocation.	The spatial strategy and site allocations as a whole have been found to be sustainable in the sustainability appraisal carried out by consultants LUC for the Council. The sites allocated have been identified for each settlement through a site assessment	None.

		Therefore build on sites such as SOM2/3 (Somerby) will have maximum negative effect on this policy .		process that takes account of suitability, sustainability and deliveryability factors in a consistent way across all settlements.	
The Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	438	In respect of Policy SS1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, we strongly support the inclusion of this policy within the new Melton Local Plan in line with Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.		Support noted and welcomed.	None
Richard Crossthwaite (Gladman Developments)	443	The policy sets out the positive approach that the Council will take that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It also sets out the commitment to work proactively with applicants to find solutions which will mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the social, economic and environmental conditions in the area. This approach is welcomed, but should be reflected in the remainder of the plan through a suite of positively framed policies.		Support noted and welcomed. The positive approach is reflected in policies throughout the plan.	None.