

## Chapter 5, Policy C1(a)

Name	Representor Number	CH5PC1(A)Q3: Response	CH5PC1(A)Q4: Representor's Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Carl Copestake	51	The land allocations for Asfordby Hill do not include the potential for residential development on the land to the south of the Welby Road / A6006 roundabout.	The site comprises land to the south of Asfordby Hill adjacent to site MBC/113/13 which was not deemed suitable due to access not being feasible for a large development. This site is accessible from the adopted highway via the roundabout on the A6006. The current access can be widened to 10m by including third party land providing suitable access for up to 150 dwellings as stated in the LCC Design Guide, providing access also to sites MBC/112/13 and MBC/113/13.	This site has been submitted as SHLAA site and assessed as a potential allocation	None.
Carl Copestake	52	The land allocations for Asfordby Hill do not include the potential for residential development on the land to the south of the Welby Road / A6006 roundabout.	The site comprises land to the south of Asfordby Hill adjacent to site MBC/113/13 which was not deemed suitable due to access not being feasible for a large development. This site is accessible from the adopted highway via the roundabout on the A6006. The current access can be widened to 10m by including third party land providing suitable access for up to 150 dwellings as stated in the LCC Design Guide, providing access also to sites MBC/112/13 and MBC/113/13.	This site has been submitted as SHLAA site and assessed as a potential allocation	None.
Carl Copestake	53	The land allocations for Asfordby Hill do not include the potential for residential development on the land to the south of the Welby Road / A6006 roundabout.	The site comprises land to the south of Asfordby Hill adjacent to site MBC/113/13 which was not deemed suitable due to access not being feasible for a large development. This site is accessible from the adopted highway via the roundabout on the A6006. The current access can be widened to 10m by including third party land providing suitable access for up to 150 dwellings as stated in the LCC Design Guide, providing access also to sites MBC/112/13 and MBC/113/13.	This site has been submitted as SHLAA site and assessed as a potential allocation	None.
Chris Sinton (GL Hearn) on behalf of Severn Trent Water	378	<p>The Site</p> <p>The site, shown edge red on the accompanying site location Plan, is irregular in shape and extends to approximately 4 hectares in area. It is situated approximately 0.5km to the west of Melton Mowbray, outside of the settlement boundary in the administrative area of MBC. It currently comprises non-operational grazing land. Access is gained from Sysonby Grange Lane to the west.</p>		The site is unrelated to the existing built up area of the town and therefore contrary to EN6. If, despite of this, the interested party would like this site to be considered by MBC, the best way to do it is via a SHLAA submission.	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH5PC1(A)Q3: Response	CH5PC1(A)Q4: Representor's Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
		<p>The site does not include any statutory or non-statutory nature conservation, landscape or heritage designations. Although, the eastern edge of the site, generally following the line of the River Eye, is classified as being within Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3.</p> <p>3.3 The site does not contain any ecological, landscape or heritage designations.</p> <p>Surroundings</p> <p>The site is bordered to the north by the Grade II Riverside Cottage at Riverside Farm, Grade II Listed Barn at Riverside Farm and Grade II St Mary's Church/ cemetery; to the east by the River Eye and beyond that by Long Field Academy and playing fields; to the south by the Nottingham-east midlands railway line and beyond that by the operational Melton Mowbray Sewage Treatment Works; and to the west by Asfordby Road Golf Course.</p> <p>Scheme Proposals</p> <p>It is proposed that the site could deliver high quality market and affordable rural housing with a tenure mix to meet local need. It is also proposed that the scheme would include publicly accessible open space for use by new and existing residents. Existing landscape features would look to be</p>			

Name	Representor Number	CH5PC1(A)Q3: Response	CH5PC1(A)Q4: Representor's Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
		<p>retained and enhanced as part of any development, particularly along the River Eye. The site could</p> <p>form part of the wider Melton West SUE for which an illustrative masterplan would be produced.</p> <p>Sustainable Development Principles</p> <p>The presumption in favour of sustainable development is the 'golden thread' running through the</p> <p>NPPF. Paragraph 7 identifies that there are three dimensions to sustainable development:</p> <p>economic, social and environmental. The development of new rural homes on the site as part of the</p> <p>wider Melton West SUE could deliver significant economic, social and environment benefits to the</p> <p>local community as detailed at paragraph 2.27 of this representation and below:</p> <p>The economic benefits which can be expected to be delivered by housing on this site are described</p> <p>below:</p> <p>§ Labour force - the site will bring new working age families into the area. This will be crucial</p> <p>to ensure that there is a resident labour force in the area, which can underpin sustainable</p> <p>economic growth without resulting in large increases in in-commuting from elsewhere in the</p> <p>region;</p> <p>§ New jobs – building new homes creates significant numbers of new jobs in construction, in</p>			

Name	Representor Number	CH5PC1(A)Q3: Response	CH5PC1(A)Q4: Representor's Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
		<p>the supply chain and in related services such as local shops and amenities;</p> <p>§ Increased spending power – new homes will bring new economically active families into the area, who will spend their disposable income in local shops and services. This will boost businesses and increase local vitality and the viability of local services and facilities; and</p> <p>§ Increased revenue – the new homes will substantially increase MBC's revenue base as a result of significant increases in Council Tax income and New Homes Bonus.</p> <p>Social</p> <p>The proposed allocation would also secure significant social benefits, positively contributing to creating a strong, vibrant and healthy local community. These benefits includes:</p> <p>§ Family homes – the site can address the growing need for new high quality and modern family homes in the area. It will deliver a wide range of new homes in terms of type and size, to meet the needs of different families in the community;</p> <p>§ Affordable homes – the new community could include a number of new affordable homes, such as starter homes and affordable rented houses. This will significantly enhance opportunities for home ownership, helping less affluent families and young first time buyers</p>			

Name	Representor Number	CH5PC1(A)Q3: Response	CH5PC1(A)Q4: Representor's Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
		<p>to get onto the housing ladder; and</p> <p>§ Publicly Accessible Open Space – development could incorporate some public open space for new and existing residents to enjoy.</p> <p>The environmental benefits that would be secured by the scheme are described below:</p> <p>§ Environmental improvements – any development would include high quality landscape to provide new and enhanced habitats to increase the biodiversity value of the site, whilst providing new landscape features and greenspaces for the community to enjoy;</p> <p>§ Recreational resources – the site could also provide new open space and green infrastructure for the local community to enjoy and spend time in; and</p> <p>STW are keen to work collaboratively with MBC to deliver a 'sound' Local Plan which meets the identified housing needs in the Borough. We would welcome the opportunity to engage with the Council to discuss development options and opportunities at the site in greater detail. STW would also seek to work in partnership with willing neighbouring landowners to help deliver the Melton West SUE.</p>			

Name	Representor Number	CH5PC1(A)Q3: Response	CH5PC1(A)Q4: Representor's Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Clawson in Action	379	<p>3.2 Objection to Policy C1(A)</p> <p>The settlement requirement for Long Clawson from 2016 to 2036 is calculated as 110 on a proportionate basis as per Table 5. It should not be 127 as shown in this policy, which includes the unfair reallocation of deficit numbers from other Service Centres and Rural Hubs.</p>	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>Long Clawson residents object to the Pre-submission Local Plan and ask MBC to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• address all infrastructure problems detailed in this letter and accompanying evidence, include and budget for them in the MBC Local Plan, and implement them prior to any development being undertaken in Long Clawson.</li> <li>• If all the infrastructure issues are addressed, and if Long Clawson housing allocation of 110 homes is accepted, the building should be evenly spread over 20 years at a rate of no more than six in any one year and tailored to local need;</li> <li>• support the development of the Garden Village at Six Hills as a sustainable alternative to 'over-loading' all the villages in the Vale of Belvoir';</li> <li>• reconsider its decision to unfairly allocate 67%, of the 35% housing allocation for villages, to villages north of the town, concentrated on the Nottinghamshire border.</li> </ul>	Comment noted. This refers to SS3 policy.	None.
Colin Love	173	<p>Bottesford and Easthorpe</p> <p>Bottesford Parish (which includes the four villages of</p>	Significantly reduce the housing allocation to Bottesford to 300 as originally indicated in the Emerging Options document.	Comment noted. This refers to SS3 policy.	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH5PC1(A)Q3: Response	CH5PC1(A)Q4: Representor's Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
		<p>Normanton, Muston, Easthorpe and Bottesford) has been allocated a residual build of 427 houses for Bottesford and Easthorpe a further 22, - 449 total plus any 'windfall additions. The Plan period build for the villages of Bottesford and Easthorpe is thus nearly 500 houses. This figure has been arrived at in a mechanistic manner - the 'proportionate' process of calculation referred to in Section 4, paras 4.2.15, 4.2.18 - 4.2.22, whereby houses are allocated to Social Hubs in accordance with the present size of the settlement. However this mechanistic process would result in a 33% growth of the Parish and a proportionately larger growth in Bottesford. This takes no, or little, account of the capacity of Bottesford to accommodate such a substantial increase in housing and the consequent negative impact on the village structure and character. The Draft Neighbourhood Plan evidence base clearly indicates that the parish residents do not want Bottesford to become, or be on its way, to becoming, a small town.</p> <p>Chapter 3 Environment Objective 19 states that within the Borough, development should be avoided in areas prone to flooding.</p> <p>Bottesford is, according to the Environment Agency, the lowest lying area of the Borough and, with three significant waterways, is categorised as a High Risk Flood Area. This was evidenced in 2001, when Bottesford and Easthorpe were subject to a major flood and in 2012 when an EA Flood Warning was issued.</p> <p>The EA has formally stated, in evidence to a Parliamentary Select Committee, that in the context of climate change, the present designation of areas subject to 100 year flood events is now inadequate and that it is intending to undertake, in 2017, an updating of Bottesford Flood Risk Assessment.</p>			

Name	Representor Number	CH5PC1(A)Q3: Response	CH5PC1(A)Q4: Representor's Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
		<p>As was demonstrated in 2001, it is not simply a question of houses being flooded, the entire centres of both Bottesford, including Belvoir Road, and Easthorpe were flooded hence making access to the schools and retail facilities virtually impossible, and great difficulty travelling out of the village. Therefore it is inadequate for MBC to argue that it has undertaken a flood risk assessment on each development site. The assessment has to be applied to the entire land area of the parish.</p> <p>7.22.3 of this document indicates that areas within the Borough that are not subject to flood risk should be sequentially preferred to those that flood. For example, Waltham, which does not flood and has a reserved site for 168 houses, should be sequentially used in preference to the high flood risk area of Bottesford.</p> <p>Further, locating a greater proportion of house development in villages closer to Melton than Bottesford would have the potential to offer far more to the Melton economy (in support of Chapter 6) as well as to reduce the 'travel to work' mileage and consequently enhance environment sustainability.</p>			
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Belvoir Estate)	381	<p>Excluded Sites</p> <p>The Belvoir Estate objects to the Melton Local Plan as it fails to allocate the following sites for residential development:</p> <p>SHLAA MBC/020/16: Land to the West of Mere Road- up to 100dw</p> <p>The 2016 SHLAA commentary states: 'Site is on aquifer. However, this shouldn't be an issue. This is a good, logical site for housing development of about 1/3 of the proposed units. Site considered achievable within 0-5 years.'</p>	<p>Policy C1a and Appendix 2 be modified by:</p> <p>CROX2: Land East of Saltby Road and South of A607</p> <p>Modifying the allocated site as shown on the attached plan.</p> <p>CROX3: Land South of Main Street (A607) and West of the Nook</p> <p>Modifying the allocated site to include the whole field as shown on the attached plan.</p>	<p>This site has ranked in a lower place in our sites assessments than other sites in the settlement, it doesn't mean that the site is good or bad, just that there are better options. Further information about this assessment can be found on our website - Evidence base - Spatial Strategy.</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH5PC1(A)Q3: Response	CH5PC1(A)Q4: Representor's Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
		<p>MBC/103/13: Land to the south of Easthorpe Lane, Redmile- up to 40dw Redmile is a sustainable village with a primary school, two pubs and an hourly bus service.</p>	<p>SHLAA MBC/020/16: Land to the West of Mere Road- up to 100dw</p> <p>Allocating this site for housing development or as a housing reserve site.</p> <p>MBC/103/13: Land to the south of Easthorpe Lane, Redmile- up to 40dw</p> <p>Allocating this site for housing development as shown on the attached plan.</p>		
David Peck	222	<p>The Local Plan has failed to respond positively to the opportunity for residential development in a sustainable location,</p> <p>namely an under-used part of the Pera Business Park, Nottingham Road, Melton Mowbray (ref. MBC/186/15). The</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal confirms the many advantages offered by this edge of town centre site. The Council's</p> <p>assessment of the site (in Settlement Sites Assessment document SS5m Melton Mowbray) provides an overview of the site.</p> <p>The key constraint that the assessment in SS5m identifies is the presence of trees protected by TPO. It incorrectly</p> <p>states however that 'all' of the trees are so protected. A good number of the trees are indeed protected but the</p> <p>assessment fails to acknowledge that many of the trees are in poor condition and / or have limited long term potential.</p> <p>The need to retain important trees that can contribute to maintaining the amenity and appearance of the site is</p>	<p>Site ref. MBC/186/15 should be allocated for residential development. This will afford the Borough an improved</p> <p>prospect of achieving delivery of the numbers of dwellings required to meet its objectives assessed needs. The</p> <p>availability of an additional, relatively modest sized site will help to counterbalance any delays in the delivery of new</p> <p>housing on other sites. In particular, the Local Plan has placed great emphasis on two significant urban extensions</p> <p>to the north and south of the town to meet more than half of Melton's housing requirement for the Plan period. Such</p> <p>large and complex sites inevitably take a significant period of time to build out. The Local Plan requires a masterplanled</p> <p>approach that will take some time to agree. There is a significant risk that they will be delayed. A greater diversity</p> <p>of sites will provide greater appeal to the development market and reduce the risk of under</p>	<p>The number of constraints affecting to this site (TPOs, access, potential contamination issues) and the potential for the site to accommodate additional employment land within the town, made the site to rank lower than other sites in Melton Mowbray. However, MBC is willing to have further conversations with developers and landowners in order to help to this site to go forward.</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH5PC1(A)Q3: Response	CH5PC1(A)Q4: Representor's Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
		<p>acknowledged by the landowner, Pera (NB The Council's assessment incorrectly ascribes ownership to 'LCC'). The</p> <p>better understand the role played by those trees within the wider townscape, and how development could be</p> <p>accommodated on the site, Pera instructed Planning and Design Group to prepare a 'Townscape Analysis and Opportunities' document (November 2014). That document was made available to the Council as part of the Local</p> <p>Plan process. A further copy is appended to this submission.</p> <p>The Townscape Analysis and Opportunities was informed by a tree survey in addition to a highways/access</p> <p>assessment and commercial viability analysis. It identified the potential to provide new development within the</p> <p>existing parkland-type area in the form of two building platforms that would lie adjacent to the existing Staveley Lodge</p> <p>building (which could itself be retained or redeveloped). Provision is made for the retention of the trees that have</p> <p>long term potential and would contribute positively to the site and wider amenity. The Council's own assessment</p> <p>(within SS5m) concludes that 'A...scheme incorporating the mature trees within the scheme may be achievable'. The</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal assessment of the site (pages 517 to 520) concludes that a number of '[p]otential significant</p> <p>positive effects were identified for this site in relation to SA objectives....There were no potential significant negative</p>	<p>delivery.</p>		

Name	Representor Number	CH5PC1(A)Q3: Response	CH5PC1(A)Q4: Representor's Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
		<p>effects identified for this site in relation to the SA objectives' (emphasis added). The SA marks the site down for</p> <p>being greenfield, however it fails to recognise that development could involve re-use of the existing Staveley Lodge</p> <p>site (a heavily modified building that has lost many of its original features, having been severely damaged by fire</p> <p>some years ago). In simple terms, this is an edge of town centre site, located in very close proximity to a wide range</p> <p>of service and facilities (including directly opposite a Sainsbury's supermarket). It benefits from an existing</p> <p>signal controlled access that operates with sufficient spare capacity to serve new development. The land is not</p> <p>publicly accessible, is underutilised and could be developed for residential use without any significant detrimental</p> <p>effects on the wider locality.</p>			
Diane Reed	244	<p>Housing already built/approved since 2011-2016 : 50</p> <p>Estimated incidental housing 2016 -2036 : 40</p> <p>These figures are not declared in the Melton Plan by MBC instead stating a minimum of 428 house in Bottesford</p>		Comment noted. This refers to the SS2 policy.	None.
Dr James Philip Clifford Harding	119	<p>The proposed large increase in housing (427) in Bottesford would overwhelm the village's (not 'town's') infrastructure with regard to traffic, parking, sewerage, schools, health facilities, shopping and leisure. As an ex employee of the Environment Agency I know that Bottesford is in a high flood risk area of the Trent plain totally unsuited to further disproportionate development which would put many more people at risk of flooding and increase the runoff that often causes the flash flooding such as has occurred in the village in the past. Bottesford parish is far away from the main centres of employment and a ludicrous choice for extra housing: there are several other more suitable brownfield sites well known to the planners far away in</p>	<p>Carry out sound and published investigations into the needs and impact on Bottesford relating to flood risk, traffic, parking, sewerage, schools, health facilities, shopping and leisure. Provide feedback to those Bottesford residents who have heard nothing from MBC in response to their comments on the earlier emerging options and draft plan.</p> <p>Provide clear reasons why a totally disproportionate number of new houses has been proposed for Bottesford rather than other more suitable brownfield</p>	Comment noted. This refers to the SS2 policy.	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH5PC1(A)Q3: Response	CH5PC1(A)Q4: Representor's Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
		Melton Mowbray. Last but not least such irresponsible development will destroy the character of a beautiful Leicestershire village.	sites closer to employment and facilities in the borough.		
Dr Neil James Fortey	78	The housing allocated to Bottesford includes sites that fall within flood risk zones and as such should not be accepted. Alternative sites within Bottesford have not been identified and indeed are unlikely to be identified in view of the pervasive flood hazard in this low lying area. Other sites should be sought in order to avoid building in environmentally unacceptable locations and these should be in other centres if needs be.	A proper assessment of housing development should be made taking into account areas of known flood risk. Sites must be selected in accordance with due diligence regarding flood risk and re-allocation of some of the present development sites be undertaken if needs be.	Most of the allocations and alternative sites in Bottesford are in Flood Zone 2 or 3. Flood risk can be mitigated to achieve a suitable site.	None.
Elanor Wright on behalf of Featherstones PDD Ltd.	388	<p>The suitability of land west of Barkestone Lane, Bottesford</p> <p>The land west of Barkestone Lane presents the opportunity to deliver a significant number of houses toward the Borough's housing requirement, alongside the provision of a substantial area of public open space with footpath links to the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>The attached Development Framework plans at Appendix 1 and 2 shows the site in context with the village and demonstrates the emerging thoughts on how the site could be developed. It illustrates that a relatively small proportion of the site is currently being proposed for residential development which would enable a significant level of public open space to be delivered which could open up footpath connections to the wider area. The site capacity is likely to be between 150 and 300 dwellings, depending on the overall scale of the site and outcomes from detailed assessment and masterplanning.</p> <p>The site has not been actively promoted during earlier stages of the Local Plan preparation and it is acknowledged that this creates issues for Plan making. However, simply because a suitable site does not come forward early in the process, does not mean it should be excluded at the expense of less sustainable sites and a less sustainable development strategy.</p>		The site is unrelated to the existing built up area of the town and therefore contrary to EN6. If, despite of this, the interested party would like this site to be considered by MBC, the best way to do it is via a SHLAA submission.	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH5PC1(A)Q3: Response	CH5PC1(A)Q4: Representor's Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
		<p>Although the proposals for the site are in the early stages of their evolution, some preliminary assessment work has been undertaken and this work concludes that there are no environmental factors which would preclude the development of the site.</p> <p>The site also scores highly in terms of an overall site assessment. The Council undertook a site assessment for the proposed allocation sites within the various villages at an earlier stage in the Local Plan preparation process. At appendix 3 we have emulated this approach to illustrate how the Barkestone Lane site compares with the other proposed allocations; the conclusions find that the site scores comparatively highly in all aspects of the assessment and compares well to other sites in the village currently proposed to be allocated. Put simply, it is a better related, more sustainable and suitable site for development.</p> <p>In terms of access, the size and form of the landholding offers the potential for the scheme to facilitate the re-opening of the Barkestone Lane A52 junction. It is understood that this could alleviate traffic issues in the village currently caused by the necessity for all school traffic to enter the centre of the village first before travelling along Barkestone Lane.</p> <p>With regard to flood risk, the wider site lies within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3 with development proposed on areas within Flood Zones 1 and 2. Preliminary assessment work indicates that flood risk matters can be appropriately mitigated. Indeed, due to the land available and the nature of the flood risk in the area there is the potential for flood alleviation work which could better increase the capacity of the site to accommodate development and deliver major benefits to the area by reducing the risk of flooding elsewhere.</p>			