

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
GADESBY					
GADD1					
Caroline Louise Stuart	292	NB. On a point of accuracy, the plot of land labelled GADD01 is incorrectly located on planning maps; I understand this error has been highlighted to Melton Borough Council on previous occasions.		Comments noted. It is recognised that the site allocation for GADD1 is incorrectly drafted.	Alter the site allocation to match the red line boundary of the planning permission.
GADD2					
Robert Appleyard; Aila Marjatta Bennett; Amanda Jane Jeyes; Amber Lily Goddard; Amrit Minhas; Andlus Geeson; Angela Murphy; Ann Mary Norman; Anne Christian; Annie Ward; Anthony John Carter; Barbara Chantrill; Bernard Hugh Murphy; Bradley Pick;	~	<p>GADD2</p> <p>1. Highways</p> <p>The site is opposite the newly expanded primary school and the village hall. At school drop off and collection times cars are parked nose to tail along the school side of Ashby Road making the road all but impassable and impossible for those trying to emerge from the Site.</p> <p>The village hall is occupied every weekday by a playgroup with is frequented by, on average, 25 to 30 children at any one time who are also dropped off and collected. In addition at certain other regular times cars are parked nose to tail on Ashby Road opposite the site. All this traffic makes the road dangerous to both motorists and pedestrians. Attached are various photos taken on 1 December 2016 at about 8.30am. Ashby Road is a busy road, which is narrow and has a sharp bend adjacent to the Site which will make it impossible to see traffic coming round the bend for vehicles exiting the Site. Ashby Road is totally unsuitable to service the existing traffic let alone the increased traffic that the proposed development would generate. In addition if one looks at the permissions granted but un-built on Ashby Road (see 3 above) a further 19 houses will potentially be serviced by Ashby Road</p>	The methodology of selecting which villages should be the subject of development should be revised and if not revised Gaddesby should be reassessed as a rural settlement for the reasons set out in the Gaddesby Community Group Representations. GADD2 should be deleted from the plan as a proposed housing allocation, for the reasons set out in the Gaddesby Community Group Representations.	<p>Highways</p> <p>Having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the Local Highway Authority 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>	Remove site GADD2 from the site allocations, due to impact on the setting of heritage assets and landscape character not being able to be appropriately mitigated making the site unsuitable for development. New site added to North of the village.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
Bryan Leslie Garley; Caroline Batchelor; Caroline Louise Stuart; Catherine and Steve Baker; Chambers; Cheryl Pick; Chloe Beth Theobald; Christine Warom; Christopher David Shatford; Claire Rudkin; Claire Warrington; Colin Nigel Rose; Daphne A Tucker; Darren James Goddard; David Benjamin Maguire; David Gary Theobald; David John Batchelor; David Rogers; David Ronald Holdsworth;		<p>which is already very busy. On the assumptions that each house has 2 cars this makes a further 38 vehicles using the Ashby Road regularly. Highways issues have not been assessed when considering the Site.</p> <p>The school have recognised the problem and the potential danger but clearly do not know how to deal with it – see the attached letter from the Head Teacher to parents dated 24 November 2016.</p> <p>Without proper assessment there is no evidence to show how the Site can be satisfactorily accessed and the impact this will have on the surrounding road network.</p> <p>2. Flooding A large part of the Site is subject to flooding. Those who walk regularly on the footpath across the Site can confirm that in wet weather most of the Site is subject to standing water. It is at the bottom of a hill. As it is, the village hall and the school have to pump their soil waste to the west of the site to the pumping station near to the Cheney Arms public house to join the waste from the rest of the village. All of the Gaddesby village waste is then pumped east towards Ashby Folville. The existing sewage system is very old and lacks the capacity to cope with the extra demand which any development would place upon it.</p> <p>If the Site were to be developed surface water is likely to cause Gaddesby Brook to flood threatening to cause damage to properties in the vicinity including the Primary School and Village Hall. Whilst at Appendix 1 of the Local Plan it is proposed that a policy requirement ensuring mitigation measures against flood risk are provided at GADD2, further investigation into surface water and foul drainage solutions is required before the Plan progresses</p>		<p>Flooding The site has been reduced in area to avoid flood risk zone 3b and the potential capacity has been reduced from 45 dwellings to 30 to lessen impact and allow for more green infrastructure. Policy GADD2 requires that any development proposed mitigates measures against flood risk and therefore surface water drainage and flood risk mitigation measures would be required through the Development Management process.</p> <p>Heritage Assets Comments noted on the impact of the development of GADD2 on the setting of the Church and the earthworks that surround the historic core of the village. Further consultation has been carried out with Historic England who have identified this particular issue and concerns about</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
David Whait; Debbie Jane Perkins; Diane Elizabeth Pritchard; Dr Clive Richard Smith; Elaine Hawkrigg; Elaine Vickers; Faye Walker; Gaddesby Community Group; Gary Pick; Gavin Walker; Genevieve Rose; Gillian Frost; Glyn Tucker; Graham Bradshaw; Gurbachan Kaur; Hannah Toon; Hardeep Singh Minha; Isabelle Toon; Jacinda Butterworth; Jack Neville Theobald; James Rudkin;		<p>any further. Without such investigation and supporting evidence it cannot be said that the allocation of the site has been properly justified in accordance with the requirements of the Framework.</p> <p>3. St Luke’s Church This sits at the top of Church Lane. It is a Grade 1 listed building. It is thought to be the most important church in the County from an archaeological perspective. If the Site were to be developed this would interfere with the setting of this wonderful building. The Site provides the only long view to and from the Church. The impact of development upon the Church’s setting has not been properly assessed in the accompanying assessment for the wider site. Without having regard to this potential impact, the Plan has the potential to conflict with national policy which states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset it should be refused consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm of loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm of loss. Further that where a development will lead to less than substantial harm, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Without a robust heritage assessment, the public benefits balancing exercise cannot be undertaken and the presumption in favour of sustainable test cannot be properly applied.</p> <p>4. Ridge and Furrow The Site is ridge and furrow and constitutes a heritage asset. This also does not seem to have been taken into account and its loss assessed.</p> <p>5. Ecological impact The site is in close proximity to a number for Local Wildlife</p>		<p>the impact not being able to be properly mitigated.</p> <p>Ecological Impact The site has been reduced in area to avoid the Local Wildlife Site and the potential capacity has been reduced from 45 dwellings to 30 to lessen impact and allow for more green infrastructure. Policy GADD2 requires that any development proposed will not have adverse impacts on the nearby Local Wildlife Site and evidence of mitigation and an assessment of this would be required through the Development Management process.</p> <p>Assessments An update to the site assessments has been carried out between November 2016 and February 2017 which has refined the assessments and provided further detail. Contact has also been made with landowners/ agents to identify availability,</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
James Toon; Jane Bakewell; Jane Cowan; Jane Freer; Janet Elizabeth Garley; Janette Gadd; Jason Peter Hamilton Jeyes; Jennifer Ingham; Jessica Francis Hart; Jessica Milward; Jessica Warrington; Joanna Watson; John Warner; Joyce Holdsworth; Julie Hayton; Justine Hunt; Kamaljit Manhas; Karen Wale; Keeley Sarah-Ann Baigent; Keith Trevor Wilby; Kenneth		<p>Sites (LWS), including the Gaddesby Brook. In Appendix 1 of the Local Plan, the Council is proposing a policy requirement “that there are no adverse impacts on the nearby LWS located in proximity of the eastern boundary”. With regard to biodiversity impacts, national policy states that the planning system should minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible and that local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for and development affecting protected wildlife sites will be judged. Gaddesby Brook contains Otters and also White Clawed Crayfish which are protected species. In order to comply with national policy, further information about the likely ecological impact of the development of GADD2 needs to be provided so a judgement about suitability of the site for development can be made.</p> <p>6. Previous assessments GADD2 was the subject of a SHLAA assessment – MBC/016/13. The site was assessed as being undeliverable and undevelopable. No further site assessment has been carried out. The failure to properly assess the site clearly demonstrates that the proposed allocation is not based on robust evidence or been appropriately considered against alternative sites within the village or elsewhere in the Borough. This is a fundamental shortcoming in the preparation of the Local Plan which as a result means the allocation of the site is not ‘justified’ or consistent with national policy, as required.</p> <p>7. Visual impact In defining a site to provide 30 dwellings, the Council has drawn up arbitrary site boundaries without justification; these are not defined or contained by physical features, for example by a hedgerow or surrounding development.</p>		<p>viability and deliverability of sites. Further information and evidence on the impact on heritage assets and landscape character has been taken account of in the Update to the Site Assessments.</p> <p>Visual Impact The site is well screened by existing hedgerows to the southern boundary and as part of the Development Management process, details of the boundary treatments to the remaining boundaries would be required to be submitted to assess whether the treatments proposed would mitigate the visual impact. The update to the Landscape Character Assessment that included Gaddesby states that the site is located in LC22 Gaddesby East with a high landscape sensitivity due to the predominantly well integrated settlement edge defined by vegetation associated with the historic estate</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
Ronald Longbottom; Kevin John Ward; Kevin Paul Madelin; Linda Jane Shaw; Loretta June Smith; Louis Fairbrother; Louise Smart; Malcolm and Gillian McColm; Martin Burdett; Martin William Lee; Mary Burdett; Matthew Stephen Wright; Merrill Wheeler; Miles Warrington; Monica Geeson; Mrs J Winterton; Niall Chantrell; Nora Beryl Perriam; Patricia Warrington; Patricia		<p>The site's northern and eastern boundaries are exposed, meaning the proposed housing development is likely to have an adverse visual impact on the wider countryside, therefore, failing to meet the 'environmental' element of sustainable development (the Council's assertion is the accompanying wider site assessment that the site is "well hidden" is considered to be inaccurate). Furthermore, the site is considered to be out of character with the surrounding development which extends along Ashby Road and Church Lane and is linear in nature. The likely adverse impact of the proposed allocation upon the character of the settlement and surrounding landscape has not been properly considered though the site assessment process.</p>		<p>landscape in relation to the Hall and Hall Farm. The landscape pattern is partially intact and this is a tranquil landscape that is susceptible to change. It is recognised that there are elements where sensitivity is reduced, due to intrusion by more modern development at the northern and southern fringes of the LCZ with the settlement. However, there is limited opportunity for mitigation through further development without further intrusion upon the parkland character of the landscape. This is taken into account in the Update to the Site Assessments.</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
Whait; Paul McWilliam; Paula Simon; Peter Frost; Peter Joseph Pritchard; Peter Martin Hooper; Peter Richard Howard; Peter Warrington; Philip David Baigent; Philip Wale; Philippa Godsiff; Philippa Jane Maffioli; Rebecca Goddard; Rebecca Jeyes; Richard Chantrill; Richard Cowan; Richard Gamble; Richard Toon; Richard Wesson; Richard Wroblewski; Robert Bullock;					

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
Robert Hunt; Robert Leonard Woods; Ronald Vickers; S Evans; Samantha Kitson; Samantha Maguire; Samantha Rogers; Samuel Geeson; Samuel John Burdett; Sandra Skelland; Sarah Elisabeth McWilliam; Sarah Wesson; Scott Machin; Sheila Warner; Shirley Diane Ingham; Stephen Freer; Steven Godsiff; Susan June Theobald; Susan Knapp;					

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
Susan Milward; Sylvia Symonds; Teresa Gamble; Tim Milward; Tom and Melissa Fairbrother; Tracey Jane Woods; Trevor John Norman; Trudy Toon; Venice Ann Measures; Victor Smart; Virginia Tarelli; Wayne Gadd; Wendy Ann Lee;					
Marrons Planning on behalf of Mr J Simon	412	GADD2 is located to the north of Ashby Road, Gaddesby. It forms part of a much wider site (8.6 hectares) which was submitted to the Council's SHLAA. The Council is proposing that around 2.2 hectares of this larger site is allocated for 30 dwellings, yet has not carried out a site assessment of the allocation site (the accompanying site assessment has assessed the 8.6ha site). The failure to properly assess the site clearly demonstrates that the proposed allocation is not based on robust evidence or been appropriately considered against alternative sites within the village or elsewhere in the Borough. This is a fundamental shortcoming in the preparation of the Local Plan which as a result means the allocation of the site is not 'justified' or	In view of the comments set out above, in order for the Local Plan to be considered 'sound' and meet the tests set out within the Framework, specifically in regard to Gaddesby, the proposed allocation GADD2 should be removed.	Assessments An update to the site assessments has been carried out between November 2016 and February 2017 which has refined the assessments and provided further detail. Contact has also been made with landowners/ agents to identify availability, viability and deliverability	Remove site GADD2 from the site allocations, due to impact on the setting of heritage assets and landscape character not being able to be appropriately mitigated making the site unsuitable for

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>consistent with national policy, as required by the Framework.</p> <p>Visual Impact</p> <p>In defining a site to provide 30 dwellings, the Council has drawn up arbitrary site boundaries without justification; these are not defined or contained by physical features, for example by a hedgerow or surrounding development. The site's northern and eastern boundaries are exposed, meaning the proposed housing development is likely to have an adverse visual impact on the wider countryside, therefore, failing to meet the 'environmental' element of sustainable development set out in the Framework (the Council's assertion in the accompanying wider site assessment that the site is "well hidden" is considered to be inaccurate). Furthermore, the site is considered to be out of character with the surrounding development which extends along Ashby Road and Church Lane and is linear in nature. The likely adverse impact of the proposed allocation upon the character of the settlement and surrounding landscape has not been properly considered through the site assessment process.</p> <p>Site Access</p> <p>The accompanying wider site assessment confirms access will be taken off Ashby Road, but that further work is needed. Paragraph 32 of the Framework confirms that in highways terms, plans should take account of whether a safe and suitable access can be achieved for all people. The site's location opposite the primary school is a factor for consideration in determining whether this can be achieved. Without proper assessment there is little evidence to demonstrate how the site can be satisfactory</p>		<p>of sites. Further information and evidence on the impact on heritage assets and landscape character has been taken account of in the Update to the Site Assessments.</p> <p>Visual Impact</p> <p>The site is well screened by existing hedgerows to the southern boundary and as part of the Development Management process, details of the boundary treatments to the remaining boundaries would be required to be submitted to assess whether the treatments proposed would mitigate the visual impact. The update to the Landscape Character Assessment that included Gaddesby states that the site is located in LC22 Gaddesby East with a high landscape sensitivity due to the predominantly well integrated settlement edge defined by vegetation associated with the historic estate landscape in relation to</p>	<p>development. New site added to North of the village.</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>accessed and the impact this will have on the surrounding road network, including the primary school.</p> <p>Heritage Impact</p> <p>The site is situated within the setting of the Grade I Listed Church of St Luke. It is understood from local residents that this is considered to be the most important Church in the County from an archaeological perspective. The impact of development upon the Church's setting has not been properly assessed in the accompanying assessment for the wider site. Without having regard to this potential impact, the Plan has the potential to conflict with national policy. Paragraph 133 of the Framework states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset it should be refused consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm of loss. Paragraph 134 of the Framework states that where a development will lead to less than substantial harm, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Without a robust heritage assessment, the public benefits balancing exercise cannot be undertaken and the presumption in favour of sustainable test cannot be properly applied.</p> <p>It is also understood that there is ridge and furrow present on the site. This is not taken into account in the Council's wider site assessment, and the potential impacts upon this asset also need to be properly assessed to ensure that any potential allocation is consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Flood Risk/Drainage</p> <p>According to the Council's Interactive Map, part of the site</p>		<p>the Hall and Hall Farm. The landscape pattern is partially intact and this is a tranquil landscape that is susceptible to change. It is recognised that there are elements where sensitivity is reduced, due to intrusion by more modern development at the northern and southern fringes of the LCZ with the settlement. However, there is limited opportunity for mitigation through further development without further intrusion upon the parkland character of the landscape. This is taken into account in the Update to the Site Assessments.</p> <p>Heritage Assets Comments noted on the impact of the development of GADD2 on the setting of the Church and the earthworks that surround the historic core of the village. Further consultation has been carried out with Historic England who have identified this particular</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>is situated in Flood Zone 3b, meaning it is defined as the functional floodplain and comprises land where water has to flow or be stored in times of flood. Development should therefore be directed away from this area. In the remainder of the site, it will need to be demonstrated that flood risk is not increased elsewhere (paragraph 103). It is understood from local residents that there may be an issue with draining foul waste from the site. Whilst at Appendix 1 of the Local Plan it is proposed that a policy requirement ensuring mitigation measures against flood risk are provided at GADD2, it is suggested that further investigation into surface water and foul drainage solutions is required before the Plan progresses any further. Without such investigation and supporting evidence it cannot be said that the allocation of the site has been properly justified in accordance with the requirements of the Framework.</p> <p>Ecological Impact</p> <p>The site is in close proximity to a number of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), including the Gaddesby Brook. In Appendix 1 of the Local Plan, the Council is proposing a policy requirement “that there are no adverse impacts on the nearby LWS located in proximity of the eastern boundary.” With regards to biodiversity impacts, national policy states that the planning system should minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible (paragraph 109 of the Framework) and that local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development affecting protected wildlife sites will be judged (paragraph 113 of the Framework). It is understood that Gaddesby Brook contains white clawed crayfish which are protected species. In order to comply with national policy, further</p>		<p>issue and concerns about the impact not being able to be properly mitigated.</p> <p>Flooding The site has been reduced in developable area to avoid flood risk zone 3b and the potential capacity has been reduced from 45 dwellings to 30 to lessen impact and allow for more green infrastructure. Policy GADD2 requires that any development proposed mitigates measures against flood risk and therefore surface water drainage and flood risk mitigation measures would be required through the Development Management process.</p> <p>Ecological Impact The site has been reduced in area to avoid the Local Wildlife Site and the potential capacity has been reduced from 45 dwellings to 30 to lessen impact and allow for more green infrastructure.</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>information about the likely ecological impact of the development of GADD2 needs to be provided so a judgement about suitability of the site for development can be made.</p> <p>Soundness Tests In order to be considered sound, the Local Plan should meet a number of tests. These tests are set out at paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Local Plan, with respect to its proposed allocation of GADD2, is considered to be unsound because it fails to meet these tests, as set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence; ☑ Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period ☑ Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework <p>A large number of constraints to development have been identified with respect to the allocation of GADD2. It is not considered that a robust site assessment has been carried out by the Council, and without further technical information to support the allocation, the Local Plan should be considered unsound on the basis that it not justified or consistent with national policy.</p> <p>It should also be noted that in the 2013 SHLAA, the Council concluded that GADD2 was not deliverable and not developable, yet the position in the 2016 SHLAA is that the site is both deliverable and developable (as set out in the paragraph below, the Council considers the site will come forward in the next 5 years). There have been None.s in</p>		<p>Policy GADD2 requires that any development proposed will not have adverse impacts on the nearby Local Wildlife Site and evidence of mitigation and an assessment of this would be required through the Development Management process.</p> <p>The Update to Site Assessments has considered further information and evidence on GADD2 including the Landscape Character Assessment and information provided by Historic England. This evidence has led to the suggestion that GADD2 is removed from the site allocations due to concerns about the impact not being able to be appropriately mitigated. Contact was made with landowners/ agents between November 2016 and February 2017 to identify availability, viability and deliverability of sites which has informed the housing</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>circumstance in relation to GADD2 since the 2013 SHLAA to justify the change in assessment. The Council should not therefore rely on this piece of supporting evidence to support the allocation of GADD2 and the allocation should not be considered to be justified in line with the definition provided in the Framework.</p> <p>The Plan is also considered to fail the 'effective' soundness test as it is not considered to be deliverable in its current form. The Council's 2016 SHLAA Assessment concludes that GADD2 is deliverable, i.e. that it will come forward in the next 5 years, and this is confirmed by the Council's Five Year Land Supply and Housing Trajectory Position (November 2016) which anticipates development starting onsite in 2021/22. GADD2 should not be regarded as deliverable in line with the definition provided at footnote 11 of the Framework. Whilst the site can be regarded as available, because of the lack of robust evidence relating to landscape, heritage, drainage, access and ecology it cannot be considered to "offer a suitable location for development now".</p>		<p>trajectory which identified the site as being available and deliverable within the first five years. However the Updated trajectory has considered the issues relating to GADD2 and it is not identified as delivering any dwellings in the plan period as it is now suggested that the site is removed from the site allocations.</p>	
Mr P Baigent	7	<p>Local Plans must be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development (Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, section 39(2)). The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) provides that Local Plans should be consistent with the principles and policies set out in the Framework, including the presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 151). The presumption requires plan makers to have regard to whether any adverse impacts of meeting objectively assessed needs would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies</p>		<p>Assessments An update to the site assessments has been carried out between November 2016 and February 2017 which has refined the assessments and provided further detail. Contact has also been made with landowners/ agents to identify availability,</p>	<p>Remove site GADD2 from the site allocations, due to impact on the setting of heritage assets and landscape character not being able to be appropriately mitigated making the site</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>in the Framework taken as a whole (paragraph 14). Our client contends that, in light of the above, the allocation of GADD2 would not contribute towards sustainable development, for the reasons set out below. GADD2 is located to the north of Ashby Road, Gaddesby and forms part of a much wider site (8.6 hectares) which was submitted to the Council's SHLAA. Despite the Council proposing that approximately 2.2 hectares of this wider site is allocated for 30 dwellings, the Council has not yet conducted a site assessment of the allocation site (the accompanying site assessment has assessed the 8.6ha site). The failure to properly assess the site demonstrates that the proposed allocation of this site has not been based on strong evidence or been appropriately considered against alternative sites within the village or elsewhere in the Borough. This is a fundamental shortcoming in the preparation of the Local Plan which as a result means the allocation of the site is not 'justified' or consistent with national policy, as required by the Framework.</p> <p>Heritage Impact The proposed allocation of GADD2 will be harmful to the historical significant of the Grade I Listed Church of St Luke. The Church sits within an historic landscape and gains historical significance as a consequence of this setting (particularly in relation to the earthwork remains of medieval cultivation of ridge and furrow). There is no evidence that the impact of the proposed development on the Church's setting has been properly assessed in the accompanying assessment for the wider site. We understand that Historic England have raised objections in relation to the impact on this heritage asset. Without having regard to the potential impact of the proposed development of GADD2 on the Church and</p>		<p>viability and deliverability of sites. Further information and evidence on the impact on heritage assets and landscape character has been taken account of in the Update to the Site Assessments.</p> <p>Heritage Assets Comments noted on the impact of the development of GADD2 on the setting of the Church and the earthworks that surround the historic core of the village. Further consultation has been carried out with Historic England who have identified this particular issue and concerns about the impact not being able to be properly mitigated.</p> <p>Visual Impact The site is well screened by existing hedgerows to the southern boundary and as part of the Development Management process, details of the boundary treatments to the</p>	<p>unsuitable for development. New site added to North of the village.</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>its surrounding landscape, the Plan has the potential to conflict with national policy. Paragraph 133 of the Framework states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset it should be refused consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm of loss. Paragraph 134 of the Framework states that where a development will lead to less than substantial harm, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Without a robust heritage assessment, the public benefits balancing exercise cannot be undertaken and the presumption in favour of sustainable test cannot be properly applied.</p> <p>Visual Impact The proposed GADD2 site appears to have been given arbitrary site boundaries by the Council without any justification; the boundaries are not defined or contained by physical features, for example by a hedgerow or surrounding development. The site's northern and eastern boundaries are exposed, meaning any proposed housing development on the GADD2 site is likely to have an adverse visual impact on the wider countryside, therefore, failing to meet the 'environmental' element of sustainable development set out in the Framework. Our client disagrees fundamental with the Council's assertion in the accompanying wider site assessment that the site is "well hidden". The site is considered to be out of character with the surrounding development which extends along Ashby Road and Church Lane and is linear in nature. The likely adverse impact of the proposed allocation upon the character of the settlement and surrounding landscape has not been</p>		<p>remaining boundaries would be required to be submitted to assess whether the treatments proposed would mitigate the visual impact. The update to the Landscape Character Assessment that included Gaddesby states that the site is located in LCZ2 Gaddesby East with a high landscape sensitivity due to the predominantly well integrated settlement edge defined by vegetation associated with the historic estate landscape in relation to the Hall and Hall Farm. The landscape pattern is partially intact and this is a tranquil landscape that is susceptible to change. It is recognised that there are elements where sensitivity is reduced, due to intrusion by more modern development at the northern and southern fringes of the LCZ with the settlement. However, there is limited opportunity for mitigation through further development without</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>properly considered through the site assessment process.</p> <p>Flood Risk/Drainage The Council’s Interactive Map shows that part of the site is situated in Flood Zone 3b. Accordingly it is defined as a functional floodplain and comprises land where water has to flow or be stored in times of flood. Development should therefore be situated away from this area. In the remainder of the site, the Council will need to demonstrate that flood risk is not increased elsewhere either on the site or on the surrounding areas, many of which are already categorised as at flood risk (paragraph 103). For example, our client’s property (which sits opposite GADD2 on Ashby Road) cannot currently benefit from flood insurance due to the existing flood risk in the area. Despite Appendix 1 of the Local Plan proposing that a policy requirement ensuring mitigation measures against flood risk is provided at GADD2, it is contended that further robust investigation into surface water and foul drainage solutions is required before the Plan progresses any further. Without such investigation and supporting evidence it cannot be said that the allocation of the site has been properly justified in accordance with the requirements of the Framework.</p> <p>Ecological Impact In relation to biodiversity impacts, national policy states that the planning system should minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible (paragraph 109 of the Framework) and that local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development affecting protected wildlife sites will be</p>		<p>further intrusion upon the parkland character of the landscape. This is taken into account in the Update to the Site Assessments.</p> <p>Flooding The site has been reduced in developable area to avoid flood risk zone 3b and the potential capacity has been reduced from 45 dwellings to 30 to lessen impact and allow for more green infrastructure. Policy GADD2 requires that any development proposed mitigates measures against flood risk and therefore surface water drainage and flood risk mitigation measures would be required through the Development Management process.</p> <p>Ecological Impact The site has been reduced in area to avoid the Local Wildlife Site and the potential capacity has been reduced from 45</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>judged (paragraph 113 of the Framework).</p> <p>GADD2 is in close proximity to a number of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), including Gaddesby Brook. Gaddesby Brook contains white clawed crayfish which are protected species. In order to comply with national policy, further information about the likely ecological impact of the development of GADD2 needs to be provided so a judgement about suitability of the site for development can be made.</p> <p>Site Access The accompanying wider site assessment confirms access will be taken off Ashby Road, but that further work is needed. Paragraph 32 of the Framework confirms that in highways terms, plans should take account of whether a safe and suitable access can be achieved for all people. The site's location opposite Gaddesby Primary School is a factor for consideration in determining whether this can be achieved. Without proper assessment there is little evidence to demonstrate how the site can be satisfactorily accessed and the impact this will have on the surrounding road network, including the Primary School. In order to be considered sound, the Local Plan should meet a number of tests. These tests are set out at paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The Local Plan, in relation to (A) its proposed allocation of GADD2 as a suitable site for development and (B) its proposed reclassification of Gaddesby as a Rural Settlement, is considered to be unsound because it fails to meet these tests, as set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the 		<p> dwellings to 30 to lessen impact and allow for more green infrastructure. Policy GADD2 requires that any development proposed will not have adverse impacts on the nearby Local Wildlife Site and evidence of mitigation and an assessment of this would be required through the Development Management process.</p> <p>Highways Having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the Local Highway Authority 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</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period • Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework <p>A large number of constraints to development have been identified with respect to the allocation of GADD2. It is not apparent that a robust site assessment has been carried out by the Council, and without further technical information to support the allocation, the Local Plan should be considered unsound on the basis that it not justified or consistent with national policy.</p> <p>The Plan is also considered to fail the ‘effective’ soundness test as it is not considered to be deliverable in its current form. The Council’s 2016 SHLAA Assessment concludes that GADD2 is deliverable, i.e. that it will come forward in the next 5 years, and this is confirmed by the Council’s Five Year Land Supply and Housing Trajectory Position (November 2016) which anticipates development starting onsite in 2021/22. GADD2 should not be regarded as deliverable in line with the definition provided at footnote 11 of the Framework. Whilst the site can be regarded as available it cannot be considered as deliverable because the lack of robust evidence relating to landscape, heritage, drainage, access and ecology means it cannot be considered to “offer a suitable location for development now”.</p>		<p>expected to be identified and appropriately addressed through the development management process as normal.</p> <p>The Update to Site Assessments has considered further information and evidence on GADD2 including the Landscape Character Assessment and information provided by Historic England. This evidence has led to the suggestion that GADD2 is removed from the site allocations due to concerns about the impact not being able to be appropriately mitigated. Contact was made with landowners/ agents between November 2016 and February 2017 to identify availability, viability and deliverability of sites which has informed the housing trajectory which identified the site as being available</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				<p>and deliverable within the first five years. However the Updated trajectory has considered the issues relating to GADD2 and it is not identified as delivering any dwellings in the plan period as it is now suggested that the site is removed from the site allocations.</p>	
<p>Jeannette Mary Hurst</p>	<p>146</p>	<p>GADD2, 3</p> <p>1) Addition of 61 houses (12/00530/FUL, 15/00826/FUL, 15/0031/OUT, MCB/0016/part and MCB/017/13) - too many for Gaddesby, all unfair proportion, totally altering the character of the village.</p> <p>2) Current bus service not appropriate for the working day.</p> <p>3) GADD2 site previously failed suitability for development criteria, SHLAA assessment MBC/016/13 site subject to flooding, site opposite the school entrance, congestion twice a day.</p>		<p>Comments noted about the current bus service which is identified as a rural issue in many settlements across the Borough.</p> <p>The site has been reduced in developable area to avoid flood risk zone 3b and the potential capacity has been reduced from 45 dwellings to 30 to lessen impact and allow for more green infrastructure. Policy GADD2 requires that any development proposed mitigates measures against flood risk and therefore surface water drainage and flood risk mitigation measures</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				<p>would be required through the Development Management process.</p> <p>Having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the Local Highway Authority 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>	
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	The proposed allocation GADD2 will be harmful to the significance of the Grade I Church of St Luke. The church gains significance from its historic landscape setting which to its east comprises the earthwork remains of medieval and later cultivation. Both in static and kinetic (moving) views one can appreciate the evolution of the agricultural and land allocation systems which supported the parish		Comments noted. The Update to Site Assessment considers this information along with an update to the Landscape Character Assessment which also identified concerns about	Remove site GADD2 from the site allocations, due to impact on the setting of heritage assets and landscape

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>community and their clergy. Of particular interest are the apparent phases of cultivation between straighter steam ploughed ridges and earlier horse and oxen ploughed strips. The proposed development would not only cause direct loss to earthwork remains but would also extend the impact of existing bungalow development into main views from the east side of the churchyard and gated lane. As such, the allocation is not considered to be sound in respect of heritage assets.</p> <p>These concerns are again not reflected within the assessment or Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The village and its nationally important heritage assets opens out to the agricultural landscape through the allocation site, which through its earthwork remains provides a direct link to how those ancient buildings and remains were inhabited and supported by labour on the land. The proposed allocation represents the best point in the village where this link to the field strips and the farmed landscape can be made and experienced directly from the field containing the monument and flanked by the Listed Buildings.</p> <p>As such, the allocation is not considered to be sound in respect of heritage assets. This concern is not adequately reflected within the Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessment.</p>		<p>any development being able to be appropriately mitigated. On the basis of the objection raised and the information received it is suggested that site GADD2 is removed from the site allocations.</p>	<p>character not being able to be appropriately mitigated making the site unsuitable for development. New site added to North of the village.</p>
Merrill Wheeler; Peter Wheeler	349; 351	<p>GADD2 and GADD3</p> <p>1. It is a misnomer to consider Gaddesby a rural hub due to inefficient employment access and high speed broadband. We believe Gaddesby is better defined as a rural settlement. It is a dormitory or commuter village. It is not sustainable as a place of employment, education or</p>		<p>Comments 1-5 dealt with under Policy SS2 responses.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>traffic for the proposed 38% increase in housing without major changes to its infrastructure and spoliation of the rural and historic character of the village.</p> <p>Since April 2015 (MLPSRR), Gaddesby has inexplicably changed its status from 'rural supporter' to 'rural hub', though it boasts only 2 of the 4 qualifying stipulations. Gaddesby does have a village hall and recently upgraded village school which will reach capacity in 4 years. The only other amenities are a pub and a church, inadequate to support employment. As noted, the town is only served by the 100 bus whose range and schedule are not flexible enough for practical commuting to most employment centres. 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>We feel the criteria for a hub should also include such facilities as a GP surgery, a Post office, food shop and newsagent, library, pub, petrol station.</p> <p>2.-5: Housing Needs Survey vis. current permission, natural growth and percentages:</p> <p>As members of the Gaddesby Community group we believe the proposed GADD2 and GADD3 developments to be putting the cart before the horse until and unless the 2017 housing needs survey deems this village to require such extensive new build in addition to the 6 new infill houses and the 14 permitted dwellings for the yet unbuilt GADD1 site. The 38% increase would indisputably change the nature of the village.</p>		<p>Highways comments noted. Having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the Local Highway Authority 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>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>6. Highways: Traffic augmentation has not been assessed by the plan. The village already suffers from a yearly palpable increase in traffic, heavy vehicles, speeding vehicles and difficulty in safe dropping off and collection of school children on Ashby Road as well as residential parking on Main Street. At peak times all access points to the A607 are dangerous and difficult. Encouraging further flow to and from the village will increase the danger of accidents and wasted time from better economic use. Better to increase residence in sites within safe walking or cycling distance to employment.</p>			
Simon Neil Hargrave	121	<p>With regard to the proposed Gadd 2 area opposite the school there are currently major concerns with the amount of traffic and parking around the start and end of school. Traffic calming measures would need to be included in any development proposal.</p>		<p>Comments noted. Having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the Local Highway Authority 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>	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	409	<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. A number of sites poses greater concern including LONG2, SOM2, EAST1, GADD2 and THOR1, these latter sites have significant and outstanding heritage implications potentially warranting objection in principle to their development.</p> <p>Land to the north of Ashby Road, Gaddesby: The development will impact upon a well preserved landscape of ridge and furrow earthworks providing good evidence of the form and character of the open field system associated with the medieval and post-medieval village. The earthworks about the Grade I listed St Luke's Church and grave yard (NHLE ref: 1307542), and also to the designated Conservation Area, offering direct setting relationships and contributing to their historic character and significance.</p>		<p>Comments noted. The Update to Site Assessment considers this information along with an update to the Landscape Character Assessment which also identified concerns about any development being able to be appropriately mitigated. On the basis of the information received it is suggested that site GADD2 is removed from the site allocations.</p>	<p>Remove site GADD2 from the site allocations, due to impact on the setting of heritage assets and landscape character not being able to be appropriately mitigated making the site unsuitable for development. New site added to North of the village.</p>
Trudy Toon – Clerk	311	<p>Specific to GADD2</p> <p>1. Highways The Site is opposite the newly expanded primary school and the village hall. At school drop off and collection times cars are parked nose to tail along that side of Ashby Road making the road all but impassable and impossible for those trying to emerge from the site. The village hall is occupied every weekday by a playgroup which is frequented by, on average, 25 to 30 children at any one time who are also dropped off and collected. In addition at certain other regular times cars are parked nose to tail on Ashby Road opposite the Site. All this traffic makes the road dangerous to both motorists and pedestrians. Attached are various photos</p>		<p>Highways Having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the Local Highway Authority is satisfied that there are no fundamental outstanding issues from a transport perspective which would require</p>	<p>Remove site GADD2 from the site allocations, due to impact on the setting of heritage assets and landscape character not being able to be appropriately mitigated making the site unsuitable for development. New site added</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>taken on 1 December 2016 at about 8.30pm. Ashby Road is a busy road, which is narrow and close to a bend adjacent to the site and is totally unsuitable to service the existing traffic let alone the development as proposed. In addition if one looks at the permissions granted but un-built on Ashby Road (see 7 above) a further 19 houses will potentially be serviced by Ashby Road which is already very busy. On the assumption that each house has 2 cars this makes a further 38 vehicles using the Road regularly. Highways issues have not been assessed when considering the Site. The school have recognised the problem and the potential danger but clearly do not know how to deal with it – see the attached letter from the Head Teacher to parents dated 24 November 2016.</p> <p>Without proper assessment there is no evidence to show how the site can be satisfactorily accessed and the impact this will have on the surrounding network</p> <p>2. Flooding</p> <p>A large part of the Site is subject to flooding. Those who walk regularly on the footpath across the Site can confirm that in wet weather most of the Site is subject to standing water. It is at the bottom of a hill. As it is, the village hall and the school have to pump their soil waste to the pumping station to the east of the site. If the Site were to be built out surface water is likely to cause Gaddesby Brook to flood. Whilst at Appendix 1 of the Local Plan it is proposed that a policy requirement ensuring mitigation measures against flood risk are provided at GADD2, further investigation into surface water and foul drainage solutions is required before the Plan progresses any further. Without such investigation and supporting evidence it cannot be</p>		<p>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>Flooding The site has been reduced in developable area to avoid flood risk zone 3b and the potential capacity has been reduced from 45 dwellings to 30 to lessen impact and allow for more green infrastructure. Policy GADD2 requires that any development proposed mitigates measures against flood risk and therefore surface water drainage and flood risk mitigation measures would be required through the Development Management process.</p> <p>Heritage Assets Comments noted on the</p>	<p>to North of the village.</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>said that the allocation of the site has been properly justified in accordance with the requirements of the Framework.</p> <p>3. St Luke's Church</p> <p>This sits at the top of Church Lane. It is a Grade 1 listed building. It is thought to be the most important church in the County from an archaeological perspective. If the Site were to be developed this would interfere with the setting of this wonderful building. The Site provides the only long view to and from the Church. The impact of development upon the Church's setting has not been properly assessed in the accompanying assessment for the wider site. Without having regard to this potential impact, the Plan has the potential to conflict with national policy which states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset it should be refused consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. Further that where a development will lead to less than substantial harm, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Without a robust heritage assessment, the public benefits balancing exercise cannot be undertaken and the presumption in favour of sustainable test cannot be properly applied.</p> <p>4. Ridge and Furrow</p> <p>The Site is ridge and furrow and constitutes a heritage asset. This also does not seem to have been taken into account and its loss assessed.</p>		<p>impact of the development of GADD2 on the setting of the Church and the earthworks that surround the historic core of the village. Further consultation has been carried out with Historic England who have identified this particular issue and concerns about the impact not being able to be properly mitigated.</p> <p>Ecological Impact The site has been reduced in area to avoid the Local Wildlife Site and the potential capacity has been reduced from 45 dwellings to 30 to lessen impact and allow for more green infrastructure. Policy GADD2 requires that any development proposed will not have adverse impacts on the nearby Local Wildlife Site and evidence of mitigation and an assessment of this would be required through the Development Management process.</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>5. Ecological impact</p> <p>The site is in close proximity to a number of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), including the Gaddesby Brook. In Appendix 1 of the Local Plan, the Council is proposing a policy requirement “that there are no adverse impacts on the nearby LWS located in proximity of the eastern boundary.” With regard to biodiversity impacts, national policy states that the planning system should minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible and that local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development affecting protected wildlife sites will be judged. It is understood that Gaddesby Brook contains white clawed crayfish which are protected species. In order to comply with national policy, further information about the likely ecological impact of the development of GADD2 needs to be provided so a judgement about suitability of the site for development can be made.</p> <p>6. Previous assessments</p> <p>GADD2 was the subject of an SHLAA assessment – MBC/016/13. The site was assessed and rejected as being undeliverable and undevelopable. No further site assessment has been carried out. The failure to properly assess the site clearly demonstrates that the proposed allocation is not based on robust evidence or been appropriately considered against alternative sites within the village or elsewhere in the Borough. This is a fundamental shortcoming in the preparation of the Local Plan which as a result means the allocation of the site is not ‘justified’ or consistent with national policy, as required.</p>		<p>Assessments</p> <p>An update to the site assessments has been carried out between November 2016 and February 2017 which has refined the assessments and provided further detail. Contact has also been made with landowners/ agents to identify availability, viability and deliverability of sites. Further information and evidence on the impact on heritage assets and landscape character has been taken account of in the Update to the Site Assessments.</p> <p>Visual Impact</p> <p>The site is well screened by existing hedgerows to the southern boundary and as part of the Development Management process, details of the boundary treatments to the remaining boundaries would be required to be submitted to assess</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>7. Visual Impact</p> <p>In defining a site to provide 30 dwellings, the Council has drawn up arbitrary site boundaries without justification; these are not defined or contained by physical features, for example by a hedgerow or surrounding development. The site's northern and eastern boundaries are exposed, meaning the proposed housing development is likely to have an adverse visual impact on the wider countryside, therefore, failing to meet the 'environmental' element of sustainable development (the Council's assertion in the accompanying wider site assessment that the site is "well hidden" is considered to be inaccurate). Furthermore, the site is considered to be out of character with the surrounding development which extends along Ashby Road and Church Lane and is linear in nature. The likely adverse impact of the proposed allocation upon the character of the settlement and surrounding landscape has not been properly considered through the site assessment process.</p>		<p>whether the treatments proposed would mitigate the visual impact. The update to the Landscape Character Assessment that included Gaddesby states that the site is located in LC22 Gaddesby East with a high landscape sensitivity due to the predominantly well integrated settlement edge defined by vegetation associated with the historic estate landscape in relation to the Hall and Hall Farm. The landscape pattern is partially intact and this is a tranquil landscape that is susceptible to change. It is recognised that there are elements where sensitivity is reduced, due to intrusion by more modern development at the northern and southern fringes of the LCZ with the settlement. However, there is limited opportunity for mitigation through further development without further intrusion upon the parkland character of the landscape. This is taken</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				<p>into account in the Update to the Site Assessments.</p> <p>Ecological Impact The site has been reduced in area to avoid the Local Wildlife Site and the potential capacity has been reduced from 45 dwellings to 30 to lessen impact and allow for more green infrastructure. Policy GADD2 requires that any development proposed will not have adverse impacts on the nearby Local Wildlife Site and evidence of mitigation and an assessment of this would be required through the Development Management process.</p>	
GADD3					
Robert Appleyard; Aila Marjatta Bennett; Amanda Jane	~	GADD3 1. Previous assessment GADD3 was the subject of a SHLAA assessment – MBC/017/13. This site was also rejected as being	Representations. GADD3 should be deleted from the plan as a proposed housing allocation, for the reasons set out in the Gaddesby	Assessments An initial site assessment was carried out between April and June 216. An update to the site	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
<p>Jeyes; Amber Lily Goddard; Amrit Minhas; Andlus Geeson; Angela Murphy; Ann Mary Norman; Anne Christian; Annie Ward; Anthony John Carter; Barbara Chantrill; Bernard Hugh Murphy; Bradley Pick; Bryan Leslie Garley; Caroline Batchelor; Caroline Louise Stuart; Catherine and Steve Baker; Chambers; Cheryl Pick; Chloe Beth Theobald; Christine Warom; Christopher</p>		<p>undeliverable and undevelopable. No further site assessment has been carried out. The failure to properly assess the site clearly demonstrates that the proposed allocation is not based on robust evidence or been appropriately considered against alternative sites within the village or elsewhere in the Borough. This is a fundamental shortcoming in the preparation of the Local Plan which as a result means the allocation of the site is not 'justified' or consistent with national policy, as required.</p> <p>2. Highways Site Appendix 1 of the Melton Local Plan states the following with regard to GADD3:</p> <p>"The site is situated in the northern edge of the village and therefore slightly detached from the limited services that the village provides. Its access via either of two well-connected roads and the proximity to the bus stop makes this site a suitable allocation for housing"</p> <p>The two roads in question, Rotherby Lane and Pasture Lane, are both unsuitable for more than the occasional vehicle, and certainly not suitable for any heavy vehicles such as buses and lorries. The main access for properties at this end of the village is Pasture Lane for traffic approaching from Melton Mowbray, or Gaddesby Lane/Rearsby Lane, via Main Street and Park Hill from Leicester. Main Street is often reduced to a single lane with overflow of parking of pub patrons, and also from the vehicles belonging to the residents of Main Street without off-road parking. These roads are not "well-connected" and are in fact highly restrictive, dangerous in some weather conditions, and are not effective to support additional residences.</p>	<p>Community Group Representations.</p>	<p>assessments has been carried out between November 2016 and February 2017 which has refined the assessments and provided further detail. Contact has also been made with landowners/ agents to identify availability, viability and deliverability of sites. Therefore site assessments have been completed for all sites.</p> <p>Highways Comments noted about rural nature of roads in this location. The Highways Authority have been consulted and have stated that 'having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the Local Highway Authority 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>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
David Shatford; Claire Rudkin; Claire Warrington; Colin Nigel Rose; Daphne A Tucker; Darren James Goddard; David Benjamin Maguire; David Gary Theobald; David John Batchelor; David Rogers; David Ronald Holdsworth; David Whait; Debbie Jane Perkins; Diane Elizabeth Pritchard; Dr Clive Richard Smith; Elaine Hawkrigg; Elaine Vickers; Faye Walker; Gaddesby Community Group; Gary		<p>Park Hill is exactly what it says – a steep hill. Vehicles naturally speed down the hill (it can be difficult to keep to the speed limit due to steepness). By the same token vehicles ascending tend to speed to be able to get up the hill. There is only one narrow footpath which is on the opposite (West) side to the main body of housing at Paske Avenue and Barrow Crescent and indeed GADD3. Therefore when walking children to school, parents have to cross the road to the footpath which is dangerous due to the speed of the traffic and due to the fact that it is on the brow of a steep hill. There are also a number of concealed entrances along Park Hill. See 9.4.18 of the 2016 draft plan.</p> <p>3. The bus service The bus service also currently uses Paske Avenue to turn around and head back down the hill to continue its route. This creates a traffic danger as Paske Avenue is a narrow road which often has many vehicles parked on it due to housing and the children’s playground and really is unsuitable for large vehicles such as buses.</p> <p>4. Ground Quality & Drainage of Existing Properties The ground on GADD3 plot is clay heavy and as a result there is a lot of surface water retention and runoff from fields. This affects a number of properties, and any new development in the area will undoubtedly have a negative knock on effect on the other existing properties. There is no mention of attempting to improve drainage facilities for existing properties, an existing drainage of the land could be called ineffective in areas, so any additional load would also be ineffective without improvement. This has not been properly assessed.</p>		<p>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>Existing issues that are currently present, such as drivers not taking account of the speed limits or bus drivers turning cannot be resolved by new developments. However if a new development were to make an existing issue worse, then the impacts would be mitigated through the development management process when a planning application is submitted. At this point, the Highways Authority would be able to consider the impact of a proposal and identify what mitigation schemes were required and these would be conditioned if planning permission were granted. This could include things such as the widening or</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
Pick; Gavin Walker; Genevieve Rose; Gillian Frost; Glyn Tucker; Graham Bradshaw; Gurbachan Kaur; Hannah Toon; Hardeep Singh Minha; Isabelle Toon; Jacinda Butterworth; Jack Neville Theobald; James Rudkin; James Toon; Jane Bakewell; Jane Cowan; Jane Freer; Janet Elizabeth Garley; Janette Gadd; Jason Peter Hamilton Jeyes; Jennifer Ingham; Jessica		<p>5. Visual impact GADD3 would have an adverse visual impact on the entrance to and exit from the village and on the wider countryside. As one reaches the top of Park Hill it is clear that one has reached open country. This would not be the case if the development were to be built. The site is considered to be out of character with the other development, which extends along Pasture Lane. The likely adverse impact upon the settlement and surrounding landscape has not been properly assessed.</p> <p>6. Ecological impact National policy states that the planning system should minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible and that local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development affecting protected wildlife sites will be judged. There is a pond on the GADD3 site which is understood to be habit for protected wildlife (newts). In order to comply with nation policy, further information about the likely ecological impact of the development of GADD3 needs to be provided so a judgement about sustainability of the site for development can be made.</p>		<p>improvement of existing footpath networks.</p> <p>Drainage Surface water drainage would be dealt with through the Development Management process and as part of Building Regulation requirements. No objection has been received from Severn Trent on this site.</p> <p>Visual Impact Comments noted. There is built form adjacent to the east of the site and directly to the south. The site is also bounded by Rotherby Lane which runs along the western boundary which provides containment to the site. It is accepted in the Update to the Site Assessments that some mitigation would be required to limit the visual impact, however due to the location adjacent existing built form and the limited site area and small scale development that will result it is considered that</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
Francis Hart; Jessica Milward; Jessica Warrington; Joanna Watson; John Warner; Joyce Holdsworth; Julie Hayton; Justine Hunt; Kamaljit Manhas; Karen Wale; Keeley Sarah-Ann Baigent; Keith Trevor Wilby; Kenneth Ronald Longbottom; Kevin John Ward; Kevin Paul Madelin; Linda Jane Shaw; Loretta June Smith; Louis Fairbrother; Louise Smart; Malcolm and Gillian McColm; Martin				the visual impact can be appropriately mitigated. Ecology Comments noted. It is recognised in the Update to the Site Assessments that an ecological report may be required through the planning application process, which would assess the ecological constraints of the site and identify the necessary mitigation measures which would need to be designed into a scheme.	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
Burdett; Martin William Lee; Mary Burdett; Matthew Stephen Wright; Merrill Wheeler; Miles Warrington; Monica Geeson; Mrs J Winterton; Niall Chantrill; Nora Beryl Perriam; Patricia Warrington; Patricia Whait; Paul McWilliam; Paula Simon; Peter Frost; Peter Joseph Pritchard; Peter Martin Hooper; Peter Richard Howard; Peter Warrington; Philip David Baigent; Philip Wale;					

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
Philippa Godsiff; Philippa Jane Maffioli; Rebecca Goddard; Rebecca Jeyes; Richard Chantrill; Richard Cowan; Richard Gamble; Richard Toon; Richard Wesson; Richard Wroblewski; Robert Bullock; Robert Hunt; Robert Leonard Woods; Ronald Vickers; S Evans; Samantha Kitson; Samantha Maguire; Samantha Rogers; Samuel Geeson;					

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
Samuel John Burdett; Sandra Skelland; Sarah Elisabeth McWilliam; Sarah Wesson; Scott Machin; Sheila Warner; Shirley Diane Ingham; Stephen Freer; Steven Godsiff; Susan June Theobald; Susan Knapp; Susan Milward; Sylvia Symonds; Teresa Gamble; Tim Milward; Tom and Melissa Fairbrother; Tracey Jane Woods; Trevor John Norman; Trudy Toon; Venice Ann					

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
Measures; Victor Smart; Virginia Tarelli; Wayne Gadd; Wendy Ann Lee;					
Jeannette Mary Hurst	146	<p>GADD2, 3</p> <p>1) Addition of 61 houses (12/00530/FUL, 15/00826/FUL, 15/0031/OUT, MCB/0016/part and MCB/017/13) - too many for Gaddesby, all unfair proportion, totally altering the character of the village.</p> <p>2) Current bus service not appropriate for the working day.</p>		Comments noted about the current bus service which is identified as a rural issue in many settlements across the Borough.	None.
John Warner	327	<p>Specific to GADD3</p> <p>ie. it is outside the village boundary and would adversely affect views to open countryside.</p> <p>The two narrow lanes adjacent is where the village folk enjoy their outdoor activities - walking; dog walking; horse riding; cycling; children playing in the woods etc etc.</p> <p>It is difficult to find any rationale other than 'box ticking' land put forward by landowners. So simplistic, that we end up with one very rich landowner and for the next 100 years plus, an absolute blot on this beautiful part of the Borough.</p> <p>Don't forget the Great Crested Newt, a protected species, which you should be aware of from previous applications.</p>		Comments noted. There are no development boundaries proposed in the draft plan. Each site is therefore to be assessed on a site by site basis and the impact on the character of the settlement taken into account. There is built form adjacent to the east of the site and directly to the south. The site is also bounded by Rotherby Lane which runs along the western boundary which provides containment to the site. It is accepted in the Update to the Site	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				<p>Assessments that some mitigation would be required to limit the visual impact, however due to the location adjacent existing built form and the limited site area and small scale development that will result it is considered that the visual impact can be appropriately mitigated.</p> <p>By allocating GADD3 it is not introducing a new type of use to Pasture Lane as residential properties front onto it to the south of GADD3. Therefore it is not considered that the limited scale development proposed on a small site such as GADD3 will significantly alter the character of a rural village or the use of the village by existing residents for outdoor activities.</p> <p>The owner of the site is not a material planning consideration and has not been taken into account in the site selection process.</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				<p>It is recognised in the Update to the Site Assessments that an ecological report may be required through the planning application process, which would assess the ecological constraints of the site and identify the necessary mitigation measures which would need to be designed into a scheme.</p>	
Sheila Warner	325	<p>GADD 3</p> <p>My objection to any houses being built on Pasture Lane are as follows:</p> <p>Having studied the Plan, I note that Pasture Lane proposed site is out of the village boundary, making it look like a carbuncle.</p> <p>Pasture Lane is a country lane and is without doubt the most walked lane in the village. Being the only real lane, people from the whole village walk, run or cycle along it.</p> <p>My thoughts are that if you are building 30 houses on Gaddesby 2 site, why not add 11 from Pasture Lane, therefore keeping the village intact.</p>		<p>Comments noted. There are no development boundaries proposed in the draft plan. Each site is therefore to be assessed on a site by site basis and the impact on the character of the settlement taken into account. There is built form adjacent to the east of the site and directly to the south. The site is also bounded by Rotherby Lane which runs along the western boundary which provides containment to the site. It is accepted in the Update to the Site Assessments that some mitigation would be required to limit the visual</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				<p>impact, however due to the location adjacent existing built form and the limited site area and small scale development that will result it is considered that the visual impact can be appropriately mitigated.</p> <p>By allocating GADD3 it is not introducing a new type of use to Pasture Lane as residential properties front onto it to the south of GADD3. Therefore it is not considered that the limited scale development proposed on a small site such as GADD3 will significantly alter the character of a rural village or the use of the village by existing residents for outdoor activities.</p> <p>The owner of the site is not a material planning consideration and has not been taken into account in the site selection process.</p> <p>It is recognised in the Update to the Site Assessments that an</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				ecological report may be required through the planning application process, which would assess the ecological constraints of the site and identify the necessary mitigation measures which would need to be designed into a scheme.	
Merrill Wheeler; Peter Wheeler	349; 351	<p>GADD2 and GADD3</p> <p>1. It is a misnomer to consider Gaddesby a rural hub due to inefficient employment access and high speed broadband. We believe Gaddesby is better defined as a rural settlement. It is a dormitory or commuter village. It is not sustainable as a place of employment, education or traffic for the proposed 38% increase in housing without major changes to its infrastructure and spoliation of the rural and historic character of the village.</p> <p>Since April 2015 (MLPSRR), Gaddesby has inexplicably changed its status from 'rural supporter' to 'rural hub', though it boasts only 2 of the 4 qualifying stipulations. Gaddesby does have a village hall and recently upgraded village school which will reach capacity in 4 years. The only other amenities are a pub and a church, inadequate to support employment. As noted, the town is only served by the 100 bus whose range and schedule are not flexible enough for practical commuting to most employment centres. 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 1-5 dealt with under Policy C1a responses.</p> <p>Comments noted about the roads. This site does not adjoin Main Street or Ashby Road. There is a limited number of dwellings being identified for this site. The Highways Authority have been consulted and have stated that 'having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the Local Highway Authority is satisfied that there are no fundamental outstanding issues from a transport perspective which would require</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>We feel the criteria for a hub should also include such facilities as a GP surgery, a Post office, food shop and newsagent, library, pub, petrol station.</p> <p>2.-5: Housing Needs Survey vis. current permission, natural growth and percentages:</p> <p>As members of the Gaddesby Community group we believe the proposed GADD2 and GADD3 developments to be putting the cart before the horse until and unless the 2017 housing needs survey deems this village to require such extensive new build in addition to the 6 new infill houses and he 14 permitted dwellings for the yet unbuilt GADD1 site. The 38% increase would indisputably change the nature of the village.</p> <p>6. Highways: Traffic augmentation has not been assessed by the plan. The village already suffers from a yearly palpable increase in traffic, heavy vehicles, speeding vehicles and difficulty in safe dropping off and collection of school children on Ashby Road as well as residential parking on Main Street. At peak times all access points to the A607 are dangerous and difficult. Encouraging further flow to and from the village will increase the danger of accidents and wasted time from better economic use. Better to increase residence in sites within safe walking or cycling distance to employment.</p>		<p>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>Existing issues that are currently present, such as drivers not taking account of the speed limits or parking inappropriately cannot be resolved by new developments. However if a new development were to make an existing issue worse, then the impacts would be mitigated through the development management process when a planning application is submitted. At this point, the Highways Authority would be able to consider the impact of a proposal and identify what mitigation schemes were required and these would be conditioned if planning</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				<p>permission were granted. This could include things such as the widening or improvement of existing footpath networks.</p>	
Anonymous	372	<p>GADD3</p> <p>Objections to Melton Local Plan (GADD3) as follows:</p> <p>(1) The Pasture Lane site would protrude over the boundary into open countryside</p> <p>(2) Beautiful country land with equally beautiful views, walked by all the village</p> <p>(3) Most importantly in Pasture Lane site, Great Crested Newts are to be found. This is recorded in a previous planning application.</p>		<p>Comments noted. There are no development boundaries proposed in the draft plan. Each site is therefore to be assessed on a site by site basis and the impact on the character of the settlement taken into account. There is built form adjacent to the east of the site and directly to the south. The site is also bounded by Rotherby Lane which runs along the western boundary which provides containment to the site. It is accepted in the Update to the Site Assessments that some mitigation would be required to limit the visual impact, however due to the location adjacent existing built form and the limited site area and small scale development that</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				<p>will result it is considered that the visual impact can be appropriately mitigated.</p> <p>By allocating GADD3 it is not introducing a new type of use to Pasture Lane as residential properties front onto it to the south of GADD3. Therefore it is not considered that the limited scale development proposed on a small site such as GADD3 will significantly alter the character of a rural village or the use of the village by existing residents for outdoor activities.</p> <p>It is recognised in the Update to the Site Assessments that an ecological report may be required through the planning application process, which would assess the ecological constraints of the site and identify the necessary mitigation measures which would need to be designed into a scheme.</p>	
Beryl Perriam	224	GADD3. As a resident of Pasture Lane, Gaddesby, I wish to		Comments noted. There	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>express my concerns regarding the Melton Plan and to strongly oppose the plan to build 11 new houses outside the boundary of the village, when there are more appropriate sites within the village.</p> <p>My other major concerns are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pasture Lane is a lane, not a road, and any access would cause more traffic, noise and chaos, also creating a hazard for walkers and dog walkers for all parts of the village who regularly use the lane. 2. Proposed site has a pond containing newts, which attracts wildlife and is good for the environment. 3. Traffic from the north of the village (i.e. Rotherby Lane) would encounter (on approach) new buildings outside the boundary which would affect the character of the village. 4. A 2 hour unreliable bus service. 5. Lack of amenities - no shops. 6. The proposed plan would spoil for all the residents of this historic village one of the nicest vies in Gaddesby. <p>Trusting you will give this protest your consideration.</p>		<p>are no development boundaries proposed in the draft plan. Each site is therefore to be assessed on a site by site basis and the impact on the character of the settlement taken into account. There is built form adjacent to the east of the site and directly to the south. The site is also bounded by Rotherby Lane which runs along the western boundary which provides containment to the site. It is accepted in the Update to the Site Assessments that some mitigation would be required to limit the visual impact, however due to the location adjacent existing built form and the limited site area and small scale development that will result it is considered that the visual impact can be appropriately mitigated.</p> <p>By allocating GADD3 it is not introducing a new type of use to Pasture Lane as residential properties front</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				<p>onto it to the south of GADD3. Therefore it is not considered that the limited scale development proposed on a small site such as GADD3 will significantly alter the character of a rural village or the use of the village by existing residents for outdoor activities.</p> <p>It is recognised in the Update to the Site Assessments that an ecological report may be required through the planning application process, which would assess the ecological constraints of the site and identify the necessary mitigation measures which would need to be designed into a scheme.</p> <p>The Highways Authority have been consulted and have stated that 'having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the Local Highway Authority is</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				<p>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>Comments noted about the bus service and the lack of a village shop. The criteria for identifying rural hubs was set out earlier in the plan making process and is based on the results of wide consultation. A village shop was not identified as one of the key criteria with the instability of such a facility and the wider opportunities in terms of internet based shopping. This is dealt with under policy SS2.</p>	
Simon Neil	121	The top of the village where Gadd 3 is located is served by		The Highways Authority	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
Hargrave		two minor roads. The Rotherby Lane is a single lane road and Pasture Lane is not much wider - cars must let each other pass in places. These are certainly not the "two well-connected roads" that are mentioned in the description of the site in the appendix.		have been consulted and have stated that 'having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the Local Highway Authority 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.'	
Caroline Louise Stuart	292	(GADD3) Location of GADD3 Site - Appendix 1 (p25) of the Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan states that the GADD3 site '...is situated in the northern edge of the village and therefore slightly detached from the limited services that the village provides'. This is a significant understatement, the GADD3 location is a long walk from the village 'services', services which only consist of a primary school and public house.		Comments noted regarding the distance between the site and the school. It is recognised that the site is on the northern edge of the existing settlement. However it is adjacent the existing settlement and therefore is connected to the village by virtue of its	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				location.	
Trudy Toon – Clerk	311	<p>Specific to GADD3</p> <p>1. Previous assessment GADD3 was the subject of an SHLAA assessment – MBC/017/13. This site was also rejected as being undeliverable and undevelopable. No further site assessment has been carried out. The failure to properly assess the site clearly demonstrates that the proposed allocation is not based on robust evidence or been appropriately considered against alternative sites within the village or elsewhere in the Borough. This is a fundamental shortcoming in the preparation of the Local Plan which as a result means the allocation of the site is not ‘justified’ or consistent with national policy, as required.</p> <p>2. Highways</p> <p>Site Appendix 1 of the Melton Local Plan states the following with regard to GADD03:</p> <p>“The site is situated in the northern edge of the village and therefore slightly detached from the limited services that the village provides. Its access via either of two well-connected roads and the proximity to the bus stop makes this site a suitable allocation for housing.”</p> <p>The two roads in question, Rotherby Lane and Pasture Lane, are both unsuitable or more than the occasional vehicle, and certainly not suitable for any heavy vehicles such as buses and lorries. The main access for properties at this end of the village is Pasture Lane for traffic approaching from Melton Mowbray, or Gaddesby Lane, via Main Street and Park Hill from Leicester. Main Street is often</p>		<p>Assessments An initial site assessment was carried out between April and June 2016. An update to the site assessments has been carried out between November 2016 and February 2017 which has refined the assessments and provided further detail. Contact has also been made with landowners/ agents to identify availability, viability and deliverability of sites. Therefore site assessments have been completed for all sites.</p> <p>Highways Comments noted about rural nature of roads in this location. The Highways Authority have been consulted and have stated that ‘having considered the draft spatial strategy (including proposed allocations to specific settlements) at a high-level, the Local Highway Authority is satisfied that there are no</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>reduced to a single lane with overflow parking of pub patrons, and also from the vehicles belonging to residents of Main Street without off-road parking. These roads are not “well-connected” and are in fact highly restrictive, dangerous in some weather conditions, and not effective to support additional residences. Park Hill is exactly what it says - a steep hill. Vehicles naturally speed down the hill (it is almost impossible to keep to the speed limit due to the steepness). By the same token vehicles ascending tend to speed to be able to get up the hill. There is only one footpath which is on the opposite (west) side to the main body of housing at Paske Avenue and Barrow Crescent and indeed GADD3. Therefore when walking children to school, Parents have to cross the road to the footpath which is dangerous due to the speed of the traffic. There are also a number of concealed entrances along Park Hill. See 9.4.18 of the 2016 draft plan.</p> <p>3. The bus service</p> <p>The bus service also currently uses Paske Avenue to turn around and head back down the hill to continue its route. This creates a traffic danger, as Paske Avenue is a narrow road, which often has many vehicles parked on it, and really is unsuitable for large vehicles such as buses.</p> <p>4. Ground Quality & Drainage of Existing Properties</p> <p>The ground on GADD03 plot is clay heavy, and as a result there is a lot of surface water retention and runoff from fields. This affects a number of properties, and any new development in the area will undoubtedly have a negative knock on effect on the other existing properties. There is no mention of attempting to improve drainage facilities for</p>		<p>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>Existing issues that are currently present, such as drivers not taking account of the speed limits or bus drivers turning cannot be resolved by new developments. However if a new development were to make an existing issue worse, then the impacts would be mitigated through the development management process when a planning application is submitted. At this point, the Highways Authority would be able to consider the impact of a proposal and identify what</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>existing properties, and existing drainage of the land could be called ineffective in areas, so any additional load would also be ineffective without improvement. This has not been properly assessed.</p> <p>5. Visual impactGADD3 would have an adverse visual impact on the entrance to and exit from the village and on the wider countryside. As one reaches the top of Park Hill It is clear that one has reached open country. This would not be the case if the development were to be built. The site is considered to be out of character with the otherdevelopment, which extends along Pasture Lane. The likely adverse impact upon the settlement and surrounding landscape has not been assessed.</p>		<p>mitigation schemes were required and these would be conditioned if planning permission were granted. This could include things such as the widening or improvement of existing footpath networks.</p> <p>Drainage Surface water drainage would be dealt with through the Development Management process and as part of Building Regulation requirements. No objection has been received from Severn Trent on this site.</p> <p>Visual Impact Comments noted. There is built form adjacent to the east of the site and directly to the south. The site is also bounded by Rotherby Lane which runs along the western boundary which provides containment to the site. It is accepted in the Update to the Site Assessments that some mitigation would be required to limit the visual impact, however</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				due to the location adjacent existing built form and the limited site area and small scale development that will result it is considered that the visual impact can be appropriately mitigated.	