

ASFORDBY PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Consultation Statement

ABSTRACT

The Asfordby Parish
Neighbourhood Plan offers the
chance for all residents and
businesses to have their say on
future development within the
parish and influence how their
neighbourhood evolves. By
working together, we can
ensure that the area develops in
a way that meets the needs of
everyone.

October 2016

1 Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	1
L	egal Requirements	1
(Consultation Process	1
2.	Neighbourhood Plan Area	3
[Designation	3
3.	Initial Consultation 2012/13	5
I	ntroduction	5
5	Stakeholder Consultation	5
	Overview	5
	Who was consulted	5
	How were people consulted	5
	Issues, priorities and concerns raised	6
	How the Issues, Priorities and Concerns have been considered	6
`	Young People Consultation: Asfordby Hill Primary School	7
	Overview	7
	Who was consulted	8
	How were people consulted	8
	Issues, priorities and concerns raised	8
	How the Issues, Priorities and Concerns have been considered	8
(Community Consultation: Jubilee Day Celebration	9
	Overview	9
	Who was consulted	9
	How were people consulted	9
	Issues, priorities and concerns raised	10
	How the Issues, Priorities and Concerns have been considered	10
`	Young People Consultation: Captains Close Primary School	10
(Overview	10
١	Who was consulted	11
ŀ	How were people consulted	11
I	ssues, priorities and concerns raised	11
ŀ	How the Issues, Priorities and Concerns have been considered	12
`	Young People Consultation: Teenagers	12
(Overview	12

Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan: Consultation Statement

	Who was consulted	12
	How were people consulted	12
	Issues, priorities and concerns raised	13
	How the Issues, Priorities and Concerns have been considered	13
4.	Issues and Options Questionnaire Survey	14
	Overview	14
	Who was consulted	14
	How were people consulted	14
	Issues, priorities and Concerns Raised	15
	How the Issues, Priorities and Concerns have been considered	17
5.	Pre-submission Draft Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan (1st Version)	18
	Overview	18
	Who was consulted	18
	How were people consulted	19
	Issues, priorities and Concerns Raised	19
	How the Issues, Priorities and Concerns have been considered	19
6.	Pre-submission Draft Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan (2nd Version)	21
	Overview	21
	Who was consulted	21
	How were people consulted	22
	Issues, priorities and Concerns Raised	22
	How the Issues, Priorities and Concerns have been considered	22
7.	Conclusion	24
Α	ppendix 1: Consultation Bodies	25
	ppendix 2: Pre-submission Draft Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan (1st ersion) Respondents	27
	ppendix 3: Pre-submission Draft Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan (1st ersion) Representations	28
	ppendix 4: Pre-submission Draft Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan (2nd ersion) Respondents	151
	ppendix 5: Pre-submission Draft Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan (2nd ersion) Representations	152

1. Introduction

Legal Requirements

- 1.1 This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal requirements of Part 5, Section 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 by:
 - (a) Detailing the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
 - (b) Outlining how these persons and bodies were consulted;
 - (c) Providing a summary of the main issues and concerns raised;
 - (d) Reviewing how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

Consultation Process

- 1.2 Throughout the process of producing the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan a more in-depth consultation process has been undertaken than required within the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.
- 1.3 The aims of the consultation process were:
 - To 'front-load' consultation and ensure that the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan is fully informed by the views and priorities of local residents, businesses, and key local stakeholders.
 - To ensure that detailed consultation takes place at all stages of the process, especially where key priorities needed to be set.
 - To engage with as broad a cross-section of the community as possible, using a variety of consultation and communication techniques.
 - To ensure consultation results are made publicly available and used to inform subsequent stages of the Neighbourhood Planning process.
- 1.4 Consultation was undertaken by Asfordby Parish Council with independent professional support from Planit-X Town and Country Planning Services and Planning Consultant Helen Metcalfe.

1.5 The programme of consultation undertaken is summarised below.

Activity	Date
Stakeholder Workshop	May 2012
Consultation with Asfordby Hill Primary School	May 2012
Jubilee Day Celebration	June 2012
Consultation with Captains Close Primary School	July 2012
Young People Consultation	July/August 2013
Issues and Options Questionnaire Survey	August 2014
Pre-Submission Consultation (1st Version)	February/March 2015
Pre-Submission Consultation (2 nd Version)	February/April 2016

1.6 This Consultation Statement provides an overview of each of the above stages of consultation in accordance with Section 15 (2) of Part 5 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

2. Neighbourhood Plan Area

Designation

- 2.1 The whole parish of Asfordby has been designated as a Neighbourhood Area following an application made by Asfordby Parish Council under Part 2, Section 5 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.
- 2.2 The Neighbourhood Plan area was approved by Melton Borough Council on 30 January 2013, following a 6-week period of public consultation as required by Part 2, Section 6 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Date Created: 7-8-2016 | Map Centre (Easting/Northing): 471012 / 319906 | Scale: 1.25593 | © Crown copyright and database right. All rights reserved (100056049) 2016 © Contains Ordnance Survey Data: Crown copyright and database right 2016

3. Initial Consultation 2012/13

Introduction

3.1 During May 2012 to August 2013 Asfordby Parish Council undertook a series of initial stakeholder consultation events as part of its preparation of the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan. This programme of initial consultation events is provided in more detail below.

Stakeholder Consultation

Date	29 May 2012
Venue	Asfordby Parish Hall
Format	Stakeholder Evening Workshop (6.30pm to 9.00pm)
Publicity	Invite only
Attendance	9

Overview

- 3.2 Asfordby Parish Council appointed Helen Metcalfe to run this workshop for parish councillors and key statutory bodies to assist in the preparation of the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan. Further support was also provided by Planit-X Town and Country Planning Services. The aims of this event were as follows:
 - To inform stakeholders about neighbourhood planning and outline the steps required to produce the plan; and
 - To identify local issues and priorities that could be turned into 'policy statements' to be tested with the wider community at the Asfordby Jubilee Day Consultation on 3 June 2012.

Who was consulted

3.3 Parish councillors and key statutory bodies were directly notified of and invited to the workshop. Over 60 individuals or organisations were invited to the event. Although the workshop was well received it was disappointing that more people did not take up the invitation. It was acknowledged that a more proactive approach may have encouraged more people to attend and this would be borne in mind for future consultations.

How were people consulted

3.4 The first half of the workshop provided the delegates with facts about the Neighbourhood Planning process and the socioeconomic situation in Asfordby. The next part of the workshop

was more of an interactive process, with group working facilitated. Delegates were asked to:

- Consider the strengths, weakness opportunities and threats facing the parish of Asfordby;
- Imagine how they would like to see Asfordby in 2026;
- Review and identify those areas for protection and development, onto a map; and
- Identify the circumstances when development in Asfordby would be acceptable.
- 3.5 These interactive exercises enabled 9 policy statements to be drafted for the Asfordby Jubilee Day community event celebration on 3 June 2012.

Issues, priorities and concerns raised

- 3.6 A detailed report on this workshop is available separately but as a summary the following key issues were raised:
 - Strengths were considered to include the range of local services and facilities, its role as a Rural Centre and reasonable level of public transport provision.
 - Weaknesses were identified as being the lack of community spirit, lack of shop at Asfordby Hill, low skill levels, use of roads as 'rat runs' and the parish consisting of 3 separate settlements.
 - Threats facing the parish were considered to include reduction in bus services and public resources, an elderly population, flooding, uncontrolled development and lack of resident interest.
 - Opportunities identified include building a community spirit, use
 of community infrastructure levy, community facilities such as a
 children's centre and a residential home for the elderly. It can
 be seen that this 'opportunities' have a link and a shared
 theme with the 'threats'.

How the Issues, Priorities and Concerns have been considered

- 3.7 From the issues raised the following statements were drafted at the workshop for wider community consultation on 3 June 2012:
 - 1. Local facilities like shops, schools, pubs, community halls are important and need maintaining in Asfordby.
 - 2. Asfordby needs to allow some housing development to keep local services, like schools, pubs, shops and doctors going in the future.

- 3. Housing could be acceptable on the north of the village next to the by-pass.
- The open fields between Asfordby Village, The Valley and Asfordby Hill need protecting to stop the settlements merging.
- 5. Land should be allocated for housing around Asfordby Hill to expand its population to support the school and other services (e.g. community buildings, a shop).
- 6. The redevelopment of Asfordby Storage Depot for housing would be OK.
- 7. New housing should link with the existing areas via footpath and road networks.
- 8. Development should be built to high energy efficiency standards.
- 9. Asfordby needs to plan for more business so that there are more jobs for local people.

Young People Consultation: Asfordby Hill Primary School

Date	17 May 2012	
Venue	Asfordby Hill Primary School	
Format Half Day Workshop		
Publicity	Arranged directly with the school	
	headteacher.	
Attendance	25 pupils	

Overview

- 3.8 As the timescale for the implementation of policies in the Neighbourhood Plan will impact more on youngsters than any other age group it was considered very important that they felt part of the Neighbourhood Plan process. The aims were as follows:
 - To ensure that young persons were able to make a significant contribution at an early stage in the policy making of the Neighbourhood Plan; and
 - To engage with and understand the views of young persons and what they value in the area and to use their responses to inform development proposals for the future.

Who was consulted

3.9 The aim was to engage and consult with pupils of Asfordby Hill Primary School. This session was delivered by Planning Consultant Helen Metcalfe, a specialist in community engagement in planning, with the support of the head teacher Mrs McConnell.

How were people consulted

3.10 The format of the session focused on short visual presentations explaining what planning is and how it affects us all and why their views were important to the Parish Council in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. The presentations were interspersed with a series of activities that allowed the children to consider the impact planning had on their lives.

Issues, priorities and concerns raised

- 3.11 A total of 25 pupils participated in the session. A detailed report on this workshop is available separately but the feedback received is summarised below.
- 3.12 It is recognised that they know their local area very well and they contributed a lot of local knowledge and a young persons' perspective of what they like and don't like about living in and around Asfordby. The children had many more likes than dislikes and the session identified the following key issues:
 - They value their play areas but additional investment is needed e.g. more ramps and shelters at the skate park and more equipment and activities at both the Valley play area and Compton Park
 - Potential underused resource at the 'Stute'
 - They use the shops in Asfordby Village although more are wanted to provide more choice
 - Open spaces were used and enjoyed although the woods next to Compton Park were identified as being unsafe and in need of maintenance.
 - Concerns were raised at having to cross a busy road to access school playing fields

How the Issues, Priorities and Concerns have been considered

3.13 The responses from the session were used to help prepare the Issues and Options Version of the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Community Consultation: Jubilee Day Celebration

Date	3 June 2012 – Jubilee Day Celebration
Venue Asfordby Parish Hall	
Format	Public Exhibition 10am – 4pm
Publicity	Leaflets, posters
Attendance	Ongoing throughout the day

Overview

- 3.14 This was the first wider public consultation event held as part of the process to develop the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan. The Jubilee Day celebrations community event was used an opportunity to raise the profile of the Neighbourhood Plan and encourage discussion. A Neighbourhood Plan stand was located in the Parish Hall, where there was entertainment throughout the day. The aims of this event were as follows:
 - To inform the community and other interested stakeholders about neighbourhood planning and outline the steps required to produce the plan; and
 - To identify local issues, priorities and the community's key aspirations for the future of Asfordby.

Who was consulted

3.15 The aim was to engage and consult with as many members of the local community as possible as well as to raise the profile of the Neighbourhood Plan. A total of 79 people provided comments on this consultation. There were also others who commented verbally but did not participate fully.

How were people consulted

- 3.16 A Neighbourhood Plan stall was set up at the Parish Hall during the Jubilee Day celebrations. It was considered that 'tagging' onto this event would provide a good opportunity to raise the profile of the Neighbourhood Plan, overcome concerns about community disinterest and to facilitate discussion within the community.
- 3.17 In addition to being asked to vote on whether they agreed with the 9 policy statements, people were also asked what they wanted Asfordby to be like in the future, identify areas for development as well as protection, and provide any additional comments on a free thinking board. Alongside this, children were provided with an opportunity to provide their ideal town.

Issues, priorities and concerns raised

- 3.18 A detailed report on this workshop is available separately but as a summary the feedback from this community consultation identified the following key issues:
 - Limited support for development to the north of the village;
 - Support in principle the expansion of Asfordby Hill;
 - Protection of the distinctiveness of the 3 settlements and prevent their coalescence;
 - Retaining key services and facilities;
 - Protection of important open spaces and local footpaths;
 - Making sure the needs of young people are met;
 - Identification of possible development sites;
 - Meeting business needs and to provide more local jobs;
 - High energy standards in new development.

How the Issues, Priorities and Concerns have been considered

3.19 The responses from the event were used to help prepare the Issues and Options Version of the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Young People Consultation: Captains Close Primary School

Date	12 July 2012	
Venue	Captains Close Primary School	
Format	Half Day Workshop	
Publicity	Arranged directly with the school	
	headteacher.	
Attendance	31 pupils	

Overview

- 3.20 As the timescale for the implementation of policies in the Neighbourhood Plan will impact more on youngsters than any other age group it was considered very important that they felt part of the Neighbourhood Plan process. Furthermore, the school is in the main settlement of Asfordby and all the children live in the parish. The aims were as follows:
 - To ensure that young persons were able to make a significant contribution at an early stage in the policy making of the Neighbourhood Plan; and

To engage with and understand the views of young persons and what they value in the area and to use their responses to inform development proposals for the future.

Who was consulted

3.21 The aim was to engage and consult with pupils of Captains Close Primary School. This session was delivered by Planning Consultant Helen Metcalfe, a specialist in community engagement in planning.

How were people consulted

3.22 The format of the session focused on short visual presentations explaining what planning is and how it affects us all and why their views were important to the Parish Council in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. The presentations were interspersed with a series of activities that allowed the children to consider the impact planning had on their lives.

Issues, priorities and concerns raised

- 3.23 A total of 31 pupils participated in the session. A detailed report on this workshop is available separately but the feedback received is summarised below.
- 3.24 It is recognised that they know their local area very well and they contributed a lot of local knowledge and a young persons' perspective of what they like and don't like about living in and around Asfordby. The children had many more likes than dislikes and the session identified the following key issues:
 - They value their play areas particularly the small open spaces around the village where they can run around and/or play football.
 - As pupils live close to each other they will often walk to the parks together, and these open spaces are highly valued by the children.
 - Additional investment is needed in play equipment at Klondike Park and the park behind the Parish Hall.
 - Areas identified as being unsafe include the garages near the Avenue and land north of Saxelby Road.
 - Speeding traffic along Hoby Road, Main Street and Saxelby Road.
 - Teenagers have nothing to do in Asfordby.

How the Issues, Priorities and Concerns have been considered

3.25 The responses from the session were used to help prepare the Issues and Options Version of the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan. This consultation event highlighted the fact that teenagers seem to have nothing to do.

Young People Consultation: Teenagers

Date	30 July 2013 and 20 August 2013
Venue	Asfordby
Format Walkabout Sessions	
Publicity	Session supported by Leicestershire County
	Council Youth Team
Attendance Discussions with 16 young people	

Overview

3.26 A review of the early community consultation undertaken highlighted concerns that the views of local teenagers had not been properly represented. The need to consult this group of young people was also highlighted during discussions with the school children. The purpose of this consultation was to discuss with the young people what they liked and didn't like about living in Asfordby and also to discuss some of the ideas that had emerged from the previous work.

Who was consulted

3.27 Two walkabout sessions were undertaken in order to seek discussion with young people. The sessions were led by Helen Metcalfe with support from 2 officers of the Leicestershire County Council Youth Team.

How were people consulted

- 3.28 The policy statements agreed at the Asfordby Parish
 Neighbourhood Plan Stakeholder Workshop were used to provide
 the basis of a questionnaire and for discussion. The main issues that
 were focused upon included:
 - What they did and didn't like about Asfordby?
 - Why Asfordby was doing a Neighbourhood Plan?
 - Where did they think housing should go and whether the suggested sites for housing development and suggested sites for protection were supported?
 - What they would do to improve Asfordby.

Any other comments on Asfordby.

Issues, priorities and concerns raised

- 3.29 A total of 16 young people between the ages of 9 and 18 years participated in the sessions. A detailed report on this workshop is available separately but the feedback received is summarised below.
- 3.30 On the whole young people liked living in Asfordby and discussions identified the following key issues:
 - They value their open space and play areas but there was felt to be an overall lack of facilities particularly for the older ones.
 - Investment is needed at Klondyke Park as well as the Parish Park.
 - Accepted the need for more housing and there were no strong negative opinions about where housing should go.
 - Awareness that housing is cheaper in Melton and new housing should include a range of house types to enable young people to stay in the village if they wish.
 - Limited job opportunities would mean they would probably have to move away.

How the Issues, Priorities and Concerns have been considered

3.31 The responses from the session were used to help prepare the Issues and Options Version of the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan.

4. Issues and Options Questionnaire Survey

Overview

4.1 In August 2014, Asfordby Parish Council distributed a questionnaire to all households, providing an opportunity for local people to have a further say about the future of their parish. This questionnaire was supported by a detailed Issues and Options Paper.

Date	August 2014
Venue	Questionnaire Survey
Publicity	Questionnaire with covering information
Responses	121

- 4.2 The questionnaire was designed, in particular, to:
 - Identify what people thought were the 3 most important issues for the Neighbourhood Plan;
 - Seek views of new housing in the parish.
- 4.3 Other issues covered in the questionnaire included:
 - Business and Economic opportunities
 - Protection of the countryside between Asfordby Hill and Asfordby Valley and between Asfordby and Asfordby Valley
 - What should be the village envelope
 - Energy efficiency in new homes
 - Identification of Local Green Space
- 4.4 A large proportion of the questionnaire concentrated on housing concerns. The housing questions related to:
 - Housing numbers
 - Type of housing, including affordable
 - Potential housing sites
 - The relationship between new housing and new facilities

Who was consulted

4.5 Hard copies of the survey were distributed in April 2014 to local households and all residents were encouraged to respond.
 Returns were received from 121 people – a response rate of 8% of households in the parish.

How were people consulted

4.6 The questionnaire was prepared by Asfordby Parish Council.

Completed questionnaires were asked to be returned to the

Asfordby Parish Office. All returned questionnaires were entered into a prize draw. Literature was also put on the Asfordby Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan website.

Issues, priorities and Concerns Raised

- 4.7 Responses were received from 121 people and the results of the completed questionnaires were published on the Asfordby Parish Council website.
- 4.8 Responses to the questionnaire identified their three most important issues for the Neighbourhood Plan. All the issues suggested were supported. Detailed below are the issues in order of importance along with the percentage of responses that supported each:
 - Protection of the countryside between settlements (70%)
 - Improved services and facilities (48%)
 - Need for affordable housing (38%)
 - Flooding (32%)
 - Ageing population (27%)
 - Population and housing growth (25%)
 - Historic Environment (20%)
 - High levels of car dependence (16%)
 - Pressure for more housing development (13%)
 - Residents commute outside the parish for work (9%)
- 4.9 Other comments made related to the provision of infrastructure, services and facilities, police presence, traffic congestion and road safety.
- 4.10 There was good support for the vision with 74% of the respondents to this question supporting it.
- 4.11 Of the other questions raised, the 'highest' scoring responses can be summarised as:
 - 45% thought the right number of new houses for the parish to be less than 12 per year;
 - 83% agreed that the priority for new housing should be family homes and downsizer housing;
 - 67% agreed that an average of 6 affordable homes a year should be sought;
 - 77% agreed opportunities should be provided for small business development;

- 88% agreed there would be wider economic value from the future development of Asfordby Business Park, Holwell Works and the Rail Test Track;
- 93% supported the protection of the countryside between Asfordby Hill and Asfordby Valley, and between Asfordby and Asfordby Valley;
- 83% supported higher standards of energy efficiency in new housing;
- 85% agreed with the definition of the Village Envelope for Asfordby and 80% agreed with the definition of the Village Envelope for Asfordby Hill;
- Significant support for the suggested areas for designation as Local Green Spaces. Each area gained support of over 75%;
- 4.12 These responses showed a good level of support for the issues raised in the questionnaire that could be covered in the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 4.13 The remainder of the questions related to housing site options within the Parish. Overall support for the housing sites in each of the settlements can be summarised as:

<u>Asfordby</u>

- Site A6: Whitlock Garages (49%)
- Site A1: Between Regency Road and Bypass (46%)
- Site A5: Between The Hawthornes and Bypass (36%)
- Site A3: Station Lane (27%)
- Site A2: West of Hoby Road (22%)
- Site A4: North of Bypass (14%)

Asfordby Hill

- Site AH1: West Side (56%)
- Site AH4: Crompton Road (53%)
- Site AH2: Glebe Road (28%)
- Site AH3: Stanton Road (24%)
- Site AH5: North of Melton Road, between Asfordby Hill and Asfordby Valley (17%)
- 4.14 70% of the respondents agreed that Asfordby Hill should have more housing development if it enabled a new shop to be built there.

Asfordby Valley

AV2: North View Close (46%)

- AV1: Main Road (36%)
- 4.15 The majority of the respondents did not support more housing in Asfordby Valley to enable more facilities to be provided there. (49%) although only slightly less of the respondents did support this approach (45%).

How the Issues, Priorities and Concerns have been considered

4.16 The questionnaire results have been used to prepare the (Pre-Submission) Draft Version of the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan.

5. Pre-submission Draft Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan (1st Version)

Overview

- 5.1 As required under Part 5, Section 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Asfordby Parish Council undertook a six-week pre-submission consultation on the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.
- 5.2 Within this period Asfordby Parish Council:
 - a) Publicised the draft neighbourhood development plan to all that live, work, or do business within the parish.
 - b) Outlined where and when the draft neighbourhood development plan could be inspected.
 - c) Detailed how to make representations, and the date by which these should be received.
 - d) Consulted any statutory consultation body (referred to in Paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012) whose interests may be affected by the proposals within the draft neighbourhood development plan.
 - e) Sent a copy of the proposed neighbourhood development plan to the local planning authority.

Consultation period	Monday 2 February to Monday 16 March 2015
Format	Hardcopy, online
Publicity	Summary, email, letters, website
Respondents	44

Who was consulted

- 5.3 Asfordby Parish Council publicised the draft neighbourhood plan to all those that live, work, or do business within the parish and provided a variety of mechanisms to both view the plan and to make representations.
- 5.4 Asfordby Parish Council formally consulted the statutory consultation bodies identified within Paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (see Appendix 1).
- 5.5 A total of 44 representations were received within the six-week consultation period (Appendix 2).

How were people consulted

- 5.6 A copy of the Pre-Submission Draft of the Neighbourhood Development Plan was made available to download, along with supporting documentation, on the Neighbourhood Plan website. A summary of the Draft Plan was delivered to all premises within the Parish.
- 5.7 Statutory consultation bodies were contacted individually by email or letter, sent a copy of the pre-submission consultation newsletter, and invited to make representations on the draft Neighbourhood Plan via e-mail.
- 5.8 Representations on the draft Plan were invited using a standard written comments form, e-mail or letter to the Parish Clerk.

Issues, priorities and Concerns Raised

5.9 Details of all the representations made in relation to the draft Neighbourhood Plan can be found at Appendix 3. Occasionally representations have been summarised or reduced in length, but original representations are available for inspection on request to the parish clerk.

How the Issues, Priorities and Concerns have been considered

- 5.10 The representations received have been reviewed by the Asfordby Parish Council and Planit-X Town and Country Planning Services (Appendix 3). A lot of responses submitted were a duplicated representations made with respect to an ongoing planning application at that time. The application was for up to 100 dwellings at Station Lane, Asfordby. Anonymous representations have not been considered.
- 5.11 A large number of representations were received and as a result the Parish Council decided to make changes. Most of the changes have been minor however three 'key' issues were raised and the required changes made have been incorporated within the second version of the Pre-Submission Version of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.
- 5.12 These three 'key' issues are summarised as below:
 - The Draft Plan identified land at Station Lane, Asfordby as a housing allocation. Since the publication of this version of the Neighbourhood Plan, Melton Borough Council granted outline permission in July 2015 (subject to the completion of a Section

- 106 agreement) to Jelson for residential development (up to 100 dwellings) at Station Lane, Asfordby.
- A representation was received promoting the development of housing at the play area, at Land off Crompton Road/Main Street, Asfordby Hill.
- A representation was received supporting the development of the Holwell Business Park but submitted that the site should support a more flexible range of uses, including housing development.
- 5.13 Therefore, the main changes made and incorporated within the second version of the Neighbourhood Plan can be summarised as:
 - Deletion of land at Station Lane, Asfordby as a housing allocation.
 - Housing allocation at Land off Crompton Road/Main Street, Asfordby Hill.
 - Revised proposals for the development of Holwell Business
 Park, to incorporate an element of residential development.

6. Pre-submission Draft Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan (2nd Version)

Overview

- 6.1 As required under Part 5, Section 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Asfordby Parish Council undertook a six-week pre-submission consultation on the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.
- 6.2 Within this period Asfordby Parish Council:
 - a) Publicised the draft neighbourhood development plan to all that live, work, or do business within the parish.
 - b) Outlined where and when the draft neighbourhood development plan could be inspected.
 - c) Detailed how to make representations, and the date by which these should be received.
 - d) Consulted any statutory consultation body (referred to in Paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012) whose interests may be affected by the proposals within the draft neighbourhood development plan.
 - e) Sent a copy of the proposed neighbourhood development plan to the local planning authority.

Consultation period	Monday 22 February to Monday 4 April 2016
Format	Hardcopy, online, Drop-in Session
Publicity	Summary, email, letters, website
Respondents	19

Who was consulted

- 6.3 Asfordby Parish Council publicised the draft neighbourhood plan to all those that live, work, or do business within the parish and provided a variety of mechanisms to both view the plan and to make representations.
- 6.4 Asfordby Parish Council formally consulted the statutory consultation bodies identified within Paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (see Appendix 1).

6.5 A total of 19 representations were received within the six-week consultation period (Appendix 4).

How were people consulted

- 6.6 A copy of the Pre-Submission Draft of the Neighbourhood Development Plan was made be available to download, along with supporting documentation, on the Neighbourhood Plan website. A summary of the Draft Plan was delivered to all premises within the Parish.
- 6.7 Statutory consultation bodies were contacted individually by email or letter, sent a copy of the pre-submission consultation newsletter, and invited to make representations on the draft Neighbourhood Plan via e-mail.
- 6.8 In addition, an 'Open Drop In Session' was held on 2 March 2016 at the Holwell Sports & Social Club, Asfordby Hill during the hours of 14:00 and 19:30hrs. This was held as the main changes in the plan were within Asfordby Hill. It was attended by the site promoters and potential developers of the site at Land off Crompton Road/Main Street, Asfordby Hill and the Holwell Business Park. About 40 people attended the event.
- 6.9 Representations on the draft Plan were invited using a standard written comments form, e-mail or letter to the Parish Clerk.

Issues, priorities and Concerns Raised

6.10 Details of all the representations made in relation to this draft Neighbourhood Plan can be found at Appendix 5. Occasionally representations have been summarised or reduced in length, but original representations are available for inspection on request to the parish clerk.

How the Issues, Priorities and Concerns have been considered

- 6.11 The representations received have been reviewed by the Asfordby Parish Council and Planit-X Town and Country Planning Services (Appendix 5). Anonymous representations have not been considered.
- 6.12 The consultation has generally only raised a limited number of real issues. The detailed summary of representations (Appendix 5) provides an explanation of why changes have or have not been made to the Neighbourhood Plan.

- 6.13 A number of comments have given rise to a number of changes to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. These have been incorporated into the Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan. Most of the changes have been minor and have not required major amendments to Plan policies of proposals.
- 6.14 With respect to the key changes between the two versions of the Draft Neighbourhood Plans, some concerns were still raised about the housing development that has since been approved at Station Lane, Asfordby, whereas there were very few concerns expressed with reference to the new housing allocation in Asfordby Hill and for a housing element to be incorporated within the development of Holwell Business Park.
- 6.15 A representation was received, on behalf of Jelson, proposing a housing allocation, adjacent to the recently permitted site for up to 100 dwellings at Station Lane, Asfordby. After careful consideration this has not been included within the Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan. Despite having been numerous opportunities during the consultation process this site has not been previously proposed. Neither has the site been submitted as part of the 2015 Melton Strategic Land Availability Assessment. Notwithstanding, the site is not of a suitable standard for further development with concerns relating to issues of sustainability and access to services and facilities, highway safety and flooding issues.

7. Conclusion

- 7.1 The publicity, engagement and consultation undertaken to support the preparation of the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan has been open and transparent, with many opportunities provided for those that live, work, and do business within the Neighbourhood Area to contribute to the process, make comment, and to raise issues, priorities and concerns.
- 7.2 All statutory requirements have been met and a significant level of additional consultation, engagement, and research has been completed.
- 7.3 This Consultation Statement and the supporting consultation reports have been produced to document the consultation and engagement process undertaken and are considered to comply with Part 5, Section 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Appendix 1: Consultation Bodies

Ab Kettleby PC

Action Deafness

Action for Blind People

Age UK Leicester Shire & Rutland

All Saints Church

Ancient Monuments Society

Asfordby & District Autumn Group

Asfordby AmateursFC

Asfordby Coop

Asfordby Gun Range

Asfordby Hill Primary School

Asfordby Methodist Church

Asfordby Storage and Haulage

Asfordby Surgery

British Telecommunications PLC

Captains Close Primary School

Country Land and Business Association

CPRE (Leicestershire)

Design Council CABE

East Leicestershire & Rutland CCG

English Heritage

Environment Agency

Federation of Muslim Organisations Leicestershire (FMO)

Federation of Small Businesses

Frisby on the Wreake PC

Frisby Water Parks

GATE (Gypsy and Traveller Equality)

Grange Garden Centre

Grimston, Saxeby and Shoby PC

Hanson Quarry Products

Harworth Estates

Hoby with Rotherby PC

Holwell Sports and Social

Homes and Communities Agency

International Punjab Society (Midlands)

Jelson Homes

Joe Orson JP CC

Kirby Bellars PC

Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust

Leicestershire County Council

Leicestershire Diocesan Board of Finance

Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan: Consultation Statement

Leicestershire Ethnic Minority Partnership (LEMP)

Local Policing Body (Police & Crime Commissioner)

Melton & Asfordby Angling Club

Melton Adult Learning Disability Team

Melton Borough Access Group

Melton Borough Council

Melton Library

Melton Local Policing Unit

Melton Mowbray & District Civic Society

Melton Mowbray Chamber of Trade

Mencap and Gateway (Melton Mowbray)

Mobile Operators Association

MYST (Melton Young Singles Trust)

National Farmers Union (East Midlands Region)

National Grid

Natural England

Network Rail

NHS England (Leicestershire and Lincolnshire Area)

Parrott, Toon

Peel Energy

Rotherhill (Asfordby) Syndicate

Severn Trent Water

Sport England

St Bartholomew Church

St Gobain PAM

The Coal Authority

The Crown

The Old Coop

Village News (Melton)

Voluntary Action Melton

Waterloo Housing Group

Western Power Distribution

Youth for the Countryside (YFC)

Appendix 2: Pre-submission Draft Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan (1st Version) Respondents

Andrew Granger & Co Ltd on behalf of Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance Asfordby Captain's Close Primary School

Coal Authority

Councillor Ronnie De Burle

Environment Agency

GVA on behalf of Jelson Homes

Head of Regulatory Services, Melton Borough Council

HSSP Architects on behalf of Danny Keightley

Kate Sanderson

Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust

Leicestershire County Council

Leicestershire Police

Marrons Shakespears on behalf of Mr & Mrs Eaton

Miss R Patel

Mr & Mrs Bullimore

Mr & Mrs D Newton

Mr & Mrs E Hewitt

Mr Alan Webster

Mr Brian Attwood

Mr Clive Summerland

Mr David Robinson

Mr James Pryce

Mr Jamie Bland

Mr John Cousen

Mr John Garland

Mr Nick Atkins

Mr Paul Gregory

Mr Peter Webster

Mr Raymond Howard

Mr Robert Frances

Mrs A Measures

Mrs Angela Parker

Mrs Carol Whitfield

Mrs Deidre Summerland

Mrs Jennifer Edson

Mrs Nina Kenchington

Ms Penelope Hames-Lambert

Natural England

Network Rail

Pegasus Group on behalf of Harworth Estates

Pegasus Group on behalf of Rotherhill (Asfordby) Syndicate

Ralph Riley

Simon Bailey

Sport England

Appendix 3: Pre-submission Draft Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan (1st Version) Representations

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs A Measure	General	Have village envelopes been scrapped? Green belt or green spaces are being given up for developments. We may need more houses in our towns and villages but what about food to feed these people. Why not use brownfield land and vacant old houses and offices? The play area at Glendon Close will need to be made bigger. The doctor's surgery needs upgrading. Station Lane at Leicester Road will need to be sorted. Do not believe it will be crime free. If flooding is not sorted all house insurances will go up.	The Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan defines Village Envelopes, protects Local Green Spaces and defines Areas of Separation between Asfordby Hill, Asfordby Valley and Asfordby. Proposed development sites have taken account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Our Neighbourhood Plan encourages the development of brownfield sites at Whitlock Garages and Asfordby Storage & Haulage, but there is insufficient brownfield sites to meet housing needs. The Parish Council is seeking the provision of a Local Equipped	Revise key objective to read: 'clean, safe and low crime'

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			Area for Play within the proposed Jelson development.	
			Asfordby Surgery is of good quality but is very limited. The practice has indicated that the additional patients will impact on this small facility as the number of consultations increase. The neighbourhood Plan requires new development to contribute to these improvements (Policy A23).	
			In order to mitigate the impact of the proposed Jelson development the junction of Station Lane with the A607 is to be improved.	
			It is agreed that 'clean, safe and crime free' objective may be over-ambitious.	
			The proposed residential development will only be located within the section of the	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			site that is within Flood Zone 1- Low Probability.	
Mr Brian Attwood	General	Asfordby only needs suitable dwellings that would allow its large aging population to downsize and to allow local families to upsize. Make smaller properties available for first time buyers. There are over 350 rented properties (public and private) in Asfordby. Young people who can't afford to buy but wish to rent must register with the Council and compete with people outside of the village. Regardless of the number of houses built the situation will remain the same. Question whether the village has been surveyed to find out the number seeking a new home. In the last few years over 120 houses have been built with over 100 more in the pipeline and of these 20 are local families.	Neighbourhood Plan Policy A16 aims to meet the different housing needs of people of different ages will help ensure Asfordby parish continues to be a mixed community with young families and older people in the parish. Our housing needs assessment is based on the 2011 Census. Policy A7 will ensure that all new affordable housing will be subject to conditions, or a planning obligation will be sought, to ensure that when homes are allocated, priority is given to people with a local connection to Asfordby Parish. Asfordby Surgery is of good quality but is very limited. The practice has indicated that the	No change

Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan: Consultation Statement

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		Asfordby amenities are of village size – doctor's surgery only has parking for 4 cars and streets are not adequate for large volumes of traffic.	additional patients will impact on this small facility as the number of consultations increase. The neighbourhood Plan requires new development to contribute to these improvements (Policy A23).	
		Somerby and Long Clawson have doctors' surgeries also. Other villages could be upgraded with \$106 monies and then our environment would be quieter and safer.	Proposed development sites are located within a reasonable walking and cycling distance of local facilities and amenities. The level of pedestrian and cyclist accessibility will help to encourage a proportion of shorter trips from the area to be made on foot or by cycle. The level of public transport provision in the vicinity of each development site is good offering regular services to key local destinations such as Melton Mowbray and Leicester.	
		Why has this exercise taken five years when Planit X has completed other villages? Although accept it is too late to start again. Wish for the Borough Council to accept plan how it is or throw it out altogether.		

Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan: Consultation Statement

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			Automatic Classified Vehicle Counts in Asfordby and the results of capacity assessments for various junctions shows that except of the A607 Main Road all the junctions assessed have adequate capacity.	
			The Melton Local Plan will be making housing provision in other villages with good levels of services and facilities.	
			Asfordby Neighbourhood Area was designated on 30th January 2013 about 2-3 years ago. There have been some delays in preparation largely due to the withdrawal of the Melton Core Strategy and Parish Council staffing resources.	
			Melton Borough Council is not responsible for approving the Neighbourhood Plan.	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Clive Summerland	General	More land to each house would be a benefit, as would more bungalows and one-bedroom houses. Need some small industrial units for small businesses in the village.	Our housing needs assessment gives an estimate of the 'optimum' mix of housing required to best fit the future needs of the parish. It includes bungalow provision. During early consultation, local people said they would like to see some opportunities for small businesses as part of the redevelopment of the Asfordby Storage and Haulage depot on Main Street, Asfordby. This is addressed by Policy A26.	No change
Mr & Mrs D Newton	General	Hope the plan proposes another play area. There should be no building until a better road structure in Melton and Kirby Bellars. Station Lane is heavy with traffic pulling onto Leicester Road and buses struggle to get round when traffic	The Parish Council is seeking the provision of a Local Equipped Area for Play within the proposed Jelson development. In order to mitigate the impact of the proposed Jelson development the junction of Station Lane with the A607 is to be improved.	No change

Representor Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
	is queuing. Melton needs a new bypass before any new homes are built. Village envelopes should be kept. Question where the school places are to come from as places are already limited and circumstances may have altered as houses change hands. Are any bungalows to be built for the aging population?	The Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan defines Village Envelopes, protects Local Green Spaces and defines Areas of Separation between Asfordby Hill, Asfordby Valley and Asfordby. When the school roll is growing due to new housing, the Government expectation is that any shortfall in places is funded by a \$106 developer contribution. In the event that we are unable to justify a contribution at the time of responding, then the Local Authority will still have to ensure that any additional places required are provided at the appropriate time, this is not an issue for the school to wrestle with or fund. Our housing needs assessment gives an estimate of the	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			'optimum' mix of housing required to best fit the future needs of the parish. It includes bungalow provision.	
Mrs Deidre Summerland	General	Sometimes think affordable house prices are too high. The three bedroom houses should have bigger gardens for children.	Affordable housing is social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to households whose needs are not met by the market. It excludes low-cost market homes. The Neighbourhood Plan does not set minimum garden size.	No change
Marrons Shakespears on behalf of Mr & Mrs Eaton	General	The plan is considered to fail the following basic conditions: Regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State; General conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area;	[From the decision of Supperstone J in BDW Trading Limited v Cheshire West and Cheshire Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1470 (Admin).] (i) The basic condition in paragraph 8(2)(e) only requires the Examiner to consider	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		It does not breach and is otherwise compatible with EU obligations. Legal concerns are raised in terms of the plan's ability to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the Development Plan. Of particular concern is the proposed provision of housing.	whether the draft neighbourhood plan as a whole is in general conformity with the adopted development plan as a whole. Whether there is a tension between one policy of the neighbourhood plan and one element of the local plan is not a matter for the Examiner to determine (paragraph 82 of BDW);	
		There are no up to date strategic policies in the Development Plan with the Melton Local Plan (2006) now time expired. Whilst the High Court has determined that a Neighbourhood Development Plan may include policies dealing with use and development of land for housing even when there is no present Development Plan setting out strategic policies, it is unsafe to assume that the Court of Appeal would not reach a different conclusion.	(ii) The Examiner was not obliged to consider the wider ramifications of the draft policy upon the delivery of housing. The limited role of an Examiner to have regard to national policy when considering a draft policy applicable to a small geographical area should not be confused with the more investigative scrutiny required by the 2004 Act in order for an	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		Bringing forward a Neighbourhood Plan dealing with such issues prior to the adoption of Development Plan Document will lead to significant practical problems for the Neighbourhood Plan in the event that the Development Plan Document is inconsistent with the Neighbourhood Plan. If conflict were to exist the conflict must be resolved in favour of the Local Plan with potential for the Neighbourhood Plan being of little weight. Should such a possibility dictate that work on the Neighbourhood Plan be delayed?	Inspector examining a draft local plan to determine whether such a plan is "sound" (see sections 20(7) to (7C) and 23 of the 2004 Act) (paragraph 83); (iii) Whereas under paragraph 182 of the NPPF a local plan needs to be "consistent with national policy", an Examiner of a neighbourhood plan has a discretion to determine whether it is appropriate that the plan should proceed having regard to national policy (paragraph 84);	
		The second legal relates to the lack of a Strategic Environmental Assessment. In the absence of an appropriate assessment it is impossible to see how	(iv) The Examiner of a neighbourhood plan does not consider whether that plan is "justified" in the sense used in paragraph 182 of the NPPF. In other words, the Examiner does	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		the Neighbourhood Plan could conform to the legal requirement to ensure that it does not breach or be otherwise incompatible with obligations derived from European law. Failure to undertake this exercise must render the Neighbourhood Plan open to legal challenge. The Neighbourhood Plan should not be pursued in its current form and without substantial modification and additional work being undertaken in relation to environmental assessment.	not have to consider whether a draft policy is supported by a "proportionate evidence base" (paragraph 85). Whilst environmental effects have the potential to take place as a result of the Neighbourhood Plan, including in relation to the majority of the SEA 'topics', it is considered that these are unlikely to be significant in the context of the SEA Directive. This includes relating to the potential for negative effects on the Frisby Marsh SSSI and the Asfordby Conservation Area.	
			In this context the significance of potential effects will be limited by key aims of the Neighbourhood Plan. These are in turn reflected by the policy	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			approaches proposed by the latest version of the plan.	
			For these reasons, it is considered that the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan is not subject to the requirements of Directive 2001/42/EC, the 'SEA Directive' and accompanying regulations.	
Mr & Mrs E Hewitt	General	Express thanks to the Parish Council on the production of the draft document. Have reviewed the plan and apologise in advance if we have misunderstood the document and our comments actually reflect those of the Parish Council.	Noted.	No change
Mr James Pryce	General	At first had some feeling of doubt with government inspectors being in a position to override any obstruction. However having now seen a High Court Judge refuse an application, I am in favour of plan and no further doubts.	Noted.	No change
Mr John Cousen	General	No Comment.	Noted.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Mr John Garland	General	There should be no development in the Parish. All development should be deferred until the new sewage system has been tested over 1 to 2 winters.	Severn Trent Water have been consulted on the Neighbourhood Plan and have raised no objection.	No change
Kate Sanderson	General	Take the opportunity to commend the Parish Council in putting this work together.	Noted.	No change
Leicestershire County Council	General	Transport - There are no real policy concerns. The Plan provides for 164 new dwellings by 2031 and in terms of new jobs it simply contains policies supporting proposals put forward by Melton Borough Council.	Noted.	No change
Head of Regulatory Services, Melton Borough Council	General	Melton Borough Council fully supports the community's initiative to produce a Neighbourhood Plan and recognises that this is a community-led process. The advice contained within this letter is	We are not obliged to consider the wider ramifications of the draft policy upon the delivery of housing. The limited role of the Neighbourhood Plan to have	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		intended to assist the Parish Council in ensuring a submission version Neighbourhood Plan is developed that will withstand examination and any possible legal challenge. Melton Borough Council's response is based on the pre-submission consultation documents provided via the Asfordby Parish Council website. This response is structured with regard to the basic conditions as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as applied to Neighbourhood plans by Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004). Each of the basic conditions is considered in turn below; Whether the Plan has regard to National Planning Policy and advice; The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The policies	regard to national policy when considering a draft policy applicable to a small geographical area should not be confused with the more investigative scrutiny required by the 2004 Act in order for an Inspector examining a draft local plan to determine whether such a plan is "sound" (see sections 20(7) to (7C) and 23 of the 2004 Act) (paragraph 83). Whereas under paragraph 182 of the NPPF a local plan needs to be "consistent with national policy", a neighbourhood plan has to have regard to national policy (paragraph 84). The neighbourhood plan does not have to be "justified" in the	

Representor Polic Para	cy/ Representation agraph etc.	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
	within the National Plater Framework (NPPF) Part as a whole constitute sustainable developmed Section 6 of NPPF refer wide choice of high a requires plans to be in Objective Assessment for both market and a (Para. 47). It also refers Housing Market Assessmechanism for assessing needs. It suggests this household and populate taking account of migate demographic changes this can be utilised to inhousing needs and furtenure type demands. The National Planning Guidance (NPPG) produced on the method assessing housing and needs. With regards to	the NPPF. the Action of Lewis J in Gladman Developments Ltd v. Aylesbury Vale District Council [2014] EWHC 4323 (Admin)] to Paragraph 8(2)(e) of schedule 4B to the 1990 Act on requires general conformity with the strategic policies of the development if such policies exist. Where they do not, paragraph 8(2)(e) is not engaged, but that does not mean that a neighbourhood plan cannot be prepared and formally "made" (paragraphs 5 to 59 and 65 of Gladman). We understand that Gladman has withdrawn from Court of Appendicular the NPPF. Th	y n

Representor Policy/ Paragraph	Representation n etc.	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
	clear that it may be appropriate to have regard to the supply of an economically active working age population and the implications for economic resilience. Thereafter the NPPG suggests consideration should given to how new housing and infrastructure could be used to assist with addressing any issues identified. The assessment of Housing Need accompanying the draft Neighbourhood Plan is welcomed; however it may be worthwhile to consider whether it meets the requirements of Para.159 of the NPPF and the advice contained within the NPPG with regard to assessing housin need. The 2014 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 1 sets out the OAN for the Borough as 245 dwellings per	context of the SEA Directive. This includes relating to the potential for negative effects on the Frisby Marsh SSSI and the Asfordby Conservation Area. In this context the significance of potential effects will be limited by key aims of the Neighbourhood Plan. These are in turn reflected by the policy approaches proposed by the latest version of the plan. For these reasons, it is	

¹ The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment, GL Hearn, June 2014, available at: http://www.melton.gov.uk/downloads/file/1676/leicester_and_leicestershire_strategic_housing_market_assessment_2014

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		annum from 2011 to 2036. This approach supports economic growth, in accordance with the Borough's desire to enhance its economic performance and the generation of jobs and employment and address issues with regard to economic resilience. The assessment of housing need for the draft Neighbourhood Plan would be enhanced if it were to incorporate these factors, which would demonstrate it is based on the most up to date data available. In February 2015 the Office of National Statistics published the 2012 based Household Projections and these may also be useful for similar reasons.	not subject to the requirements of Directive 2001/42/EC, the 'SEA Directive' and accompanying regulations.	
		We note that the draft Neighbourhood Plan makes allocations for approximately 230 units and acknowledges the delivery of 80 units since 2011, totalling 312 units over the plan period. The NPPF is supportive towards the identification of a supply of specific deliverable sites throughout the		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		planned period. Perhaps a delivery trajectory could be used to illustrate anticipate delivery rates for the Neighbourhood Plan. This could also be used to demonstrate the supply of both infrastructure and jobs over the planned period and explain when each site and specific infrastructure is expected to be delivered over the plan period. The NPPF (Para.47) provides advice with regards sites identified in plans. With reference to deliverable sites it states that they should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now and be achievable with a reasonable prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within 5 years.		Plan
		The NPPF is clear that plans can also include developable sites. These are sites not relied upon for the deliverable supply, but it is necessary to have an understanding that the site will be available at a specific point in the future. The allocation of Asfordby		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		Storage and Haulage Depot, Main Street, Asfordby (Policy A15) for some 67 units is listed as currently unavailable. It is not clear whether this allocation is to be relied upon in order to achieve the identified 312 units over the plan period and when. It suggested that the position with regard to this site is clarified in the plan. A trajectory may aid this clarification. Initial discussions with property services		
		at MBC welcome the inclusion of the Whitlock Garage site within the draft plan. However, the Authority is yet to make a decision on the intended path to development for this site, including whether it should deliver market or affordable housing. Therefore, at this stage we feel the assumption of 100% affordable housing on this site is not appropriate nor is there any indication as to whether the site is suitable or deliverable for solely affordable housing provision. Additional clarification on the		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		allocation of this site for affordable housing provision would be beneficial to the draft plan.		
		Whether the Plan contributes to Sustainable Development.		
		Golden-Thread of Sustainable Development As evidenced above sustainable development is the 'golden thread' running through the NPPF. The basic conditions require the qualifying body, in this circumstance the Parish Council, to demonstrate how their plan will contribute to sustainable development. As a general observation you may wish to consider whether the policies of the plan are worded as positively as they could be, in order to fully capture the thrust of presumption in favour of sustainable development.		
		In particular the policy wording around existing employment sites is not positive towards the growth or expansion of		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		these sites and we are concerned may be judged not to capture the NPPFs aspiration to generate additional employment opportunities. The plan should cover how it intends to actively respond to changes in working patterns and technology which could have implications for employment opportunities, both within the local area and more widely, perhaps the current wording of these policies is intended to do just this and seeks to respond to employment or industry changes but this is not completely clear and a		
		justification would be useful. Core Planning Principle One of the core planning principles within the NPPF is the provision of infrastructure, which should also be identified through an objective assessment (Para.17). Policy A23 of the draft Neighbourhood Plans relates to infrastructure provision. In order to meet		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		the requirements of NPPF and support the provision of sustainable development this approach within Policy A23 needs to be justified and robust. It will be the subject of scrutiny by the development industry, but also the independent examiner will require justifications to the infrastructure requirements, in order to ensure the plan is deliverable (Para. 173 NPPF).		
		Perhaps an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS) could be prepared to support Policy A23. An example IDS is available alongside the Melton Local Plan Issues and Options documents.		
		Whether the Plan is in general conformity with the Council's own development plan;		
		The NPPF requires the Neighbourhood Plan to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan (Para.184). Whilst there are no strategic policies for the Local Plan at this time, as		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		they emerge and the Melton Local Plan begins to hold weight, the Neighbourhood Plan will need to respond and ensure its alignment as will the Local Plan with the Neighbourhood Plan. This will require flexibility being built into the Neighbourhood Plan in order to respond to potential increases in growth and/or future directions of growth.		
		The current timetable for the Melton Local Plan is a draft Melton Local Plan by Summer 2015 and adoption of the plan by Summer 2017.		
		We acknowledge that the draft Neighbourhood Plan cannot be tested against emerging Local Plan policies (Para.184). However, the reasoning and evidence informing the Local Plan process is still relevant to the basic conditions against which a neighbourhood plan is tested.		
		The Melton Local Plan is an external factor that needs to be considered		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		within the Neighbourhood Plan. It is considered that the Plan may be enhanced if it could explain how it would respond to external factors, such as the Melton Local Plan or neighbouring development sites, for housing or employment, coming forward within the plan period. The influence of Melton Mowbray town is also an area where the plan may wish to add additional commentary, perhaps setting out its relationship with the town in terms of the flow of people, jobs/services and goods.		
		All Plans, be they Local Plans or Neighbourhood Plans need to be monitored to ensure their delivery. A clear monitoring framework is the key to ensuring the success of any plan, but also a monitoring framework could be utilised to establish when a partial or early review of the Neighbourhood Plan would be required in order to align it with the Melton Local Plan.		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		Whether the Plan complies with various European Obligations; A Neighbourhood Plan must be compatible with European Union Obligations, as incorporated into UK Law, in order to be legally compliant. There are four directives (Directive 2001/42/EC, Direction 2011/92/EU, and Directive 2009/147/EC) however Directive 2001/42/EC or Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is perhaps the one to be consideration by the draft plan. Whilst there is no legal obligation for an SEA or Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for a Neighbourhood Plan, the NPPF suggests the use of a SA as a useful method for assessing the environmental impacts of the Neighbourhood Plan. A screening assessment could be carried out initially if it is felt that an SA is not required. However, given that the plan clearly		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		has environmental implications and has involved the consideration of alternative approaches for allocated development sites, it is suggested that the SEA obligations are considered.		
		You may also wish to consider the implications of the Equality Act 2010 and it may be beneficial to undertake an Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) individually or as part of any wider assessment designed to meet the EU obligations.		
		Overall it may useful to produce a basic conditions statement; this would set out how the basic conditions have been complied with throughout the preparation of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Guidance on producing a basic condition statement, including a template, is available on the Locality website.		
		The community are congratulated for making considerable progress on the		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		draft Neighbourhood Plan. Melton Borough Council welcomes the opportunity for continued communication on the interlinking relationship between the Neighbourhood Plan and Melton Local Plan.		
Mr David Robinson	General	The plan should include the protection of all green field sites until all other options are exhausted. A good example of a Brownfield site is the houses currently being built on Saxelby Road. The housing requirement is 12 houses per year and not large 100 home estates.	Our Neighbourhood Plan encourages the development of brownfield sites at Whitlock Garages and Asfordby Storage & Haulage, but there is insufficient brownfield sites to meet housing needs. The Neighbourhood Plan provides for around 250 dwellings over the 20yr period 2011 to 2031 i.e. (@12dw pa).	No change
Natural England	General	Natural England generally welcomes the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan. Consider that our interests in the natural environment are well covered in the plan.	Whilst environmental effects have the potential to take place as a result of the Neighbourhood Plan, including in relation to the majority of the	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		Where Neighbourhood Plans could have significant environmental effects, they may require a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). Further guidance and requirements on consulting Natural England on SEA are set out in National Planning Practice Guidance.	SEA 'topics', it is considered that these are unlikely to be significant in the context of the SEA Directive. This includes relating to the potential for negative effects on the Frisby Marsh SSSI and the Asfordby Conservation Area.	
		Natural England, together with the Environment Agency, English Heritage and Forestry Commission has published joint advice on neighbourhood plans, which sets out sources of environmental information, and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans. Local	In this context the significance of potential effects will be limited by key aims of the Neighbourhood Plan. These are in turn reflected by the policy approaches proposed by the latest version of the plan.	
		environmental record centres hold a range of information on the natural environment. You should consider whether your plan has any impacts on legally protected species, and standing advice is available on this.	For these reasons, it is considered that the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan is not subject to the requirements of Directive 2001/42/EC, the 'SEA Directive' and accompanying regulations.	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		Neighbourhood Plans may provide the opportunity to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding built and natural environment; use natural resources more sustainably and bring benefits for the local community, e.g. green space provision and access and contact with nature. Opportunities to incorporate new features into new build or retrofit buildings should be considered as any part of new proposals, e.g. roosting opportunities for bats or installation of bird nest boxes.		
		If you consider your plan will significantly impact on designated nature conservation sites or protected species or has other significant impacts on the environment, you should contact Natural England.		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Ms Penelope Hames-Lambert	General	Comments on planning application 14/0098/OUT We don't want rabbit warrens How many houses will belong to the Council? How many 2 and 3 bedroom homes and how many on income support? Why are there not Section 1,2 and 3 type of houses. There are 3 sections on the plan and why not use them? (1 – flats/terraced, 2 – first time buyers, 3 – More mature family owners). This type of sectioning does help properties to hold value. Developers provide a park/play area which provides the landowner with an income as does separate car parking. Please squash these costs.	On 16 July 2015, Melton Borough Council decided to grant outline planning permission (subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement) to Jelson for residential development (up to 100 dwellings) and associated infrastructure at Station Lane, Asfordby. all matters except access are reserved for subsequent approval; it is unlikely that any of the houses will belong to either Melton Borough Council or Asfordby Parish Council; this matter is reserved for subsequent approval. The Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan expects 42% of new homes to be 2bed and 4% to be 3bed. At	Revise key objective to read: 'clean, safe and low crime'

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		The Parish Council should provide their comment. This provides	least 30% of homes should be affordable;	
		neighbourhood/council with a judgement towards verdict on a 50/50 basis.	the Neighbourhood Plan expects the development to provide mainly for family housing.	
		Clean, safe and crime free is not realistic.	It is not clear how the developer will receive an income from the provision of play areas or parking.	
			The Parish Council objected to the planning application.	
			It is agreed that 'clean, safe and crime free' objective may be over-ambitious.	
Leicestershire Police	General	Appreciate the hard work that has gone into the plan and the Parish are to be congratulated for this.	Noted.	No change
Mr Raymond Howard	General	Where is a police officer when you need one? The parking of cars outside the shops on Bradgate Lane needs to	The Neighbourhood Plan can only deal with land-use issues. It cannot affect the provision of	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		be stopped. Drivers are too lazy to use the car park provided.	police resources, parking enforcement, shop prices or cash points.	
		Asfordby needs more shops for people's needs. The Co-op shop is too expensive for pensioners. Now there is no cash	L COROR MICHARDO CIDIMANTO IN	
		point. Makes it more difficult for people. There needs to be more jobs in the village for those who want them, young and old.	The principal employment sites in Asfordby parish are Asfordby Business Park and Holwell Works. The Neighbourhood Plan expects the redevelopment of the Asfordby Storage and Haulage site should incorporate	
	The whole of Asfordby needs a good shake up. The Parish Council and Melton Council are a lot to be desired, with no teeth to bite.	a small number of live/work units. Melton Borough Council and Asfordby Parish Council elections took place on 7 May 2015.		
Councillor Ronnie De Burle	General	Hardly a representative level of return.	All residents have had several opportunities to have their say on the Neighbourhood Plan.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Sport England	General	Planning Policy in the National Planning Policy Framework identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process and providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type and in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means positive planning for sport, protection from unnecessary loss of sports facilities and an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land and community facilities provision is important. It is important therefore that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects national policy for sport as set out in the above document with particular reference to Pars 73 and 74 to ensure proposals	Neighbourhood Plan Policy A20 safeguards open space, sports and recreational buildings and land. Melton Borough Council's Sport and Recreation Assessment has not yet been published although we understand that the findings are not likely to affect Asfordby.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		comply with National Planning Policy. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing fields (see link below), as set out in our national guide, 'A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England – Planning Policy Statement'.		
		http://www.sportengland.org/facilities- planning/planning-for- sport/development- management/planning- applications/playing-field-land/		
		Sport England provides guidance on developing policy for sport and further information can be found following the link below:		
		http://www.sportengland.org/facilities- planning/planning-for-sport/forward- planning/		
		Sport England works with Local Authorities to ensure Local Plan policy is underpinned by robust and up to date		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		assessments and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports delivery. If local authorities have prepared a Playing Pitch Strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports strategy it will be important that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects the recommendations set out in that document and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support the delivery of those recommendations.		
		http://www.sportengland.org/facilities- planning/planning-for-sport/planning- tools-and-guidance/		
		In this regard, Melton Borough Council is currently working on a built Sports Facilities Strategy and a detailed Playing Pitch Strategy. The evidence once adopted should be used to inform the development of the neighbourhood plan. It is assumed that Parish Councils have been consulted on the development of the strategies so far.		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		If new sports facilities are being proposed Sport England recommend you ensure such facilities are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.		
		http://www.sportengland.org/facilities- planning/tools-guidance/design-and- cost-guidance/		
Mr & Mrs Bullimore	Para 2.7a and b	What say do we have? Developers do not provide the public services or see a need to improve or provide infrastructure. Can we achieve this or is it down to Central Government.	The Neighbourhood Plan, taken as a whole, constitutes our view of what sustainable development in Asfordby parish means in practice.	No change
Mr David Robinson	Para 2.10	The green spaces between the three Asfordby Villages and other local villages should be considered as green spaces.	The Neighbourhood Plan identifies Areas of Separation between Asfordby Hill, Asfordby Valley and Asfordby.	No change
Mr & Mrs E Hewitt	Para 2.10	The document fails to consider the impact and consequence of expanding the village boundaries into	The Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan defines Village Envelopes, protects Local Green Spaces	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		the green field land outside the existing village envelope.	and defines Areas of Separation between Asfordby Hill, Asfordby Valley and Asfordby. Proposed development sites have taken account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Our Neighbourhood Plan encourages the development of brownfield sites at Whitlock Garages and Asfordby Storage & Haulage, but there is insufficient brownfield sites to meet housing needs.	
Mr & Mrs E Hewitt	Para 2.12	Document acknowledges the areas to the south of Asfordby village lies in flood land yet advocates building in this land.	The proposed residential development will only be located within the section of the site that is within Flood Zone 1-Low Probability.	No change
Nina Kenchington	Para 2.12	Worried that Jelson will be able to build houses on a flood plan. Are there not laws against this? Owners of the new homes may find them difficult to insure.	The proposed residential development will only be located within the section of the site that is within Flood Zone 1-Low Probability.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Nina Kenchington	Para 2.17	Fit for purpose homes are needed as well as affordable homes, and no more cupboard size rooms. Family homes need to be big enough for growing families.	Nationally described space standards will replace the existing different space standards used by local authorities.	No change
Nina Kenchington	Para 2.18	Happy for Asfordby Valley to stay as it is and is within walking distance of Asfordby's facilities. Areas of separation and village envelopes are important to us.	Noted.	No change
Mr David Robinson	Para 2.18	Services should include the Emergency Services.	East Leicestershire & Rutland Clinical Commissioning Group, NHS England (Leicestershire and Lincolnshire Area), Melton Local Policing Unit and the Local Policing Body (Police & Crime Commissioner) were consulted on the Neighbourhood Plan.	No change
Mr & Mrs E Hewitt	Para 2.19	Agree but it will never be enforced unless monies are put up front before any development.	Infrastructure improvements are normally secured using Section 106 Agreements. If the s106 is	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			not complied with, it is enforceable against the person that entered into the obligation and any subsequent owner. The s106 can be enforced by injunction. In case of a breach of the obligation the planning authority can take direct action and recover expenses.	
Mr & Mrs Bullimore	Para 2.19	Can developers be made to contribute towards the cost of providing additional infrastructure?	New development will have some impact on the existing, and the need for new, infrastructure, services and amenities. Sometimes these impacts can be detrimental and so developers must expect to contribute towards the cost of providing additional infrastructure. See Neighbourhood Plan Policy A23.	No change
Mr & Mrs E Hewitt	Para 2.20	Totally agree	Noted.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Mr & Mrs Bullimore	Para 2.21	Small business and new development doesn't and shouldn't exist to impair on homeowners. Despite us needing new social housing the ideal place would be on the Boroughs Garage Site.	Land is allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan for housing development on land occupied by garages and vacant land between Whitlock Way and Charnwood Avenue, Asfordby.	No change
Natural England		Particularly support the section on Green Infrastructure.	Noted.	No change
Asfordby Captain's Close Primary School	Policy A1	Concerns with the surrounding land and the impact on the size of the community and our intake.	It remains the Local Authority's legal responsibility to ensure there are enough pupils places. When the school roll is growing due to new housing, the Government expectation is that any shortfall in places is funded by a \$106 contribution. In the event that we are unable to justify a contribution at the time of responding, then the Local Authority will still have to ensure that any additional places required are provided at the appropriate time, this is not an	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			issue for the school to wrestle with or fund.	
Mrs Deidre Summerland	Policy A1	Agree we should keep a good space between the hill and Valley and Asfordby. Should never join up with Melton.	Noted.	No change
Miss R Patel	Policy A1	Agree that the countryside between settlements should be protected, as this is how Asfordby has always defined – Asfordby Village, Asfordby Valley and Asfordby Hill.	Noted.	No change
Mr Robert Frances	Policy A1	Surely we want some green fields as we live in the countryside. Do not like the thought of joining Asfordby Hill and Valley and Village together.	The Neighbourhood Plan identifies Areas of Separation between Asfordby Hill, Asfordby Valley and Asfordby.	No change
Mr & Mrs E Hewitt	Para 3.9	Document acknowledges areas to the south of the village are in the valley floor yet advocates building in this land despite it being flood land.	The proposed residential development will only be located within the section of the site that is within Flood Zone 1-Low Probability.	No change
Mr David Robinson	Para 3.12	As a Brownfield site should this still not be considered over the use of	The NPPF does not support a 'brownfield first' approach to	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		Greenfield site. A builder offered a suitable number of properties to overcome any issues.	the release of housing sites and instead promotes the importance of achieving sustainable development in meeting identified housing needs. In this regard, the former gun Range performs poorly as a housing site when compared with other, better located options. In particular, the site has poor access to the health and community services, education, shops, leisure, open space and sport and recreation facilities.	
Marrons Shakespears on behalf of Mr & Mrs Eaton	Para 3.12	Comments made with reference to the Gun Range are uninformed. The Gun Range has not been assimilated in the surrounding countryside and it is wrongly suggested that access is poor. Also paragraph 3.12 should be deleted.	Located in the countryside to the north of Asfordby Valley, the remnants of the former Asfordby Gun Range have been invaded by trees, scrub and plant so that the site has now been assimilated into the wider landscape. The site itself lies off Welby Lane a narrow, single	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			track road, with no footway. Access to the A6006 at Asfordby Valley is via Brook Crescent and under a railway bridge of restricted width.	
Coal Authority	Policy A2	It is noted that Policy A2: Countryside refers to mineral extraction and waste. Whilst the policy is not seeking to restrict these proposals and consequently we have no objection to the policy. It should be remembered that minerals and waste development are explicitly excluded from the issues within the jurisdiction of a Neighbourhood Development Plan by virtue of s61K of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 9 of the Localism Act 2011). At present therefore the pre-submission Neighbourhood Development Plan is at risk of not meeting the basic conditions required.	Noted.	Policy A2 be revised to exclude: N mineral extraction; and O waste management facilities.

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Asfordby Captain's Close Primary School	Policy A2	Impact of increased traffic and damage to the environment is a concern.	Noted.	No change
Mr & Mrs Bullimore	Policy A2	Policy A2 L – Wind Turbines. Has Policy A3 changed in any way? Policy A2 O – Please explain waste management services.	Waste management refers to recovering, treating, storing, processing, sorting, transferring or depositing of waste.	No change
Mr & Mrs E Hewitt	Para 3.14	Development outside the village boundaries will negatively affect the pastoral landscape and wildlife. It does extol the virtue of ridge and furrow yet in the Geology section it is not recognised. Request that this be reviewed in terms of land to the south of the village.	The Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan defines Village Envelopes, protects Local Green Spaces and defines Areas of Separation between Asfordby Hill, Asfordby Valley and Asfordby. Proposed development sites have taken account landscape and biodiversity. Ridge and furrow is an archaeological pattern of ridges and troughs created by a system of ploughing rather than a geological feature.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Mr & Mrs Bullimore	Para 3.15	The wind farm would not be sited in the Asfordby Business Park. It would be in what prior to the mine tip was an attractive green valley and is slowly reverting back. It also includes a wet land area for wading birds.	Noted. The site was on land which has been restored following closure of the Asfordby underground coal mine in 1997.	Paragraph 3.15 be revised so that the first sentence reads 'The Asfordby Wind Farm is a proposed 9 turbine Wind Farm with an installed capacity of up to 20.7MW to be located near Asfordby Business Park.'
Asfordby Captain's Close Primary School	Policy A3	Impact of increased traffic and damage to the environment is a concern.	Noted.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Mr & Mrs E Hewitt	Par 3.21	Totally agree and should not be considered for development.	Noted.	No change
Mr & Mrs E Hewitt	Para 3.22	Green space should be protected at all costs.	The Plan will rule out new development on designated Local Green Space other than in very special circumstances.	No change
Asfordby Captain's Close Primary School	Policy A4	What impact does this have for our children's access to green space?	The Rivers Eye and Wreake corridor has the potential to provide access to nature for the communities in the Asfordby area.	No change
Ralph Riley	Policy A4	There are no proposals to improve much needed access to the side of the Wreake through Asfordby, just a general statement of intent. If this policy is to have meaning it must have a definable plan and measurable objectives	Policy A14 criteria Eiii requires new link to be created alongside the River Wreake between part footpath/part bidleway H37 and Station Lane. Policy A27 criteria A27 at Frisby Waterparks requires	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			development to be safe and accessible and create opportunities for countryside recreation for visitors and local residents.	
Ralph Riley	Policy A5	On the online consultation, the maps shown which are the only ones, which it is able to read the detail upon, do not have a Legend or Key. So they can't be used to see the proposals.	Noted.	Main Policies Maps to include a legend.
Asfordby Captain's Close Primary School	Policy A5	What impact does this have for our children's access to green space?	By designating land as Local Green Space, the Plan will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances.	No change
Mrs Deidre Summerland	Policy A5	Agree we should try and keep the Green Space protected.	Noted.	No change
Mr & Mrs Bullimore	Para 4.2	Asfordby Relief Channel should be maintained and isn't.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot address this matter.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Mr & Mrs E Hewitt	Para 4.2	Document acknowledges areas to the south of the village are in the valley floor yet advocates building in this land despite it being flood land.	The proposed residential development will only be located within the section of the site that is within Flood Zone 1-Low Probability.	No change
Mr & Mrs E Hewitt	Para 4.3	Advice from the Environment Agency and LCC is irrelevant in the real world. This is flood land and houses built in this area will be impossible to insure.	The proposed residential development will only be located within the section of the site that is within Flood Zone 1-Low Probability.	No change
Asfordby Captain's Close Primary School	Policy A7	Curriculum requires us to develop consideration of areas of National heritage. We would wish to conserve these for generations of children.	Noted.	No change
Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust		We think that it is important that the value of this site needs to be recognised in the plan, it is undoubtedly one of the best in Leicestershire for flora and fauna	Agreed.	The Policies Map be revised to show Local

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		 particularly butterflies and moths and other invertebrate species. A range of rare plant species is also present. Parts of the site are designated as a Local Wildlife Site – see attached notification and map. 		Wildlife Site(s) at Asfordby Hill. The first sentence of
		We believe that this site needs to be protected and managed for wildlife.		Policy A7 be amended to
		Asfordby Hill (Notification of Local Wildlife Site) – Site visits undertaken in April, June and July 2008.		read: 'New development should not harm the network of
		Rational for notification: -		local ecological features and
		1. Habitat Quality The grassland meets the primary criteria for Calcareous grassland because it is over 2500m2 and has 7 species from List J – Calcareous grassland. See continuation sheet for species. The grassland also meets the primary criteria for Mesotrophic grassland because it is over 2500m2 and has 18		habitats which include Asfordby Hill Local Wildlife Site as shown on the Policies Map.'

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		grassland. See continuation sheet for species.		
		The grassland also meets the primary criteria for Mixed grassland because it is over 2500m2 and has 29 species from Lists F, G – Wet grassland, H – Acid grassland, and J.		
		See continuation sheet for species.		
		The recommended review period is 5 years.		
		A list of species has also been provided along with a list of present Red Data Book Species.		
Natural England		Particularly support the section on Biodiversity.	Noted.	No change
Ralph Riley	Para 5.4	After over 23 years that I can personally vouch for, Frisby lakes have been lost to public access. Now they are out of public eye, how does anyone know what is happening to them, so how can these be listed as an aspect of improving biodiversity? Is that what the	This matter is addressed in more detail at paragraphs 8.15-8.17 and Policy A27 of the Pre- submission Neighbourhood Plan.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		new ditches put in to prevent access have produced? I doubt it!		
Mr Peter Webster	Paras 5.7	Red Lodge, Hoby Road. This is the historic house for the present agricultural field. It is not acceptable for modern town houses to be built on this site.	There are no proposals to develop the site associated with Red Lodge.	No change
Mr & Mrs E Hewitt	Para 5.7	The ridge and furrow field at the bottom should be considered a heritage asset and secure by the Council as a teaching aid for the local village schools. With respect to development on the west side of the village (Station Lane), we have major reservations on building in the proximity of overhead power lines. The Parish Council has a duty of care to thoroughly investigate and take scientific advice on this issue. My own research has found conflicting information on safe distances from power lines.	Criteria G of Policy A14 relates to the land south of the Jelson site. The land south of the site is of limited development value due to flood risk- informal recreation use will be consistent with Green Infrastructure Strategies. Electric and magnetic fields are all around us. EMFs are associated with all electrical apparatus, including power lines, underground cables and domestic appliances. There are continuing concerns about EMFs. Over the past 20	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			years, some scientists have linked exposure to everyday levels of EMFs with various health problems, ranging from headaches to Alzheimer's disease. The most persistent of these suggestions relates to childhood leukaemia. But the evidence is not straightforward. No causal link has so far been	
			established between cancer (or any other disease) and EMFs and there is no established mechanism by which these fields could cause or promote disease.	
			In the UK the Government relies on the scientific advice of the National Radiological Protection Board (NRPB), an independent body charged by Parliament with giving advice on EMFs, including advice on safe levels of exposure.	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			Neither the UK Government nor the NRPB has recommended any special precautions for the development of homes near power lines on EMF grounds.	
Mr Peter Webster	Para 5.8	No access to the river due to scrub tree planting. This should be conserved and enhanced.	Noted.	No change
Ralph Riley	Para 5.8	As a resident of Church Lane and someone presumably affected by the Conservation area in all the time that I have lived here I have never seen what the Conservation Area includes or indeed what this means in terms of local planning or proposed actions. I do know that a few years ago workmen turned up, unannounced to remove the top tarmac surface of Church Lane, which revealed the original cobbled surface leading all the way down from the cross to the Church. The workmen were ripping these up. Why I was never told.	A Conservation Area is an area of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance. The residents and businesses in a Conservation Area all have an important part to play in preserving and enhancing the special character that led to its designation. We encourage high quality design for all	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		But if this was part of the Conservation Area why was this valuable asset destroyed. I travel all over Europe and ancient cobbled roadways are treasured and protected features. So how come this happened in Asfordby Conservation Area. I did by the way object and managed a very temporary halt to the work, but this should never have happened and does not bode well for Asfordby's conservation values!	development in a conservation area. The concerns expressed about the loss of the cobbled roadway in Church Lane will be taken up with the Highway Authority.	
Asfordby Captain's Close Primary School	PolicyA8	Curriculum requires us to develop consideration of areas of National heritage. We would wish to conserve these for generations of children.	Noted.	No change
Marrons Shakespears on behalf of Mr & Mrs Eaton	Policy A8	It would appear that the Gun Range has been included within the Local Heritage Assets List. This appears an arbitrary list and not informed by appropriate consideration, independent justification or evidence. An unsound and unreasonable approach and Policy A8(M) should be deleted.	In July 1918 the Midland Railway were asked to modify the "North Sidings" near Asfordby to accommodate a Government Gun Proof Range as requested by the Ministry of Munitions. The range was built adjacent to these sidings and became known as Asfordby Gun Range,	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			servicing heavy-calibre guns. Used up until the 1960's to test naval shells, the noise became a major source of annoyance to Asfordby residents and some even claimed cracks were appearing in their houses from the vibrations. It is possible it fell into disuse for a while, because in 1965, local residents protested at plans by the MOD to reopen it, and a noise muffling tunnel was installed in 1968. When it did close in March 1971, some 70 employees were made redundant. The last gun was fired at Asfordby Gun Range in October 1971 in a short ceremony to mark its closure. Whilst not listed by the Secretary of State, we feel the Gun Range is an important part of Asfordby's heritage due	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			primarily to its historic significance.	
			Most of the other buildings on the Local Heritage Asset list have been drawn from the Asfordby Conservation Area appraisal which identifies a number of buildings and structures of note but which are not listed by the Secretary of State.	
Nina Kenchington	Para 5.10	New houses should blend in with older houses but the size of accommodation is even more important.	Nationally described space standards will replace the existing different space standards used by local authorities.	No change
Nina Kenchington	Para 5.11	Houses that work well for occupants and that are built to last are really important. We know of a small family who needed bigger accommodation and were not able to find one and afford one locally. Our own 1997 home has needed a lot of work doing to it.	Nationally described space standards will replace the existing different space standards used by local authorities.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		We need better quality houses from developers.		
Asfordby Captain's Close Primary School	Policy A9	Recognise the need for developing housing and addressing need. In principle would be happy with a reasonable rise in numbers but our key concern is how we would resource the growth in pupil numbers with the expected rise in population. Also want to protect the nature and culture of the school as well as looking to the future to provide the best service we can to children and families of the village. We have no reserve assets to increase accommodation and government have announced that our funding is not protected going forward. Therefore would need to source some significant funding for accommodation and staffing as well as costs linked to staff pensions, insurance, subscription costs, resources, furniture and family support services.	It remains the Local Authority's legal responsibility to ensure there are enough pupils places. When the school roll is growing due to new housing, the Government expectation is that any shortfall in places is funded by a \$106 contribution. In the event that we are unable to justify a contribution at the time of responding, then the Local Authority will still have to ensure that any additional places required are provided at the appropriate time, this is not an issue for the school to wrestle with or fund.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		With a rising population, a potential 50% increase in numbers, with none or reduced funding; this is a concern, particularly as the school received no additional funding from the recent housing development next door.		
Mr & Mrs Bullimore	Policy A9	Design – So many designs have been allowed so which one are we talking about?	Just because poor design has been allowed in the past doesn't mean that we will allow it to continue. Design guidance is set out in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan.	No change
Miss R Patel	Policy A9	The design of new housing should not be typical of new developments. They should maintain the character of the countryside and blend in. Asfordby should be different with characteristic development.	Agreed.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Andrew Granger & Co Ltd		On behalf of our client we are seeking to work with Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan Group in promoting, Land off Crompton Road/Main Street, Asfordby Hill, for residential development and a community recreation facility. Have made Melton Borough Council (MBC) aware of the site's availability for development through various submissions, including 'Call for Sites' (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) and the Core Strategy, as well as the new Local Plan 'Issues and Options' consultation, which concluded in January 2015. As Asfordby Hill has been identified by MBC as a sustainable village, which has a number of local services, we believe the settlement will be required to accommodate residential	The land to the south of Melton Road and east of Crompton Road, Asfordby Hill consists of a play area, disused allotments and other vacant land. The play area is owned by the Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance but is let to the Parish Council. It is well used but poorly equipped. The rest of the site has become overgrown with scrub and self-set trees. Local schoolchildren think that the woods next to the play area is dangerous, with old mattresses and broken glass. Parents have raised similar concerns. Access to the site is not ideal, but we think that the redevelopment of the site provides an opportunity to tidy-up the area and improve local play facilities.	Allocate Land off Crompton Road/Main Street, Asfordby Hill, for residential development.

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		development through the new Local Plan. We are promoting the site as being available for development and deliverable within 5 years.		
		The site (plan was enclosed with the submission) measure approximately 0.65ha and is owned by the Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance. Part of the site, used as a play area, is let to the Parish Council. The remainder of the site is derelict allotment land which is not its intended purpose. Propose to bring the derelict site back into use for residential development in line with the National Planning Policy Framework. It would deliver residential development in close proximity to services, public transport links and employment opportunities.		
		The site is located in close proximity to good public transport links, a primary		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		school and sports facilities in Asfordby Hill, as well as excellent service provision in Melton Mowbray, accessed via public transport.		
		Suggest that the site could deliver approximately 15 dwellings, including a suitable mix of housing. A submitted illustrative layout shows how the site could be developed. We proposed predominantly 2 and 3 bed units and a few 4 bed units.		
		Also seeking to retain part of the use of the site as a community recreation facility and make this available for an enhanced play area for local children. This facility could be made available for the long term and additional and enhanced equipment would be delivered as part of the residential scheme.		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		Vehicular access to the site would be taken from Main Street (Details shown on a submitted plan). Understand a suitable and acceptable access can be achieved. Have worked with highway consultants to draw up an access design, which includes relocating an existing bus stop, and constructing a new bus stop lay-by. A new footpath would connect the site to the existing footpath along Main Street. Access road is sufficiently wide enough to access the site for the proposed development and the required visibility splays can be achieved.		
		The allocation of the residential development site would allow flexibility in the plan to support the delivery of residential dwellings to accommodate future housing need in the village. Development will be needed to provide for various household groups, including		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		those looking for starter homes, families wishing to remain living in Asfordby Hill and those wishing to downsize. Wish to remain involved in the Neighbourhood Plan process and request to be informed on any future consultation processes and when the document is submitted to Melton Borough Council and the Independent Examiner.		
Mr Alan Webster		Agree with the housing allocations but in the event additional sites are required the following should be considered. Site A5 – between the Hawthorns and the bypass with access off Loughborough Road. Sites AH1 and AH4 – Asfordby Hill Site of Holwell Works Institute, Football Club and Rifle Range should be included to provide access to the extension Brownfield site where a mix of	Noted. The site between The Hawthorns (A5) and the bypass, is a very long and thin strip of land that will be challenging and inefficient to develop. Added to this, the proximity of the site to the bypass and its prominence, will require a significant part of the site to remain undeveloped to act as a noise and landscape buffer. The site has	Reconsider the policy concerning Asfordby Business Park

licy/ ragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
	residential/industrial and 1 or 2 retail units could be developed. The inclusion of shops would regenerate the area and make it sustainable. Asfordby Hill has a primary school, good bus service, garden centre/restaurant and Holwell Works Institute and a convenience store/newsagent would breath life into the community.	not been promoted by the landowner. The site at West Side, Asfordby Hill (AH1) has not been selected as South Street, St Johns Road and West Side are private streets in poor condition and not suitable for the additional traffic. The site would result in the loss of woodland and ecological interest. The proposed housing site access to site AH4 would require the relocation of the existing bus stop, which would make the stop a little more remote for the rest of the settlement, particularly those properties served from Crompton Road estate and further down Melton Road. The access would also be very close to the pedestrian crossing point and may encroach within the hatching of	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			the crossing, which again would be undesirable. The new access road would also be relatively close to the junction of Melton Road with Crompton Road, and the interaction between the junctions and possible issues with visibility splays crossing the junctions, would again be undesirable and would need consideration, which may affect the location of the proposed access, which would then have a knock on effect on the pedestrian crossing and location of the bus stop.	
Mrs Angela Parker	Site A1	Land between Regency Road, Asfordby and the bypass. Important trees, hedges, ponds and a footpath link across the site need to be protected and the development needs to take account of noise and disturbance from bypass traffic as our house backs onto	When asked to choose the best housing sites in Asfordby Village, almost a half of local people included the land between Regency Road and the bypass. This site has excellent access to local services and facilities.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		the bypass separated by a small strip of land and the road is noisy now I would not want to live closer to it. Narrow site reduces capacity for housing. Saxelby Road is not a suitable standard for additional traffic because it has a school on it, which causes parking problems on the road already and extra traffic, would make it dangerous for children walking to school. The site is of ecological interest as it provides a haven for wildlife.	Important trees, hedges, ponds and a footpath link across the site are to be protected and the development needs to take account of noise and disturbance from bypass traffic.	
Mrs Angela Parker	Site A5	See above. Very narrow site reduces capacity for housing. Saxelby Road not suitable standard for additional traffic. Adjacent to bypass- noise and disturbance to future residents. Ecological interest. May exacerbate flooding Sites at Asfordby Valley and Hill – Not sure why these sites have been ruled out. Not having a shop is not an excuse	The site between The Hawthorns (A5) and the bypass, is a very long and thin strip of land that will be challenging and inefficient to develop. Added to this, the proximity of the site to the bypass and its prominence, will require a significant part of the site to remain undeveloped to act as a noise and	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		not to build. New houses have been built there recently off the A6006 and not caused a traffic problem, as the A6006 is 40 mph and the Hill 30 mph. Most people have a car to get to work and the supermarket. Judging by the amount of cars outside Asfordby shops nobody walks. It would be better for the environment if houses were kept off Greenfield land and Brownfield sites utilised, such as Asfordby haulage and storage, the garage and Holwell works sites.	landscape buffer. The site has not been promoted by the landowner. While Asfordby Hill has some services and facilities, there is no shop, pub, GP surgery, pharmacy or place of worship. However the village is well connected to Melton Mowbray and Asfordby Village. The scope for additional growth at Asfordby Hill has largely been taken up by the approval (subject to a Section 106 Agreement) of 15 affordable homes at land adjacent to 23 and 24 Glebe Road in July 2015 (15/00201/FUL). Our Neighbourhood Plan encourages the development of brownfield sites at Whitlock Garages and Asfordby Storage & Haulage, but there is	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			insufficient brownfield sites to meet housing needs. Holwell Works is a key employment site to be safeguarded for employment	
Asfordby Captain's Close Primary School	Policies A10-A17	Recognise the need for developing housing and addressing need. In principle would be happy with a reasonable rise in numbers but our key concern is how we would resource the growth in pupil numbers with the expected rise in population. Also want to protect the nature and culture of the school as well as looking to the future to provide the best service we can to children and families of the village. We have no reserve assets to increase accommodation and government have announced that our funding is not protected going forward. Therefore would need to find some significant funding for accommodation and	It remains the Local Authority's legal responsibility to ensure there are enough pupils places. When the school roll is growing due to new housing, the Government expectation is that any shortfall in places is funded by a \$106 contribution. In the event that we are unable to justify a contribution at the time of responding, then the Local Authority will still have to ensure that any additional places required are provided at the appropriate time, this is not an issue for the school to wrestle with or fund.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		staffing as well as costs linked to staff pensions, insurance, subscription costs, resources, furniture and family support services. With a rising population, a potential 50% increase in numbers, with no or reduced funding; this is a concern, particularly as the school received no additional funding from the recent housing development next door.		
GVA on behalf of Jelson Homes	Policy A10	Jelson supports the housing targets set out in Policy A10, although in common with other tiers of planning policy it is considered that the target of 164 should be expressed as a minimum. In terms of allocations generally - Jelson supports the allocation of a range of alternative sites to provide for choice, competition and flexibility. Such flexibility is an essential component of a deliverable strategy.	Noted. We do not agree that the target of 164 should be expressed as a minimum though. The introduction of a minimum housing requirement risks unsustainable development and introduces uncertainty, contrary to the provisions of the NPPF. It would also make infrastructure planning more difficult.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Nina Kenchington	Policy A10	Need a safe and suitable access. We could do with that at Asfordby Valley as the Slip Road accesses can be lethal at times.	Noted. Policy 10 criteria C requires safe and suitable access to development sites for all people.	No change
Marrons Shakespears on behalf of Mr & Mrs Eaton	Policy A10	The Borough Council acknowledges that it is currently unable to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land and there are no up to date Development Plan policies which govern the supply of housing. The most up to date information in relation to housing requirements is that contained within the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (June 2014) (SHMA). The housing assessment that underpins the Neighbourhood Plan does not appear to pay regard to the SHMA. It is considered likely that the emerging Melton Local Plan will determine Asfordby is a sustainable location for more growth than that contained within	We are not obliged to consider the wider ramifications of the draft policy upon the delivery of housing. The limited role of the Neighbourhood Plan to have regard to national policy when considering a draft policy applicable to a small geographical area should not be confused with the more investigative scrutiny required by the 2004 Act in order for an Inspector examining a draft local plan to determine whether such a plan is "sound" (see sections 20(7) to (7C) and 23 of the 2004 Act) (paragraph 83).	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		the Neighbourhood Plan (NP). Such circumstances will render the NP's housing supply policies as being out of date and given limited weight. There is limited value in the NP identifying housing provision where the Borough Council is unable to identify a five year housing supply and where the Borough Council is likely to address housing supply in a Local Plan which may determine that Asfordby needs to accommodate more housing that the NP currently identified. Recommend that this policy be deleted.	Whereas under paragraph 182 of the NPPF a local plan needs to be "consistent with national policy", a neighbourhood plan has to have regard to national policy (paragraph 84). The neighbourhood plan does not have to be "justified" in the sense used in paragraph 182 of the NPPF. [From the decision of Lewis J in Gladman Developments Ltd v Aylesbury Vale District Council [2014] EWHC 4323 (Admin)] (i) Paragraph 8(2)(e) of schedule 4B to the 1990 Act only requires general conformity with the strategic policies of the development if such policies exist. Where they do not,	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			paragraph 8(2)(e) is not engaged, but that does not mean that a neighbourhood plan cannot be prepared and formally "made" (paragraphs 58 to 59 and 65 of Gladman). We understand that Gladman has withdrawn from Court of Appeal proceedings. The Parish Council and the local planning authority have been working constructively to make timely progress, to ensure housing need is met through the neighbourhood planning process and for there to be broad alignment with the emerging new Melton Local Plan.	
Mr Nick Atkins	Paras 6.7 to 6.11	Survey data shows that there seems to be a desire for development outside the main village. For the Valley, amenities	The preferred location for new housing development in the parish is Asfordby Village.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		are already within walking distance. For the Hill development a shop would be welcomed. The plan does not reflect this as all four developments proposals are within the main village.	Asfordby Village has a good range of services and facilities-shops, Post Office, primary school, GP surgery, pharmacy, recreation and leisure, public house and place of worship. New housing will help ensure the viability of these services.	
			While Asfordby Hill has some services and facilities, there is no shop, pub, GP surgery, pharmacy or place of worship. Even if there was an improvement in services, for example a shop, Asfordby Hill residents did not want more housing development other than infill.	
			Asfordby Valley has no facilities other than a children's play area.	
Mrs Carol Whitfield		There are better housing sites than Station Lane. Asfordby Storage site is	Our Neighbourhood Plan encourages the development	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		prime but they will never vacant. Alternative suggestions include the BT Exchange, the overgrown area next to the Parish Hall, and the area next to the detached houses on the edge of the village. Why have we campaigned so long for a bypass but now insist on filling up next to it.	of brownfield sites at Whitlock Garages and Asfordby Storage & Haulage, but there is insufficient brownfield sites to meet housing needs. The community has been consulted on range of alternative development sites and we have taken account of local views in selecting the preferred sites.	
Mr Danny Keightley	Policy A11	Request that further consideration be given to the inclusion of the site of Melton Rd, Asfordby Hill for residential development/allocation in the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan for a low density scheme of single storey properties to meet local housing needs. In preparing the Neighbourhood Plan background papers recognise that 250 or so additional households would live in Asfordby by 2031. To meet this need a	The development of the proposed site would represent a significant detrimental intrusion into the open countryside in a prominent location that contributes to the rural setting of Asfordby Hill.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		number of potential sites were identified in the Sites Profile Paper. All these sites are Greenfield and outside of the present limits to development and only one site is identified as not having any major constraints. Therefore there should be no objection in principle to this proposed site.		
		There are no constraints to the development of this site and its development would have a comparatively less impact on the open countryside than the other potential development sites. Site fares well in comparison to the other potential development sites. A site profile is attached addressing issues including description, its current use, land type, adjacent uses, size, capacity, accessibility, heritage assets, ecology, landscape, drainage, noise and planning history.		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Marrons Shakespears on behalf of Mr & Mrs Eaton	Policy A11	Significant concerns over the ability of a NP to allocate housing land outside of the Development Plan process. This issue is to be heard at the Court of Appeal. Legislation is clear that a site allocation policy cannot lawfully be contained in a NP but can only be set out in a Local Development Document. Recommend that this policy be deleted.	National Planning Practice Guidance advises that a neighbourhood plan can allocate sites for development. In the Larkfleet Homes case (Uppingham), the Court of Appeal confirmed an earlier High Court judgment that neighbourhood plans can allocate land for development.	No change
GVA on behalf of Jelson Homes	Policy A11	As discussed earlier, Jelson is supportive of the flexibility built into the plan through the allocation of a number of different sites. This appears particularly important given that a number of the sites have question marks over their deliverability.	Noted.	No change
Simon Bailey	Para 6.12	The plan states 'almost a half of local people', realistically this is almost a half of total respondents to the 2014 questionnaire and not half of local people.	The Plan makes it clear that in August 2014 we sent a questionnaire to all households inviting residents to set out their views on development in the parish.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Mr David Robinson	Para 6.12	(Land between Regency Road, Asfordby and the bypass) – As a green field site this should not be considered until all brown/industrial sites are used. There is also the risk with the bypass that it forms an artificial barrier to the village, which you then build up.	Our Neighbourhood Plan encourages the development of brownfield sites at Whitlock Garages and Asfordby Storage & Haulage, but there is insufficient brownfield sites to meet housing needs. The community has been consulted on a range of alternative development sites and we have taken account of local views in selecting the preferred sites.	No change
Mr & Mrs Bullimore	Para 6.13	Traffic to and from the school is a problem taking into account the number of houses proposed. There would be quite a lot of movement and potential speed problems.	Policy A12 ensures that the development incorporates measures to reduce the speed of traffic using Saxelby Road.	No change
Mr & Mrs Bullimore	Policy A12	Land between Regency Road and bypass. Believe financial contributions were made to people living in Council houses backing onto the bypass.	Policy A12 ensures that the development takes account of noise and disturbance from bypass traffic.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		Should investigate this and make sure new properties are treated the same.		
Leicestershire County Council	Policy A12C	States a vehicular access to the site is to be from Saxelby Road and Regency Road. As the site is for around 55 dwellings it could be accessed from a single access point and it would be difficult to resist in highway terms. An additional pedestrian access point would be beneficial to improve pedestrian links to the school and/or the village centre.	Noted. All vehicular traffic should come off Saxelby lane (which will be improved at certain points) with only walkways and cycleways off Regency Road as a vehicle access off Regency Road would be substandard.	Policy A12B be amended to read: 'vehicular access to the site is to be from Saxelby Road'
GVA on behalf of Jelson Homes	Policy A12	As discussed earlier, Jelson is supportive of the flexibility built into the plan through the allocation of a number of different sites. This appears particularly important given that a number of the sites have question marks over their deliverability. Site A12, between Regency Road and the bypass, is a very long and thin strip of land that will be challenging and potentially inefficient to develop.	Following discussions with the landowner's agent and the Highway Authority we are confident that a housing development of around 55 dwellings can be achieved. Community consultation identified it as local residents' preferred site.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		Added to this, the proximity of the site to the bypass and its prominence, will require a significant part of the site to remain undeveloped to act as a noise and landscape buffer. This was a requirement of the Jubilee Close development as detailed in Policy H16 of the Melton Local Plan. This required a minimum 23m buffer to be put in place. A similar requirement would very significantly erode the capacity of site A12 to deliver any significant level of new housing.		
Mr Jamie Bland	Policies A12	Strongly against development, particularly Station Lane as this would destroy the existing countryside views of the community and add more pressure to the roads (Station Lane/Leicester Road junction).	The NPPF requires Local Plans to set targets for development based upon an Objective Assessment of Need and to provide a flexible and responsive land supply to ensure those targets can be met. At present the Borough Council cannot demonstrate a five year land supply.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			On 16 July 2015, Melton Borough Council decided to grant outline planning permission (subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement) to Jelson for residential development (up to 100 dwellings) and associated infrastructure at Station Lane, Asfordby. In order to mitigate the impact of the proposed Jelson development the junction of Station Lane with the A607 is to be improved.	
Miss R Patel	Policy A12	Do not agree that further housing should be built between Regency Road, Asfordby and bypass. Enough housing has been built in the area and the surrounding countryside would be spoilt.	Noted, However, the NPPF requires Local Plans to set targets for development based upon an Objective Assessment of Need and to provide a flexible and responsive land supply to ensure those targets can be met. At present the	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			Borough Council cannot demonstrate a five year land supply.	
GVA on behalf of Jelson Homes	Policy A13	As discussed earlier, Jelson is supportive of the flexibility built into the plan through the allocation of a number of different sites. This appears particularly important given that a number of the sites have question marks over their deliverability. Site A13 may be a suitable redevelopment site, however, it is unclear who owns the site and whether it is available for development. It is also unclear whether the garages are currently tenanted. Is it also unclear whether replacement parking provision would have to be provided as part of any scheme.	The site is owned by Melton Borough Council and Asfordby Parish Council. Both Councils are keen to see the site developed. Many of the garages are vacant or used for storage.	No change
Mr & Mrs E Hewitt	Policies A13	This area should be considered first for development. Over the length of time Brownfield sites within the village boundary will present themselves.	Our Neighbourhood Plan encourages the development of brownfield sites at Whitlock Garages and Asfordby Storage	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			& Haulage, but there is insufficient brownfield sites to meet housing needs.	
Mr Robert Frances	Policy A13	Whitlock and Charnwood Avenue garages and parkland. Welcome plan for houses on this site as the parkland is used by dog owners causing dog fouling in the area. Contractors such as builders and gardeners also mostly use garages, whereas their use should be for car parking only and not for storage.	Noted.	No change
Mr Jamie Bland	Policy A13	Whitlock garages is an eyesore and an attraction for unsavoury characters. This would benefit from building houses.	Noted.	No change
Environment Agency	Policy A13	Policy A6 Water Management deals with SUDS. But as Policy A12 on housing allocation has made specific mention of SUDs at point Giii then this point should be repeated in Policy A13.	The Whitlock Garages Site is a small, brownfield site and we are uncertain what the drainage solution will be at this time.	No change
Leicestershire County Council	Policy A13	No comment.	Noted.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Nick Atkins	Para 6.16	Data shows this not to be particularly popular whilst increasing the village envelope and consuming more green fields. The plan states we do not need identikit houses yet this Jelson development would be such. Whilst A1 and A6 are sensible developments more consideration should be given to AH1 and AH4 with the requisite infrastructure improvements.	On 16 July 2015, Melton Borough Council decided to grant outline planning permission (subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement) to Jelson for residential development (up to 100 dwellings) and associated infrastructure at Station Lane, Asfordby.	No change
Mrs Jennifer Edson	Policy A14	Asfordby does not need this amount of housing. Would bring a large amount of traffic to the Station Lane junction and to the medieval bridge, which is already a bottleneck, and with a dangerous junction. Proposed site is of archaeological importance having had a survey and dig in the last two weeks with a large number of Neolithic flints found.	On 16 July 2015, Melton Borough Council decided to grant outline planning permission (subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement) to Jelson for residential development (up to 100 dwellings) and associated infrastructure at Station Lane, Asfordby. In order to mitigate the impact of the proposed Jelson	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		There would be other sites that should be infilled, namely Whitlock Garages in an area mainly used for fly tipping. Please save our green sites. Also concerned about the types of houses being built. They are of a size and price that would be snapped up by buy to let landlords bringing mainly unwanted people to the village who have no care for properties.	development the junction of Station Lane with the A607 is to be improved. Given the close proximity of the one-way traffic signals at the Station Lane bridge over the River Wreake to the proposed site access, it is important to ensure that any southbound queues do not extend as far as the proposed site access and impact upon the safe operation of the site access. The results of a queue length survey undertaken at the stop line at the traffic signals indicated maximum queue lengths in a southbound direction of 42.5m in the AM peak period and 38.5m in the PM peak period. The distance between the proposed site access and the southbound stop line at the signals is approximately 150m.	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			Therefore, queuing traffic at the traffic signals will not extend as far as the proposed site access.	
			An archaeological evaluation has been carried out. The work did not reveal any significant archaeological deposits.	
			Our Neighbourhood Plan encourages the development of brownfield sites at Whitlock Garages and Asfordby Storage & Haulage, but there is insufficient brownfield sites to meet housing needs.	
			Neighbourhood Plan Policy A16 aims to ensure that new housing meets the different housing needs of people of different ages that will help ensure Asfordby parish continues to be a mixed community with young families and older people in the parish.	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Leicestershire County Council	Policy A14	Currently subject to a planning application which is currently being considered by the highway authority.	On 16 July 2015, Melton Borough Council decided to grant outline planning permission (subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement) to Jelson for residential development (up to 100 dwellings) and associated infrastructure at Station Lane, Asfordby.	No change
Miss R Patel	Policy A14	Agree with housing on land to the west of Station Lane as there is enough land to build on and not affecting the rest of Asfordby.	On 16 July 2015, Melton Borough Council decided to grant outline planning permission (subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement) to Jelson for residential development (up to 100 dwellings) and associated infrastructure at Station Lane, Asfordby.	No change
Mr Jamie Bland	Policies A14	Strongly against development, particularly Station Lane as this would destroy the existing countryside views of	Our Neighbourhood Plan encourages the development of brownfield sites at Whitlock	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		the community and add more pressure to the roads (Station Lane/Leicester Road junction).	Garages and Asfordby Storage & Haulage, but there is insufficient brownfield sites to meet housing needs.	
			On 16 July 2015, Melton Borough Council decided to grant outline planning permission (subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement) to Jelson for residential development (up to 100 dwellings) and associated infrastructure at Station Lane, Asfordby.	
			In order to mitigate the impact of the proposed Jelson development the junction of Station Lane with the A607 is to be improved.	
GVA on behalf of Jelson Homes	Policy A14	Jelson welcomes the proposed allocation of its site at Station Lane under Policy A14. As demonstrated in our recent planning application, the site	The requirement for 12% of dwellings to be bungalows is not arbitrary. The Station Lane site and the site between Regency	Criteria G of Policy A14 be amended to read: 'Land to

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		is suitable for housing, is deliverable and its development raises no technical or environmental concerns. In fact, based on information currently available, the Jelson site appears to be the only proposed allocation that has been demonstrated to be deliverable in the short to medium term. It is noted that criteria B of Policy A14 includes a requirement for 12% of the dwellings to be bungalows. Jelson is happy in principle to consider the inclusion of bungalows on the site, as it did at the request of the Parish Council at its Hawthorns development in the village. We would however, be concerned about the imposition of an arbitrary total, particularly as the justification for the particular target chosen is not clear. For example, the optimum housing profile for the village set out on page 25 of the draft plan only indicates a requirement for 8% bungalows. It is also noted that none of	Road and the bypass will together provide some 155 new homes and account for most of the planned development in the village. At a rate of 8%, they should provide for 12 bungalows in total. However, the site between Regency Road and the bypass is unsuitable for bungalows because of the restricted depth of the site. Furthermore, given the proximity of the primary school our Plan envisages the site being developed mainly for family housing. The Station Lane site is larger and less restricted and is better placed to accommodate the 12 bungalows that are needed. The bungalows can also be used as a means of limiting the impact of the new development on the amenities	the south- between the development and the River Wreake- shall be laid out and made available for informal recreation.'

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		the other housing allocations include a similar requirement to provide bungalows, which is clearly inconsistent. If the aim of this element of the policy is to increase the number of bungalows available in the village then this should be an aim that applies equally to all sites. Encouragement for bungalows might therefore be more appropriately included as a general objective applying to all sites within Policy A10. If the specific requirement to include bungalows on the Station Lane site is more related to design and residential amenity (particularly in respect of residents in Klondyke Way) then it needs to be recognised that there may be other ways of addressing any concerns other than the use of bungalows. It would be more appropriate therefore for Policy A14 to include a provision that requires the privacy and outlook of existing residential properties adjoining the scheme to be maintained through	of existing residents on Klondyke Way. Criteria G of Policy A14 relates to the land south of the site. Although the land to the west of the site has been identified by Jelson as open space its value is diminished because of the overhead high-voltage power lines. This is due to health concerns- real or perceived, limitations on recreation activities and visual impact. The land south of the site, on the other hand, is of limited development value due to flood risk, but informal recreation use will be consistent with Green Infrastructure Strategies. The site is controlled by Jelson. The bus service is not fixed as bus services can be diverted to new bus stops within these	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		the use of appropriate design solutions (which could include bungalows), maintenance of minimum separation distances and landscaping.	distances. The need for an accessible bus service is particularly important here given the size of the	
		Criteria G of Policy A14 is also of concern as it is currently drafted. It is unclear whether this statement relates to the land to the west of the site, which has already been identified by Jelson as being laid out as open space, or the large area of land to the south of the site. Jelson has already committed to laying out an area of land to the west of the site as informal open space and so if the reference is to this land then there is no objection.	development and distance to other village facilities.	
		However, if the reference is to the land to the south of the site then this would generate significant concern. This land does not form part of the site that Jelson is promoting for development. The land also forms part of the functional floodplain and so is not suitable for 'laying out' as recreation or amenity		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		space and is not an area to which it would be sensible to generally encourage public access. It is therefore important that the land to which Criteria G is intended to apply is clarified.		
		Finally, it is also unclear why Criteria H of Policy A14 is not included in relation to any of the other proposed housing sites. The bus service within the village is fixed, it is common to all sites and has already been judged to be sufficient to support the expansion of the village. Criteria H should therefore be deleted.		
Mr & Mrs E Hewitt	Policy A14	The inclusion of this site conflicts with the objection we made to Melton Council to such a development. Would prefer Brownfield sites to be developed rather than green areas and thus expanding the village envelope.	On 16 July 2015, Melton Borough Council decided to grant outline planning permission (subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement) to Jelson for residential development (up to 100 dwellings) and associated infrastructure at Station Lane, Asfordby.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			Our Neighbourhood Plan encourages the development of brownfield sites at Whitlock Garages and Asfordby Storage & Haulage, but there is insufficient brownfield sites to meet housing needs.	
Leicestershire County Council	Policy A14	Currently subject to a planning application which is currently being considered by the highway authority.	On 16 July 2015, Melton Borough Council decided to grant outline planning permission (subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement) to Jelson for residential development (up to 100 dwellings) and associated infrastructure at Station Lane, Asfordby.	No change
Environment Agency	Policy A14	The southern part of this site as shown on the Policies Map is affected by Flood Zone 2 and is therefore subject to sequential testing in accordance with NPPF. Confirmation will be required that the site has passed the Sequential Test	Criteria G of Policy A14 relates to the land south of the site. Informal recreation use will be consistent with Green Infrastructure Strategies. Amenity open space, nature	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		before planning approval and development can commence. A site which includes areas of flood risk, even if the area of flood risk does not include built development, is still subject to Sequential Testing.	conservation and biodiversity are classified as 'water compatible development' and is an appropriate use in Flood Zone 2.	
Mr Nick Atkins	Paras 6.17-6.19	Site was not mentioned in the survey and too much effort has been wasted on this site, when it is not available for development. Whilst the roadside is an eyesore, effort would be better spent improving the look of the village by addressing the shop facades, garage and BT exchange to regain the charm of Asfordby Village.	Early consultation with local people showed that there was a lot of support for the redevelopment of the Asfordby Storage and Haulage site for housing.	No change
Miss R Patel	Policy A15	Asfordby Haulage and depot land should be built on so it doesn't become wasted land.	Our Neighbourhood Plan encourages the development of the Asfordby Storage & Haulage site.	No change
Mr & Mrs E Hewitt	Policies A15	This area should be considered first for development. Over the length of time Brownfield sites within the village boundary will present themselves.	Our Neighbourhood Plan encourages the development of brownfield sites at Whitlock Garages and Asfordby Storage	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			& Haulage, but there is insufficient brownfield sites to meet housing needs.	
GVA on behalf of Jelson Homes	Policy A15	As discussed earlier, Jelson is supportive of the flexibility built into the plan through the allocation of a number of different sites. This appears particularly important given that a number of the sites have question marks over their deliverability. In respect of site A15 it does not appear from the commentary provided on page 24 that the owner of this site is a willing participant in the Neighbourhood plan process and that the site is therefore available for development.	Unfortunately, the owner of the Asfordby Storage & Haulage site has not been willing to participate in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan so we cannot be sure that there is a realistic prospect of housing development. Our Plan does not depend on the development of the site to deliver the planned housing provision.	No change
Environment Agency	Policy A15	The southern part of this site as shown on the Policies Map is affected by Flood Zone 2 and is therefore subject to sequential testing in accordance with NPPF. Confirmation will be required that the site has passed the Sequential Test before planning approval and	This matter is addressed by Appendix 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		development can commence. A site which includes areas of flood risk, even if the area of flood risk does not include built development, is still subject to Sequential Testing.		
Mr Jamie Bland	Policy A15	Not knowing the actual area covered but it seems it could accommodate quite a lot of the area needed for the village expansion plan and would not cause any existing views.	Unfortunately, the owner of the Asfordby Storage & Haulage site has not been willing to participate in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan so we cannot be sure that there is a realistic prospect of housing development. Our Plan does not depend on the development of the site to deliver the planned housing provision.	No change
Leicestershire County Council	Policy A22	It is current County Council policy to only ask for travel packs and bus passes for developments of 25 dwellings or more.	Policy 22 requires all housing developments to make provision for Travel Packs. Due to the disproportionate burden of developer contributions on small scale developers, for sites of 10-units or less, tariff style	The first sentence of Policy 22 be revised as follows 'Housing developments of more than

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			contributions should not be sought.	ten dwellings should make provision for one Travel Pack per dwelling to inform new residents, from first occupation, what sustainable travel choices are available in the area.'
Mr & Mrs Bullimore	Para 6.14	Whitlock garages is the best place for businesses but accept that social housing is a must.	Noted.	No change
Simon Bailey	Para 6.14	The plan states 'almost a half of local people', realistically this is almost a half of total respondents to the 2014 questionnaire and not half of local people.	The Plan makes it clear that in August 2014 we sent a questionnaire to all households inviting residents to set out their views on development in the parish.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Mr David Robinson	Para 6.16	As a Greenfield/agricultural area it should not be considered until all Brownfield sites are used. The current plans do not meet the requirements of the NPPF. The risks of flooding from the River Wreake is mentioned and these fields play an important role in absorbing water during times of heavy rain. Building on this land will increase water run-off and possibilities of flooding to current and new properties. Local highway and transport links are not suitable for further increases in vehicle movements generated by large developments. The current infrastructure of the village will also struggle to cope.	On 16 July 2015, Melton Borough Council decided to grant outline planning permission (subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement) to Jelson for residential development (up to 100 dwellings) and associated infrastructure at Station Lane, Asfordby. Our Neighbourhood Plan encourages the development of brownfield sites at Whitlock Garages and Asfordby Storage & Haulage, but there is insufficient brownfield sites to meet housing needs. Policy 14 criteria Fiv requires an appropriately designed, constructed and maintained sustainable drainage system. In order to mitigate the impact of the proposed Jelson	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			development the junction of Station Lane with the A607 is to be improved.	
Mr & Mrs Bullimore	Para 6.24	Affordable Housing. Local Asfordby Parish residents should not have to compete with those from the Borough unless originally from Asfordby.	Policy A17 requires new Affordable housing (Rural Exception Sites and homes provided as part of market housing developments) to be allocated initially to people with a local connection, including those living, working or with close family ties in the Parish.	No change
Simon Bailey	Response 44	These seem to have been written post the Jelson application and therefore seem to be strongly worded around what the Parish Council would like to see from the development and what Jelson would need to do to get the application passed. Following the public meeting held in January it is clear that housing of this magnitude is not welcome on this site.	On 16 July 2015, Melton Borough Council decided to grant outline planning permission (subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement) to Jelson for residential development (up to 100 dwellings) and associated infrastructure at Station Lane, Asfordby.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		The planning application has had a massive input into the plan and has prejudiced its preparation. The site should be removed from the list in Policy A11. It is clear that the site off Station Lane is not within the Asfordby Village Envelope and therefore should not be listed as suitable for development.		
Nina Kenchington	Policy A10	Need a safe and suitable access. We could do with that at Asfordby Valley as the Ship Road accesses can be lethal at times. Para 6.16 – the scale of the Jelson development defies belief and the houses seem so small and definitely not family size. The plan is crazy – on the flood plain with another access onto the bends south of Asfordby. Doubt they will be affordable or sold to local	On 16 July 2015, Melton Borough Council decided to grant outline planning permission (subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement) to Jelson for residential development (up to 100 dwellings) and associated infrastructure at Station Lane, Asfordby.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		people – are checks made to see if local people move in?		
		Policy A14 – too many houses on a small area. Houses are small.		
		Para 6.23 – maybe sufficient rooms for a family but rooms need to be bigger. Our house is too small. Where in these rooms in space for toys and living space?		
		Asfordby should set standards for building and for the rest of the country to follow.		
Paul Gregory	Policy A14	Understand the argument for new housing but as the village grows the infrastructure needs to be adapted to suit. Assuming the 100 new homes at Station Lane are built it is necessary to upgrade Station Lane, a most used link	On 16 July 2015, Melton Borough Council decided to grant outline planning permission (subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement) to Jelson for residential development (up to 100	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		road from Asfordby Village to the Leicester Road. Over recent years the amount and size of vehicles has significantly increase. It is used as a by-pass to avoid Melton Mowbray. Queues can often be found at the Leicester Road junction. Large vehicles are damaging side of the roads. Vehicles from an extra 100 homes will exacerbate these problems with increased risk of accidents. Therefore propose the following:	dwellings) and associated infrastructure at Station Lane, Asfordby.	
		Station Lane is widened to cater for increased traffic and larger vehicles.		
		Tight bends are reduced, especially the bend just after the hump back bridge Traffic lights installed to help movement of traffic exiting onto Leicester Road		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		Introduction of traffic calming measures from the village towards Klondike Way turning that doesn't reduce the width of the road.		
Mr Peter Webster	Para 6.16 and Policy A14	Not in compliance with the Melton Plan. Overhead electricity lines on the preferred site.	On 16 July 2015, Melton Borough Council decided to grant outline planning permission (subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement) to Jelson for residential development (up to 100 dwellings) and associated infrastructure at Station Lane, Asfordby.	No change
Councillor Ronnie De Burle		Do not believe the number of houses required as shown is a correct evaluation for the borough. The estimates are based on old date. A decline in manufacturing and with no new large scale proposals for development on the horizon, this will limit demand above the natural and		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		organic expansion of the town and villages surrounding it. Housing Association and affordable housing tenants will bring growth in people numbers but will require tax payer help and impose a burden on the existing system. The way forward is to encourage higher quality and value small scale development to bring money into the area.		
Mr David Robinson		Should there be a section that includes the Emergency Services. An increase in population without an increase in resource and finances will mean a reduction in the effectiveness of the Emergency Services in the area.	Leicestershire Constabulary and NHS England have been consulted during the preparation of the Plan.	No change
Asfordby Captain's Close Primary School	Policies 18 & 19	Recognise the need for developing housing and addressing need. In principle would be happy with a	It remains the Local Authority's legal responsibility to ensure there are enough pupils places.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		reasonable rise in numbers but our key concern is how we would resource the growth in pupil numbers with the expected rise in population. Also want to protect the nature and culture of the school as well as looking to the future to provide the best service we can to children and families of the village. We have to reserve assets to increase accommodation and government have announced that our funding is not protected going forward. Therefore would need to fund some significant funding for accommodation and staffing as well as costs linked to staff pensions, insurance, subscription costs, resources, furniture and family support services.	When the school roll is growing due to new housing, the Government expectation is that any shortfall in places is funded by a \$106 contribution. In the event that we are unable to justify a contribution at the time of responding, then the Local Authority will still have to ensure that any additional places required are provided at the appropriate time, this is not an issue for the school to wrestle with or fund.	
		With a rising population, a potential 50% increase in numbers, with no or reduced funding; this is a concern, particularly as the school received no additional		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		funding from the recent housing development next door. Policy A23 How would the provision of extra spaces the funded? What support could be accessed for our already congested access - our risk assessment for our car park does not support access to the front at busy times. Also anticipate increase need for family services, school nursing team, Children's centre, welfare services, wrap around school care (separate building) with the 30% affordable housing provision proviso.		
Mr & Mrs Bullimore	Para 7.4	There are no capacity problems at the moment but an evening surgery is needed.	Noted	No change
Ralph Riley	Para 7.5	The Parish Hall is neither managed, programmed nor promoted as a	Asfordby Parish Hall is available for hire for parties, weddings,	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		community asset. There is nothing to tell you when it is being used or by who or if indeed if as a community asset the community can attend. A parish hall just used for exclusive private lets is not a community asset!	sport, club meetings, conferences, etc. at very reasonable rates with special concessions for Asfordby parish residents. The Centre is in regular use by a range of groups and classes including badminton, Tae Kwon Do, Guides & Brownies, dance, fitness, and parent & toddler groups.	
Mr & Mrs Bullimore	Para 7.9	There are not enough parking spaces for the shops at the moment. Built youth club with official leaders.	Noted	No change
Mr & Mrs Bullimore	Para 7.12	Do not believe you can call the sports field on the Hill the Asfordby Hill school's playing field.	Noted.	The last sentence of paragraph 7.12 be amended to read 'Mowbray Rangers Junior Football Club's ground lies just outside the

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
				parish boundary; there are three junior football pitches and two mini pitches.'
Simon Bailey	Para 7.12	Should read 'Mowbray Rangers junior football club; there are three junior football pitches and two mini pitches.'	Noted.	The last sentence of paragraph 7.12 be amended to read 'Mowbray Rangers Junior Football Club's ground lies just outside the parish boundary; there are three junior football pitches and two mini pitches.'
Ralph Riley	Para 7.13	The plan says that Asfordby Captains Close Primary School has a swimming pool, which is available for community	Captain's Close pool is used school swimming and for children aged 3 years upward	The second sentence of paragraph 7.13

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		and sports club use. I don't believe this to be the case. I can see that the pool is used for private swimming lessons, which is a very lucrative business but that is all. As an acknowledged UK expert in swimming pools it would concern me greatly if this pool was used for any form of extended use for it was not designed for this purpose and would pose considerable health risks to users if this were the case. However the plan is wrong to indicate that this is a community asset to Asfordby. This is misleading!	to learn to swim, plus confidence building parent and baby classes for 6 week to 3 year olds.	be amended to read 'Asfordby Captains Close Primary School has a swimming pool which is available for private swimming lessons.'
Mr & Mrs Bullimore	Para 7.18	The Crompton not Compton play area is a disgrace and not a safe area. Could do with a purpose built youth club with official leaders.	Noted	No change
Mrs Carol Whitfield	Policy A23	Main concern is that the village's current infrastructure will be unable to sustain the major growth in housing proposed. The schools are already full and ACC has always been considered to have a larger percentage of	The affordable housing requirement in Melton is normally 40%. To enable the level of housing development set out in the Plan to take place, there will need to be	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		"deprived and special needs families." Social housing will increase these problems and 30% affordable housing provision seems a large percentage. There is no provision for teenagers and no dentist. Doctors and pharmacy only opens in the mornings. Inadequate bus service especially at weekends/evenings. Traffic will be a major issue.	improvements at Asfordby Captains Close Primary School, Asfordby Surgery, the Parish Hall and sports & recreation provision in Asfordby Village as set out in Policy A23.	
GVA on behalf of Jelson Homes	Policy A23	Jelson does not object to development contributing to supporting village infrastructure, nor to the list of potential requirements. There needs to be an acknowledgement within the policy, however, that contributions will be governed by the provisions of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 and in particular regulations 122 and 123. Reference is made to the 'pooling' of contributions which raises particular issues in relation to the restrictions on pooled contributions	Noted	Paragraphs 7.23 and 7.24 be revised to refer to contributions being governed by the provisions of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		contained in Regulation 123(3) which come into force on 6 April 2015.		
Kate Sanderson		Object to the building of houses on Greenfield land especially where it pushes out the village envelope. Comments are made in reference to the housing sites identified in the 'Site Profiles'. Object to Site A4, as it is totally dislocated from the village on the far side of the bypass. Object to Sites AH2 and AH3 on safety grounds. Both of these would require feeding traffic through the Crompton Road junction with the main road. It is already dangerous and congested at rush hour and in close proximity to a primary school and there are safety concerns due to children crossing the road. Also the road is steep and icy.	Noted. Sites A4, AH2 and AH3 have not been allocated for development in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. However, Melton Borough Council have subsequently granted planning permission (15/00201/FUL) for the construction of 15 dwellings on land adjacent to 23 and 24 Glebe Road, Asfordby Hill (Site AH2)	Section 6 (Housing) of the Neighbourhood Plan be revised to reflect Melton Borough Council's decision to grant planning permission (15/00201/FUL) for the construction of 15 dwellings on land adjacent to 23 and 24 Glebe Road, Asfordby Hill.

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		The housing estate could not safely accommodate the additional volume of traffic.		
Mr David Robinson	Para 7.21	The 5/5A bus service is no longer a daily service and no longer runs on Sundays and evenings. Whilst travel packs are a good idea without a good public transport option people will revert to their car.	Noted.	No change
Leicestershire Police	Policy A23	My comments relate to the impact of additional housing on Policing and the need for additional development to help mitigate this. Like most other public services our funds, are not sufficient to meet what additional housing will generate. Without mitigation the Police are obliged to spread over cover unnecessarily thinly. Our priority is to keep people safe.	Outline application for residential development (up to 100 dwellings) and associated infrastructure at Field No 0070, Station Lane has been granted planning permission subject to the completion of a \$106 Agreement. The \$106 Agreement is to include a contribution towards policing infrastructure.	No change
		We look to major housing developers to make contributions and we believe the Local Planning Authorities supports the		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		case for this as does the National Planning Policy Framework. Melton District do not have an up to date plan and so for some time the Neighbourhood Plan when adopted will have special policy significance locally. Ask that you recognise policing in your consideration of essential services and facilities and infrastructure necessary to accompany growth. We understand the issues you identify around viability. Suggest an addition to Policy A23 "E – necessary additions to policing infrastructures that will serve the new development.		
Pegasus Group on behalf of Harworth Estates	Policy A24	Identification of the Asfordby Business Park and Old Dalby Test Track is broadly supported. However the allocation should be extended to enable the delivery of employment benefits associated with the development of the	Historic England have advised: There are heritage assets nearby, including the Grade II* listed Church of St Bartholomew to the north and a scheduled monument, Sysonby Grange to the north east. The field	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		site in accordance with policy objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan. It is important for the Neighbourhood Plan to identify existing important employment sites that need to be safeguarded. This approach will ensure a flexible and responsive supply of employment land within the local area. Asfordby Business Park has the potential to deliver a substantial amount of employment land. 61% of the business park is currently occupied and therefore 19 acres of employment land is available for development within the existing park curtilage. The site is only 1.5km from the edge of Melton Mowbray and close to Asfordby, which is identified as a rural service centre. It is necessary to provide into page where	opposite the Grade II* church is of particular importance to its setting and non-designated remains within it support the significance of the church. Historic England would object to the proposed extension to the employment land allocation shown in blue on the land use plan submitted by Harworth Estates as part of their representation to the Neighbourhood Plan, as this development would result in substantial harm to the significance of the Grade II* Church. The proposed employment allocation in its entirety (as shown within the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan and not including the area shown in blue	Plan
			1	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		broad range of economic development. The business park is a significant Brownfield site with a large power supply and a rail connection. The Roger Tym report, commissioned by Melton Borough Council, notes there is little in the way of constraints that would make development undeliverable. It also states that financially there are no reasons why development would not be viable. This position has not changed. The report considers employment development to be deliverable. An attached land use plan identifies how the site could be developed:	assessment will be required to determine the impact upon the significance of these heritage assets; we would recommend that you are guided by the advice of your Conservation and archaeology specialists. Without more detailed information relating to the detailed design and layout of the allocation it is not possible to comment comprehensively; however, there may be concern if the buildings within the business park were of significant height, bulk and / or scale. The quantum of harm upon nearby heritage assets should not be increased as a result of the development.	
		1,500 sqm of starter units		
		 Modular/Starter Office Park 		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		 39,000 sqm Industrial Units (Class B1 (c) and B2) 23, 255 sqm Distribution/Warehouse units (Class B8) It is crucial that this site is safeguarded for employment development and the boundary of the allocation be amended to accord with the attached land use plan, and include land to the north west of the currently proposed allocation. 		
Network Rail	Policy A24	Welcome the support in the plan for the Old Dalby Test Track. It is an important piece of infrastructure for Network Rail. Keen to ensure its future in the development of railway infrastructure and the health and sustainability of the rail industry. Network Rail has taken over from London underground as the owners and	Noted.	Paragraph 8.5 be amended by replacing 'London Underground' with 'Network Rail'.

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		operators of the track. Will look to utilise the track further in the future to aid with further improvements to rail infrastructure. Suggest par 8.5. replaces London Underground with Network Rail.		
Coal Authority	Policy A25	The Coal Authority supports the recognition in Policy A25: Holwell Works and Holwell Business Park of the need to consider ground stability. It should be noted that The Coal Authority will not support any built development over or within the influencing distance of the 2 mine entries in the business park.	Noted.	The following sentence to be added to the second paragraph of Policy A25: 'Built development should not take place over or within the influencing distance of the two mine entries.'

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Pegasus Group on behalf of Rotherhill (Asfordby) Syndicate	Policy A25	Support this policy however a more flexible range of uses on this site is necessary in order to deliver employment benefits. It is important for the Neighbourhood Plan to identify important existing employment sites that need to be safeguarded. However a flexible approach should be taken where there is no real prospect of continued employment use. This approach will ensure a flexible and responsive supply of employment land. Holwell Works is a significant Brownfield redevelopment opportunity. The site has outline permission for 35,080 sqm of B1(c), B2 and B8 Industrial, and warehouse units. Planning permission to extend the time period for implementation was granted on 15th April 2013.	There have been several proposals for the redevelopment of the southern part of the Holwell Works site, off Welby Road. In 2009, a planning application (09/00356/OUT) was submitted by Rotherhill (Asfordby) Syndicate for the development of 36,152m2 of industrial and warehouse units called Holwell Business Park. Planning permission was granted in 2010 and an extension of time was agreed in April 2013. The redevelopment of this brownfield, contaminated site has been difficult to achieve. The developers have considered ways of making the redevelopment more viable and even looked at the possibility of relocating the sports and recreation provision	Make provision for residential development at Asfordby Business Park.

· · · · ·	olicy/ aragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		The intention is to implement this permission as the offer of freeholds plots in this location will attract businesses to the site. However a more flexible range of uses would be appropriate and would ensure the delivery of a substantial amount of employment land and associated jobs. The site should be partly retained for employment uses but also include housing and improved community facilities. A Masterplan submitted for this site identifies sport pitches, a convenience store, a new scout hut, community facility and indoor shooting range. It also shows suggested alternative uses including: -	at Holwell Sports and Social Club and redeveloping the site for housing. We want the redevelopment of the site for employment uses to go ahead so that it can provide job opportunities for local people. We recognise that new housing development may be required to enable this to happen, but if there is to be a significant amount of new housing development, additional services and facilities are required to enhance the sustainability of Asfordby Hill.	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		 Employment development of approximately 26,500 sqm Business start up units Approximately 100 dwellings 3,000 sq ft retail convenience store New adult football pitch All-weather pitch to provide 4 tennis courts and 5-a-side football pitch New sport and social club/community facility New scout hall Indoor shooting range Would welcome further discussions with the Neighbourhood Plan Group, Melton Borough Council, and the local community to refine proposals. 		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		The allocation of this site should be amended in accordance with the attached Illustrative Masterplan and include the range of uses as set out in the Draft Masterplan.		
Environment Agency	Policy A26	It is confusing what the use of the Asfordby Storage & Haulage site is to be. Policy A15 states residential and at Policy A26 it is Live / work units. Is the intention for a mixed use site?	It is intended that a small number of live/work units are included within the redevelopment.	Policy A15 be revised to include an additional criterion: 'the development incorporates a small number of live/work units in accordance with Policy A26'
Ralph Riley	Policy A27	I realise it is too late now, but to say that a development of 59 lodges (60 potential additional vehicles and 240 additional residents), be it on a variable tenement basis is "small scale" and not a considerable development in comparison to a village of 3000	Policy A27 criteria A requires new development to be small-scale and of a design that is compatible with its landscape setting. It does not apply to development already permitted and implemented. Indeed the	Paragraphs 8.16 be amended delete the last sentence and instead refer to the addition of Public

Representor Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
	residents is wrong. This is not small scale the statement is ludicrous and wrong. But even this would be palatable provided that the access to Asfordby residents around the lakes which has been used for well over 20 years is reinstated. But there is neither sign of this nor any support shown to reinstatement in the plan. If this plan is to mean anything at all then it has to provide a meaningful chance for all residents to have their say on future development within the parish and influence how their neighbourhood evolves. Residents of Asfordby and users of the lakes have already objected to the action to prevent access around the lake. The County Council has considered the matter and the objectors case upheld, the landowners have appealed and now the matter rests with the Minister of State. In this situation it would have been good to see the plan reflect both these	policy aims to prevent the construction any additional lodges above those already permitted. Local residents have had several opportunities to comment on the Neighbourhood Plan as outlined in the Plan's introduction. An application for the addition of a footpath to the Definitive Map of Public Rights of way between Frisby on the Wreake and Asfordby was made in 2011. In August 2013, Leicestershire County Council agreed that the evidence appears to show that the route meets the criteria in Section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 for a public footpath.	Footpaths H108 and H108a, Frisby Lakes Modification Order 2013. An additional criteria be added to Policy A27 to ensure the protection of Rights of Way at Frisby Lakes.

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		actions and indeed to lend what support it can to the residents case. The compensatory action provided in the plan in A14 by the provision of new space as part of the residential development at Station Lane is inadequate in both substance and nature. And by the way is not even shown, so how can it be judged. However, it cannot possibly compensate for a delightfully, scenic, health promoting walk around a lake that used to be used for sailing and other forms of active recreation. In this world of increasing obesity and heart disease we need more and more opportunities for active recreation. The loss of access to the lakes acts against the stated intent and policy of both national and local government. Finally, I note that the policy states the development shall not introduce services or facilities. Strange when there	The Addition of Public Footpaths H108 and H108a, Frisby Lakes Frisby on the Wreake in the Parish of Asfordby in the Borough of Melton Definitive Map Modification Order 2013 was the subject of a public local inquiry in September 2015. The outcome of the inquiry is not yet known, but notwithstanding it is appropriate to make reference to the application in the text and the policy be amended to ensure that Rights of Way are protected.	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		is already a café promoted on the site last summer.		
Environment Agency	Policy A27	This Policy is confusing as development at Frisby Water Park has already been granted and development will proceed in accordance with submitted plans. Point G restricts any development that requires a water supply or sewerage infrastructure, thus restricting toilets, cafe or visitor centre etc. proposals is this the intention?	The policy sets out the position with respect to development beyond that already permitted and implemented.	Policy A27 criterion G be deleted.

Appendix 4: Pre-submission Draft Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan (2nd Version) Respondents

Brown

Cawthorne

Coal Authority

Eades and Rose

East Leicestershire and Rutland CCG

Environment Agency

GVA on behalf of Jelson Homes

Hudson

Latham House Medical Practice

Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust

Leicestershire County Council

Marriott

Melton Borough Council

Natural England

Patel

Pegasus on behalf of Rotherhill Developments

Stirling

Summerland

Wakefield

Appendix 5: Pre-submission Draft Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan (2nd Version) Representations

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Natural England	General	The changes to the pre-submission draft do not materially affect the advice provided in our response to your consultation on the first draft of the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Consultation back in February/March 2015 which is attached for ease of reference.	Noted. Natural England's previous representations are also considered below.	No change
Environment Agency	General	Thank you for consulting us on the amendments to the Asfordby Parish NHP. We have no comments to make in respect of the amendments as they lie outside of the remit of this Agency. We are pleased to see that some amendments have also been made to the plan in line with the comments we made to yourselves in February 2015.	Noted	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Natural England	General	Where Neighbourhood Plans could have significant environmental effects, they may require a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) under the Environment Assessment of Plans and Programs Regulations 2004. Further guidance on deciding whether the proposals are likely to have significant environmental effects and the requirements for consulting Natural England on SEA are set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance	A SEA Screening Statement has been prepared in relation to the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan.	No change

Melton	Paragraph	This states that "a large amount of New	The New Homes Bonus (NHB) was	No change
Borough	2.25	Homes Bonus as a result of growth in	introduced by the Coalition	
Council		Asfordby parish and it's only fair that our	Government with the aim of	
		villages enjoy the benefits". We would	encouraging local authorities to	
		suggest this be deleted or altered, as in	grant planning permissions for the	
		reality this is not how the New Homes	building of new houses in return for	
		Bonus works. It is not like CIL, wherein a	additional revenue. In the 'New	
		certain proportion is guaranteed to be	Homes Bonus: final scheme design'	
		spent in the Parish where the New Homes	the Government states 'The	
		are built. The New Homes Bonus is an	Government expects local	
		important revenue stream the council	councillors to work closely with	
		uses to help the provision of Council	their communities – and in	
		Services to new residents and more	particular the neighbourhoods	
		generally used to provide essential	most affected by housing growth –	
		services across the Borough. In high	to understand their priorities for	
		growth areas such as Asfordby, this	investment and to communicate	
		money is essential in ensuring services	how the money will be spent and	
		can be provided to new residents without	the benefits it will bring.' It also	
		diminishing services to existing residents.	states 'We want the economic	
		The government even goes as far as to	benefits of housing growth to be	
		state that "Councils can decide how to	more visible to the local	
		spend the New Homes Bonus." Moreover	community'. A very large amount	
		the whole system of the New Homes	of New Homes Bonus has been	
		Bonus is currently in a state of upheaval	received by Melton Borough	
		and as such it is difficult to include in a	Council as a result of development	
		plan to 2036.	in Asfordby parish but the Borough	
			Council has not made it clear how	
			the community has benefitted.	
			,	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Natural England	Green Spaces	Natural England generally welcomes the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan and considers that it provides a useful framework for the future of the community. We consider that our interest in the natural environment is well covered within the Plan and we particularly support the sections on Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity.	Noted	No change
Natural England	Green Spaces	Natural England, together with the Environment Agency, English Heritage and Forestry Commission has published joint advice on neighbourhood planning which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans. Local environmental record centres hold a range of information on the natural environment.	Our plan has taken into account the Melton Borough Biodiversity and Geodiversity Study.	No change
The Coal Authority	A2	It is noted that Policy A2: Countryside no longer refers to mineral extraction and waste as we requested. We welcome this change as it removes any possibility of	Noted	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		the Plan failing to meet the basic conditions.		
Melton Borough Council	A2	Whilst we have no problem of the initial wording of the paragraph, the extensive list that follows is potentially too large and includes uses not appropriate for use in the Countryside, for example Community Services and Facilities.	The list of uses that are potentially acceptable in the countryside is qualified in the policy. All development in the countryside 'requires a rural location' and 'should be of a scale and environmental impact that is compatible with the character of its rural location and respects landscape character'.	No change
Melton Borough Council	A5	We would suggest using alternate terminology. Local Green Spaces has very specific NPPF connotation and our own evidence produced for the Local Plan has stated specifically and with explanation that none of the open green spaces in Asfordby Parish can be designated as this with the NPPF definition. It is the Councils view however that Neighbourhood Plans in the Borough can introduce their own terminology for	Local Green Space designation is for use in Local Plans or Neighbourhood Plans. Local Green Spaces may be designated where those spaces are demonstrably special to the local community. There has been no community input into the Borough Council's evidence report "Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		the protection of Open Spaces using a different title, so long as this is evidenced to explain the importance to the community in terms of use, functionality and access and how the open space contributes to the character of the area. We would direct you to our evidence report "Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study" and its Annexe for more information. Should the Neighbourhood Plan choose to continue to use the term Open Green Space, this needs to be evidenced as to how it meets the NPPF criteria.	Study" and therefore it is fundamentally flawed. The proposed Local Green Spaces in the Draft Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan have been individually assessed and meet the criteria set out in paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Once the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan has been made, Melton Borough Council should take the designated Local Green Spaces into account when preparing the Local Plan and avoid duplicating them.	
Natural England	A7	You should consider whether your plan has any impacts on legally protected species.	A SEA Screening Statement has been prepared in relation to the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan. Our plan has also taken into account the Melton Borough Biodiversity and Geodiversity Study.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Natural England	A7	Neighbourhood plans may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature. Opportunities to incorporate features into new build or retro fitted buildings which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes should also be considered as part of any new development proposal.	Neighbourhood Plan Policies A12, A16 and A27 provide for improvements in biodiversity.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Melton Borough Council	A8	Whilst this policy in essence can be supported, it needs to be clearly backed up with the relevant evidence to support their conservation and enhancement. This is particularly relevant for heritage assets not listed and thus given this protection through the listing process.	Almost all of the buildings and structures of local heritage importance identified in Policy A8 are drawn from Melton Borough Council's Conservation Area Management Plan or Appraisal. The principal exception is Asfordby Gun Range. In July 1918 the Midland Railway were asked to modify the "North Sidings" near Asfordby to accommodate a Government Gun Proof Range as requested by the Ministry of Munitions. The range was built adjacent to these sidings and became known as Asfordby Gun Range, servicing heavycalibre guns. Used up until the 1960's to test naval shells, the noise became a major source of annoyance to Asfordby residents and some even claimed cracks were appearing in their houses from the vibrations. It is possible it	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			fell into disuse for a while, because in 1965, local residents protested at plans by the MOD to reopen it, and a noise muffling tunnel was installed in 1968. When it did close in March 1971, some 70 employees were made redundant. The last gun was fired at Asfordby Gun Range in October 1971 in a short ceremony to mark its closure. Whilst not listed by the Secretary of State, we feel the Gun Range is an important part of Asfordby's heritage due primarily to its historic significance.	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Melton Borough Council	A9	Whilst the inclusion of pictures in the Appendix is useful in setting some context, without appropriate wording this policy doesn't actually set any clear design principles. We suggest development of this policy/appendix to more clearly demonstrate the positive design features you wish for and how this policy can then be used by Development Management.	In 2013 Design Council CABE helped us set out basic design principles that should be followed by all new development. The full document is too lengthy to be incorporated into the Neighbourhood Plan but an extract of that work is set out at Appendix 1.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Melton Borough Council	A10	Whilst we appreciate the Neighbourhood Plan Group has worked to fulfil its duty to work in conformity with the MLP Draft, it is worth making a note that the figures given to the Parish are currently in draft and subject to consultation and examination may change. Furthermore, like the MLP, a trigger for review may be necessary to ease examination and to future-proof the Neighbourhood Plan. We are still awaiting the result of our updated OAN through the Leicestershire wide HEDNA (Housing Economic Development Needs Assessment). The results of this may affect our OAN which may increase the demand for housing land in the Borough. Moreover, through this work we may arrive at a situation wherein our OAN doesn't change, but it does in Leicester City, which could lead to them having a shortfall in Housing Land to meet their updated requirement. This could mean that other districts in the Housing Market Area (HMA), including potentially Melton,	The Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan will not be tested against the policies in the emerging Local Plan although the reasoning and evidence informing the Local Plan process may be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which a neighbourhood plan is tested. We have used the evidence available to Melton Borough Council so that every effort is made to meet identified local need through the neighbourhood planning process. Nevertheless, as set out in paragraphs 1.9, 6.3 & 6.4 and 9.3 it is recognised that we may need to review our Neighbourhood Plan to ensure that it conforms to the new proposals and requirements once the Melton Local Plan is adopted.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		having an increased Housing Requirement to make up this shortfall. An example of this can be seen in Derbyshire wherein Derby City couldn't meet its housing requirements and as such other districts in its HMA (Amber Valley and South Derbyshire) had to take the resulting overspill. Should these scenarios come to fruition, we in our Local Plan Review may need to allocate additional land in the Parish if the option of review is not included in the Neighbourhood Plan. We obviously hope this is ultimately not necessary but it is important that the group is aware and prepared for such possibilities and the option of internal review would mean the people of Asfordby remain in a position to make the decisions.		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Melton Borough Council	A10	There is a slight misprint in this policy in that it refers to a Period up to 2031. Moreover from the inset maps it is noted that the Village Envelope does not go around the suggested Housing Allocations. Since these allocations would become part of the village when developed, it makes sense that the envelope reflects this and includes them within the village envelope.	The reference to '2031' in Policy A10 should be amended as the plan period is to '2036' as set out in paragraph 2.1. The Parish Council is concerned that the inclusion of the whole of an allocated site within Limits to Development might give the impression that the full site is acceptable for development. For example, the indicative layout for the Jelson site shows large areas of open space within the site boundary. If the full site were included within the Limits to Development, it might encourage the development of the proposed open spaces. It is not possible to identify these open spaces as Local Green Spaces as they do not fulfil the criteria and, because the layout is indicative only, their position might change anyway. As a consequence, we propose to	Policy A10 be amended by replacing '2031' with '2036'. Policy A2 be amended by including another category 'land allocated for development in this Neighbourhood Plan by Policies A11, A12, A15, A16, A25, A26 and A27.

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			amend the Limits to Development once the development is complete. Nevertheless, we do recognise that there is currently a conflict with Policy A2.	
Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Jelson Ltd	A10	The Draft Plan recognises that the housing need identified for the villages must be in conformity with the need identified by the strategic policies in the development plan. As the housing policies in the 1999 Melton Plan are out-of-date, the Draft Plan considers the housing need figures that are presented in the Emerging Option Melton Local Plan instead. We support the approach of using the Emerging Local Plan figures which suggest that Asfordby requires 300 dwellings and Asfordby Hill requires 50 dwellings. These are the most robust figures available at present and are the figures most likely to stand up to scrutiny when the Neighbourhood Plan is independently examined.	Noted	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Jelson Ltd	A10	Policy A10 (Housing Provision) seeks the delivery of at least 148 dwellings over the period until 2031 to be allocated on the sites identified in the Plan. The figure of 148 has been derived by deducting those sites already committed since 2011 from the 350 minimum target, i.e. 350 minus: • 80 at Jelson's Hawthorns scheme; • 100 at Jelson's Station Lane scheme; • 15 at Glebe Road, Asfordby Hill; and • 7 other dwellings. We generally support the figure used, although we have concerns about the delivery of all 148 dwellings having regard to the proposed allocations (see detailed comments below). We support the policy wording which confirms that the figure is a minimum target ("at least") as this is what is required by the strategic policies in the development plan.	Noted	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Jelson Ltd	Paragraphs 6.10 to 6.12	The Draft Plan provides a development strategy for the three individual settlements of Asfordby, Asfordby Hill and Asfordby Valley for the period until 2031. Asfordby is one of the most sustainable settlements within the Borough of Melton. It has an excellent range of facilities / services including a primary school, GPs, public houses and a frequent bus service. Asfordby Hill has some services and facilities, but is not a sustainable location for large-scale development. Asfordby Valley has no facilities other than a children's play area and it is generally an unsustainable location for new housing.	Noted	No change
Melton Borough Council	Paragraph 6.11	It is our opinion that this paragraph contradicts the allocation of up to 100 homes in Asfordby Valley. We appreciate that the proposed allocation comes with additional facilities, but it should be highlighted more clearly in the wording or deleted.	This paragraph is not contradictory as the last sentence makes clear that unless there is some improvement in services and facilities, Asfordby Hill is not a sustainable location for large-scale housing development.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Melton Borough Council	A11	It would be helpful if this Policy was to list the size and residential capacity of each of these sites within the Policy. Moreover, we feel the allocation of housing at Holwell should be better explained and certainly warrants being included as a housing allocation. At present it is easy to miss for those only looking at the housing section. Finally, the policy and subsequent wording is light on explanation of the expected delivery of these sites. Certainly sites such as Whitlock garages needs better investigation and explanation, in particular reference to deliverability, expected timescales and signs that the landowner has an interest in the site being developed.	It is accepted that more clarity can be given by indicating the number of dwellings proposed for each site. Holwell Business Park is a mixed use development, but will be mainly for employment uses. We have accepted that some housing provision will be needed to enable the redevelopment of the site for business uses to go ahead. As a consequence, it is appropriate for the relevant policy to be located in the 'Jobs' section of the plan. Notwithstanding the housing provision is referred to in Policy A11. We have evidence to suggest that all of our allocated housing sites (with the exception of the Asfordby Storage and Haulage Depot) are suitable, available and achievable. We are surprised, by the comments regarding the Whitlock Garage site as the	Policy A11 be amended so that A-D refer to the potential development capacity for each site.

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			Borough Council is principal landowner and has expressed the view that it is keen for the site to be developed.	
Leicestershire County Council	A12	In order for the CHA to be able to condition speed reducing measures outside the school, the reasons would need to be evidence based e.g. by speed survey results. o Access would not be permitted off the A6006 in line with policy IN5 of the 6Cs Design Guide.	Criterion B of Policy A12 states that vehicular access to the site is to be from Saxelby Road. Criterion C requires measures to be in place to reduce the speed of traffic using Saxelby Road in response to concerns from local residents and the primary school.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Jelson Ltd	A12	Policy A12 (Land Between Regency Road, Asfordby and the Bypass) proposes to allocate land (identified on the Policies Map) for around 55 dwellings. We acknowledge that the site is well related to the primary school and that the development of this land has received some support from local people. However, we have reservations about whether the site can deliver the amount of development suggested. The site is physically constrained by the bypass which will have impacts in respect of noise / disturbance that need to be mitigated, i.e. by including an appropriate separation distance. Appropriate distances will also need to be left between existing dwellings to ensure that the amenity of existing and new residents is not compromised. We would suggest that the figure might be an optimistic estimate of what is deliverable on site and would recommend that some preliminary	The proposal is supported by an indicative layout, access design and noise assessment which has been prepared on behalf of the landowner. The layout suggest that the site is capable of being developed for the number of dwellings proposed. The landowner has expressed an intention to sell the site for development. There is a reasonable prospect that the housing site will be developed within the plan period and a planning application is imminent.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		technical investigations (into access, noise, ecology, trees, drainage etc.) are undertaken and an indicative masterplan prepared to test the feasibility of a scheme. It is not clear from the Draft Plan who owns the site and what interest there has been in developing it. It would be useful to understand whether the land is in single or multiple ownerships, whether access can be achieved and whether a house builder has expressed an interest in acquiring the land. In the absence of such information, there must be considerable doubt as to if and when the site will be delivered.		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Leicestershire County Council	A13	The site does not appear to have been considered as an allocation by Melton Borough Council. The CHA would have concerns with removal of existing off street parking facilities if they were removed and not replaced or would increase on-street parking elsewhere. Any reduction in replacement parking spaces compared to the number of existing spaces/garages would need to be justified and provided in accordance with the 6C's Design Guide. o While 1 access point is sufficient for a development of this size, the existing access off Whitlock Way appears to be narrow, and is unlikely to comply with the requirements within the 6C's Design Guide. This would mean the new road serving the development would not be adopted in the future. It is more likely a design compliant access road could be created off Charnwood Avenue.	A neighbourhood plan can allocate sites for development. Where a neighbourhood plan has been made, the local planning authority should take it into account when preparing the Local Plan strategy and policies, and avoid duplicating the policies that are in the neighbourhood plan. Most of the garages are used for storage, but nevertheless criterion D of Policy A13 requires any impact arising from the loss of garages shall be mitigated by the provision of new off-street car parking.	Criterion B of Policy A13 be amended to read 'a single vehicular access to the site to be from either Whitlock Way or Charnwood Avenue'.

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Leicestershire County Council	A14	The site does not appear to have been considered as an allocation by Melton Borough Council. o Note any future application for the site which the CHA is asked to comment on would have to be assessed on its own merits. It would not be possible for the CHA to advise refusal to the LPA on the grounds that the site is preferred for housing.	A neighbourhood plan can allocate sites for development. Where a neighbourhood plan has been made, the local planning authority should take it into account when preparing the Local Plan strategy and policies, and avoid duplicating the policies that are in the neighbourhood plan.	No change
Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Jelson Ltd	A14	Policy A14 (Asfordby Storage and Haulage Depot, Main Street, Asfordby) proposes to allocate this depot site for 67 dwellings. We note that the Parish has prepared a development brief for the site, but that the owner has not been willing to participate in the process. In the absence of confirmation from the owner that the site is available for development, the Draft Plan cannot rely on the development of this site in order to meet housing needs.	The Draft Neighbourhood Plan does not rely on the development of the Asfordby Storage and Haulage Depot to meet housing needs	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Melton Borough Council	A14	Whilst we appreciate the difficulties with this site and the desire of the community to see it positively redeveloped, it does need to be better stated that this is a longer term option, potentially not until the end of the Plan period. Furthermore, we appreciate that because of the difficulties suggested this site has not been put towards the housing numbers.	The owner has not been willing to participate in the preparation of the brief nor the Neighbourhood Plan so we cannot be sure that there is a realistic prospect of housing development. This does not mean that it could not come forward in the short-term.	No change
S Eades & D Rose	A15	The proposal as exhibited on 2 March we have no objections to. The mix of housing and layout shown seemed reasonable. We support the covenant to protect the green space as highlighted at the exhibition and see this as an important part of accepting the proposal.	Noted	No change
Mrs S Hudson	A15	It would be lovely to see the back of the old park and the scruffy woodland nearby removed for new, nice, bright houses.	Noted	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Mr & Mrs Brown	A15	Having houses where the park is, or the woodland at the back of, would be more pleasurable and useful for the community than looking at the overgrown land that lies there now. It would have easy access for traffic and safer than half-way up Asfordby Hill, it would be better for children, it would be safer for them to play. It would also take the impact of water from Asfordby Valley as there are a lot of natural soakaways there.	Noted	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Melton Borough Council	A15	Certainly in the text and the policy there seems to be a number of question marks regarding the access. Statements such as "access to the site is not ideal" immediately brings questions with it questions of the sites inherent deliverability. More work on the access then an update to this policy would certainly ease examination of the Plan.	The access arrangements have been the subject of considerable discussion between the Parish Council, landowner and the Highway Authority. On 2 June 2015 the Highway Authority advised 'Whilst the site is far from being ideal for the reasons given above, it may be that the Local Highway Authority would not be able to demonstrate severe harm, providing the issues of the bus stop relocation, pedestrian crossing and access location can be overcome'.	No change
Stuart Sterling	A15	Due to the 100+ houses being built on the Welby Road site is there any real requirement to build behind Crompton Road causing certain unnecessary disruptions and the introduction of a new hazard. Access to the proposed site onto Melton Road, adjacent to the school crossing would create a very real hazard	The access arrangements have been the subject of considerable discussion between the Parish Council, landowner and the Highway Authority. On 2 June 2015 the Highway Authority advised 'Whilst the site is far from being ideal for the reasons given above,	No change

Po	olicy/ aragraph tc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		for the primary school children trying to cross an already busy main road. The reason for developing the site is to tidy-up the site. Having spoken to other affected residents we are happy to clear and tidy the wooded area. Therefore, providing a safe and stimulating play area for children. At present Asfordby Hill is virtually crime free. With the introduction of housing association residents, the likelihood of 'problem families' being sent to the area is greatly increased.	it may be that the Local Highway Authority would not be able to demonstrate severe harm, providing the issues of the bus stop relocation, pedestrian crossing and access location can be overcome'. Although the offer to tidy-up the site from local residents is very welcome, the condition of the site is largely outside the control of local people as it is owned by the Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance. The site will comprise of mainly market housing- predominantly 2 and 3 bed dwellings with a couple of 4 bed units.	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Miss R Patel	A15	No- has flooding been considered, if built Asfordby Valley will be vulnerable to flooding again. The Valley and the Hill should be kept separate as it always has been. Access is terrible where this is going to be.	We have consulted the Environment Agency on the Neighbourhood Plan. The Agency provides advice on improving resilience and adaptation to the effects of climate change, with particular regard on flood risk, water resources, water quality (Including groundwater) and aquatic biodiversity. The Agency has advised that the site is situated within Flood Zone 1 and are therefore an appropriate location for residential development in respect of flood risk grounds. The access arrangements have been the subject of considerable discussion between the Parish Council, landowner and the Highway Authority. On 2 June 2015 the Highway Authority advised 'Whilst the site is far from being ideal for the reasons given above, it may be that the Local Highway	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			Authority would not be able to demonstrate severe harm, providing the issues of the bus stop relocation, pedestrian crossing and access location can be overcome'.	
			The settlement of Asfordby Hill is distinctly separate from Asfordby Valley and is surrounded by open countryside. Policy A1 aims to protect this important Area of Separation but the Crompton Road site does not lie in it.	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Leicestershire County Council	A15	The CHA may have concerns with an access off Melton Road. The access would be close to an existing pedestrian crossing, require relocation of a bus stop and also be relatively close to the Crompton Road junction, which could affect visibility splays at both junctions with Melton Road. These issues would need to be resolved. If an access in accordance with the 6Cs Design Guide could be achieved off Crompton Road, this would be preferable to the CHA.	The access arrangements have been the subject of considerable discussion between the Parish Council, landowner and the Highway Authority. On 2 June 2015 the Highway Authority advised 'Whilst the site is far from being ideal for the reasons given above, it may be that the Local Highway Authority would not be able to demonstrate severe harm, providing the issues of the bus stop relocation, pedestrian crossing and access location can be overcome'.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Miss Lorraine J Marriott	A15	I have concerns with the proposed plan for 14 houses to be built on the land, especially with the further plan for 100 homes on the other side of the road on the Holwell Works site. As stated in the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan "Access to this site is not ideal". My main concern is that this will be directly opposite the primary school that is at the top of a hill and during certain times of the day this is a very busy road. I question if this really a safe place for further traffic to join the road from a new housing development? I can appreciate that further houses are needed, however, I feel that the Crompton Road Play Area could be developed in a different way to keep an environmentally responsible and natural area on Asfordby Hill for all residents to enjoy. In the past this area was allotment gardens. These have been overgrown for many years (I have lived in my home for	The access arrangements have been the subject of considerable discussion between the Parish Council, landowner and the Highway Authority. On 2 June 2015 the Highway Authority advised 'Whilst the site is far from being ideal for the reasons given above, it may be that the Local Highway Authority would not be able to demonstrate severe harm, providing the issues of the bus stop relocation, pedestrian crossing and access location can be overcome'. The condition of the site is largely outside the control of the Parish Council as it is owned by the Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance. The Parish Council consider that the redevelopment of the site provides an opportunity to tidy-up the area and improve local play facilities.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		around 15 years and have seen the trees grow and nature levels increase in this time). This has resulted in a wild natural habitat for wildlife, trees and foliage. If this was developed, home to birds, insects and animals such as squirrels, foxes, bats, mice, shrews and hedgehogs will be lost forever. Would the site not be better positioned to enlarge and better equip the play area and create either some allotments again, a natural picnic area or nature trail perhaps? A large part of this could be left in its current natural state to keep nature and wildlife on Asfordby Hill. I believe that this would be a much more valuable use of the space than the small number of houses that could be fitted onto a non-ideal site.		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Jelson Ltd	A16	Policy A16 (Land West of Station Lane, Asfordby) defines the site as a housing commitment for up to 100 dwellings. The site is owned by Jelson. The supporting text correctly notes that the Council has resolved to grant planning permission subject to completing a Section 106 Agreement. We are expecting the legal agreement to be finalised and the Decision Notice issued imminently. The reserved matters application will be prepared shortly afterwards. The policy is generally supported, with the exception of three points. Bullet A requires that around 12% of the new homes should be bungalows. Whilst Jelson is prepared to consider providing bungalows within the scheme the exact number and location of properties has not yet been determined. This will need to be subject to further discussions with the Parish Council and the District Councils' Housing Officers and will need to take into account evidence of local	The requirement for 12% of dwellings to be bungalows is not arbitrary. The Station Lane site and the site between Regency Road and the bypass will together provide some 155 new homes and account for most of the planned development in the village. At a rate of 8%, they should provide for 12 bungalows in total. However, the site between Regency Road and the bypass is unsuitable for bungalows because of the restricted depth of the site. Furthermore, given the proximity of the primary school our Plan envisages the site being developed mainly for family housing. The Station Lane site is larger and less restricted and is better placed to accommodate the 12 bungalows that are needed. The bungalows can also be used as a	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		need, market demand and viability. The 12% requirement seems somewhat arbitrary and is overly prescriptive at this stage. It is also not in conformity with the Emerging Local Plan which does not provide specific requirements for bungalows. We request that the 12% figure is removed and replaced by a requirement for a "proportion of the dwellings to be bungalows in accordance with evidence of local need, market demand and viability". Any requirement to consider bungalows should apply equally to all other proposed allocations. Bullet E advises that the land to the south of the development should be laid out and made available for informal recreation. This land is within Jelson's ownership, but outside of the application site boundary. It is unlikely to be developed given its location in a flood zone, a location that also makes the land generally unsuitable for laying out for formal recreational use. There may be an	means of limiting the impact of the new development on the amenities of existing residents on Klondyke Way. Criteria E of Policy A14 relates to the land south of the site. Although the land to the west of the site has been identified by Jelson as open space its value is diminished because of the overhead high-voltage power lines. This is due to health concerns- real or perceived, limitations on recreation activities and visual impact. The land south of the site, on the other hand, is of limited development value due to flood risk, but informal recreation use will be consistent with Green Infrastructure Strategies. The site is controlled by Jelson.	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		opportunity to facilitate access via informal paths; however, no detailed discussions have yet been had with the Parish Council in this regard. Bullet E should therefore be amended to read "The potential to provide informal access to the land south of the development, bounded by Station Land and the River Wreake, shall be investigated between the developer and the Parish Council." Finally we note at paragraph 7.21 of the Draft Plan that the preference is for new development to contribute to the enhancement and improvement of existing play areas, rather than providing new ones. We agree with this strategy as it improves overall quality but minimises ongoing maintenance costs for public authorities. The Station Road site is located immediately adjacent to the established Glendon Close play area and it is considered that improvements to that facility are preferable to the provision of a new LAP on site. Policy A16 should make reference to this approach.		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
James Wakefield	A16	The lower half of this site below where the initial access is flood plain land. When Jelson starts building they will remove topsoil from the upper side of the site and spread it on the lower land. This will raise the ground level, which in turn means that when the river floods (as it has done recently) the water instead of qualling itself out either side of the river it will be pushed higher on the opposite side, this in turn will affect the commercial buildings on the other side, and worst case scenario will cause flooding on the railway line and further down even in Rearsby.	On 16 July 2015, Melton Borough Council decided to grant outline planning permission (subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement) to Jelson for residential development (up to 100 dwellings) and associated infrastructure at Station Lane, Asfordby. There has not been a fully worked up designed Sustainable Urban Drainage (SuDs) scheme submitted for approval although within in the supported documentation the developers have indicated that there will be SuDs incorporated within the layout to manage the surface water. This is likely to be in the form of swales and retention basins (ponds). Following the introduction of the Surface Water Management Act 2010 developments of this size are required to manage surface water	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			"on top" as opposed to using an underground piped system, so as not to cause flood risk on the site or elsewhere. A two stage treatment approach would be required to ensure no contamination from the roads and parking areas is discharged into any water courses. As this site is a greenfield site the surface water run off rate can be no greater than it currently is and the SuDs system will have to be designed to accommodate all of the surface water from the development.	
Melton Borough Council	A16	Policy dependant on result of current application ref 14/00980/OUT. Notwithstanding this, there are further comments on this Policy. A) points to 12% of the homes needing to be bungalows, a statement contradicted on the next page at 6.27 where a requirement of 8% is listed. There is a caveat to this at 6.28 which states that these figures may need	The Station Lane site and the site between Regency Road and the bypass will together provide some 155 new homes and account for most of the planned development in the village. At a rate of 8%, they should provide for 12 bungalows in total. However, the site between	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		to be adjusted, but there is no commentary as to the evidence of the need to uplift this figure to 12% mentioned at A16. E) comments on the land south of the development area, however this is beyond the remit of the developer as it is land not included in the proposal. Whilst this may be a community aim, it cannot be included in this policy as a requirement for this development.	Regency Road and the bypass is unsuitable for bungalows because of the restricted depth of the site. Furthermore, given the proximity of the primary school our Plan envisages the site being developed mainly for family housing. The Station Lane site is larger and less restricted and is better placed to accommodate the 12 bungalows that are needed. The bungalows can also be used as a means of limiting the impact of the new development on the amenities of existing residents on Klondyke Way.	
			Criteria E of Policy A14 relates to the land south of the site. Although the land to the west of the site has been identified by Jelson as open space its value is diminished because of the overhead high- voltage power lines. This is due to	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			health concerns- real or perceived, limitations on recreation activities and visual impact. The land south of the site, on the other hand, is of limited development value due to flood risk, but informal recreation use will be consistent with Green Infrastructure Strategies. The site is controlled by Jelson.	
Leicestershire County Council	A16	Part C: We would support sustainable measures where necessary for development.	Noted	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Miss R Patel	A16	Fine as long as it looks like local architecture not just a normal new build site.	Asfordby parish has been subjected to standard, 'identikit' homes that typify new developments built by some volume house builders. Some of our housing looks exactly the same as developments elsewhere and could be anywhere in the country. Too often new developments are dominated by the same, identikit designs that bear no resemblance to local character. We now expect all development to contribute positively to the creation of well-designed buildings and spaces in accordance with Neighbourhood Plan Policy A9.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Melton Borough Council	Paragraph 6.32	This makes reference to an Affordable Housing Study completed in 2008. This is far too dated to rely on for your evidence. In the 6 years since 2008 there have been a number of factors that make this data inappropriate for use, for example the recession and subsequent recovery, change of government with subsequent changes in policy, including the change of the planning system through the NPPF and NPPG. Moreover, the maths in the Paragraph above (6.31) does not align with the 30% suggested in 6.32. The 138 required against the target of 350 equals 39%. This is higher than the most recent SHMA (2014) and our draft plan which both indicate 37%, the current Local Plan (1999) indicates 40%. Even though there is a shortfall, you should still be seeking 37% unless more up to date evidence can show otherwise. Moreover, care should be taken as to what effect the current Planning and Housing Bill will have on this, with issues such as Starter	The 1999 Melton Local Plan policy H7 makes provision for the development of affordable dwellings on housing sites but does not set a target. The Council's proposed target is from Table 47 of the 2014 Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Market Housing Assessment (SHMA) which indicates that, as a percentage of the overall demographic-led housing need, the requirement is 37% for Melton (the percentage ranges by local authority from 22% in Charnwood to 104% in Blaby). The report emphasises that this only informs affordable housing policy decisions and that any requirement will be decided by local affordable housing policy or on a development by development basis. Further, the 37% requirement has not been subject to viability assessment.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		Homes likely to have an impact on the delivery of more conventional affordable housing.	While Melton Borough Council's Affordable Housing Viability Study is a little dated, it is still on the Council's website under its Local Plan evidence base. The Study concluded: 'By way of policy review, it is important to state that the Preferred Option for the Core Strategy requires developments of 6 dwellings or more to make a 40% on-site contribution However, we feel that a 40% target applied to many of the urban sites, and particularly those in lower value areas, will be too high. Therefore, in Melton and Asfordby, we feel that the target should be set around 30%, reflecting the difference in sub market situations.'	
			The maths does align. On 16 July 2015, Melton Borough Council decided to grant outline planning permission (subject to the completion of a Section 106	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
			Agreement) to Jelson for residential development (up to 100 dwellings) and associated infrastructure at Station Lane, Asfordby. A condition of permission was the provision of 40% affordable housing. Changes to national planning policy including amendments to the national definition of affordable housing are recognised in paragraph 9.2 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.	
Melton Borough Council	Paragraph 6.34	The wording could use a slight adjustment in the first sentence. Certainly the word "provision" suggests more of an allocation type approach and if it could be deleted or altered it would better serve the sentiment and rationale as per the rest of the paragraph.	Agreed.	The first sentence of paragraph 6.34 be amended to read: 'Our Plan will therefore allow planning permission to be granted for Affordable housing on 'Rural Exception

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
				Sites', i.e. sites within or adjoining Asfordby Hill or Asfordby Valley that would not normally be released for private market housing (Asfordby Village is too big to be considered as a rural community).'
Melton Borough Council	Policy A18	This policy may be affected by an awaited court case decision which will give an indication of what the threshold of affordable housing should be, this may well mean the threshold will rule out most windfall sites likely to come forward in the Parish.	On 11 May 2016, the Court of Appeal in London today backed government plans to exempt small development sites from the need to have affordable housing included on them.	the second sentence of Policy A18 be amended to read: 'On windfall housing developments of more than

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
				ten dwellings the minimum Affordable housing provision is 30%.'

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Jelson Ltd		Having regard to the policies in the Draft Plan and to our analysis above we conclude that there is significant doubt as to whether the sites identified in Neighbourhood Plan will deliver the minimum residual requirement for 148 dwellings. We acknowledge that some additional dwellings may come forward as 'windfalls'. However, the number generated by this means is likely to be negligible. Moreover, small windfall sites are unlikely to make any significant contribution to the infrastructure requirements in the village. Accordingly the Draft Plan does not demonstrate that the housing needs of the village can be met and it fails to meet the basic conditions of the Localism Act in this regard.	The sites allocated for housing development are suitable, available and achievable with the possible exception of the Asfordby Storage and Haulage Depot on Main Street, Asfordby. The Asfordby Storage and Haulage Depot may not be available as the owner has not expressed an intention to sell. However, the Neighbourhood Plan does not rely on the redevelopment of this site to meet local housing needs. Instead this site, along windfall opportunities, provides the Plan with flexible in the unlikely event that the other allocated housing sites do not deliver.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Jelson Ltd		Jelson owns a parcel of land between Station Lane and Hoby Road, directly to the west of the land that is already committed for 100 dwellings (see enclosed Site Plan). This land is not currently identified in the Draft Plan. However, it is available and suitable for development. The site extends to approximately 3 hectares and comprises open land used for arable farming. Development of the site would provide a logical extension to the approved scheme and the village. Approximately 80 dwellings could be provided allowing for a density of 30 dwellings per hectare and the inclusion of open space, drainage and other infrastructure. The site is not in an area of separation and its development would not result in coalescence of the settlements; one of the overriding ambitions of the Draft Plan. We consider that, given the constraints of the settlement (the bypass and areas of	Despite having numerous opportunities during the consultation process, this site has not previously been proposed by Jelson. Neither has the site been submitted as part of the 2015 Melton Strategic Land Availability Assessment. Notwithstanding, its location is very similar to Site A2 which was also located off Hoby Road, Asfordby and which has been the subject of site appraisal. Like Site A2, the proposed new Jelson site is poorly related to the built-up area of Asfordby village and a long distance from most services and facilities. The Highway Authority advised that Hoby Road has a 60 mph speed limit which will make achieving a suitable access difficult. It is also not of a suitable standard for further development. The Melton Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifies a large part	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		flood risk) the site offers the only realistic prospect for an additional allocation. Flood risk work undertaken recently in respect of the approved scheme demonstrates that development in this location will not have an adverse impact. Nor would development of the land have adverse impacts in respect of heritage assets, sensitive landscapes, Local Wildlife Sites or the amenity of existing residents. Development beneath the overhead power line would be avoided. Access could be taken from Station Lane (through the recently consented scheme) or from Hoby Road. Unlike proposals for small sites (of less than 10 dwellings) development of this site would make significant contributions to affordable housing and the other infrastructure requirements set out at Policy A23. Notably, the site is controlled by a house builder and there are no constraints to the site being brought forward for development. It is the only site available	of the proposed Jelson site to be in Flood Zone 2.	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		in Asfordby where there are no question marks over its deliverability. We conclude that the site would provide a very valuable contribution to the housing need for Asfordby, particularly in the light of the constraints posed by the alternative sites in the village and the significant doubts as to how and when these might be delivered. In the absence of an additional residential allocation the Plan does not allow for sufficient land to accommodate the identified housing need. It is unlikely to satisfy the basic conditions of the Localism Act in this regard. We would therefore encourage the Parish Council to additionally allocate the land shown on the attached plan for residential development. This will add much needed flexibility to the Plan should the other sites identified prove undeliverable. We can prepare an illustrative masterplan and provide a more accurate capacity figure in due course.		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Leicestershire County Council	General	I welcome the consideration of community facilities in the Neighbourhood Plan. It is a positive feature of the Plan that community facilities are recognised and valued and that the Plan seeks to protect and retain existing facilities. Community facilities provide a venue for social, recreational and educational activity and a place where people can meet and access local services. Perhaps support for the independent development of new facilities could be considered along with a policy relating to the protection of Assets of Community Value to support any existing or future designations. Also, in relation to shops, suggest that the statement that Planning applications that ensure that the Local Centre continues to provide a diverse range of Local Centre Uses which appeal to a wide range of age and social groups will be permitted is qualified to clarify that this is subject to	Assets of Community Value are designated under separate legislation. All the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan should be read together when considering planning applications.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		acceptability in relation to other planning considerations.		
Melton Borough Council	A19	This cannot be used as a way of protecting services and facilities for no other reason than for protections sake. Need to justify "unnecessary loss" and how this policy will work in practice. What if services and facilities are unviable? Moreover, the policy is a bit broad, will all proposals for the modernisation of facilities be encouraged and supported? How will the plan do this and how will these effect decisions made by Officers/Planning Committee?	The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 28) promotes the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship. further clarification might be helpful.	The first sentence of Policy A19 be amended to read: 'Development that fails to protect existing facilities providing for people's day- to-day needs will not be supported unless: A) the facility is replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
				suitable location; or B) there is evidence that the facility is no longer required by the community, is duplicated elsewhere within the settlement, or is no longer viable. When considering viability, evidence of reasonable attempts to sell or let the facility as a going concern will be material.

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Leicestershire County Council	A23	The CHA would liaise with the developer to provide travel packs and bus passes where it considers these are necessary.	To encourage the use of sustainable transport, the Parish Council want all new houses (over 10 dwellings) to be provided with a Travel Pack containing information about the local area, advice on local transport bus services, cycle routes, taxi information, walking maps and journey planning assistance.	No change
Leicestershire County Council	A24	It is not clear what measures would be proposed to address parking problems outside the school, however note that resolving parking issues in one area can have a knock on effect at another.	The Neighbourhood Plan is not prescriptive on the measures that might address local traffic congestion and parking problems associated with the Primary School. However, they could include additional parking provision, 'drop-off' points, parking restrictions, road narrowing etc.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
East Leicestershire and Rutland Clinical Commissioning Group	A24	We have reviewed the consultation plan regarding the developments within Asfordby in particular the housing development which would include 100 dwellings. Currently Latham House Medical Practice through their branch site provides Primary Medical Care to the population. Patients within this area use both the Main site which is located at Sage Cross Street and their Asfordby Branch Site. When reviewing the impact of the proposed development this would result in an increase to the surgery of 240 patients. After discussing this with the Practice and to provide service to the increase of patients we would be looking to develop an application of \$106 Funds.	Policy A24 includes provision for Section 106 developer contributions to the improvement, remodelling or enhancement of Asfordby Surgery.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Latham House Medical Practice	A24	An increase in the housing infrastructure of 100 dwellings is likely to increase the patients registered at Latham House Medical Practice by 500 patients. Patients are seen at our branch surgery in Asfordby and at our main site in Melton Mowbray. This increase will add additional pressures on our service provision, and we will have to expand both sites to accommodate these pressures (subject to obtaining suitable planning permission). It is also likely that the practice will have to recruit additional clinical and administrative staff to support the increased population aswell. The Practice is willing to work with the council and NHS England to secure additional funds to help support any expansion required.	Policy A24 includes provision for Section 106 developer contributions to the improvement, remodelling or enhancement of Asfordby Surgery.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Leicestershire County Council	A24	The County Council recognises that residents may have concerns about traffic conditions in their local area, which may be exacerbated by increased traffic due to population, economic and development growth. The County Council's budgets are under severe pressure. It must therefore prioritise where it focuses its limited funds, so that measures deliver the greatest benefit to Leicestershire's residents and road users. Given this, it is likely that any highway measures would need to be funded from third party funding, such as Section 106 (s106) developer contributions. To be eligible for s106 contributions proposals must fulfil various legal criteria. Measures must also directly mitigate the impact of the development e.g. they should ensure that the development does not make the existing highway conditions any worse. They should not be used to address existing problems. Where potential s106 measures would	Policy A24 and paragraph 7.25 have regard to the legal requirements regarding developer contributions.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		require future maintenance, which would be paid for from the County Council's funds, the measures would also need to be assessed against the County Council's other priorities. With regard to public transport, securing s106 contributions for public transport services will normally focus on larger developments, where there is a more realistic prospect of services being commercially viable once the contributions have stopped i.e. they would be able to operate without being supported from public funding. Those undertaking Neighbourhood Plans should be aware that the current 'conventional' supported bus network is likely to reduce, given the pressures on the County Council's budgets.		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Leicestershire County Council	A24	There is no specific policy on developer contributions within the draft Asfordby NP. Whilst there is a reference to infrastructure on page 36 Policy A23. If new development was to come forward there might be a requirement for developer contributions to mitigate the impacts of new development, particularly on local services and infrastructure. A policy therefore might be prudent to be included within the (draft) Asfordby NP made along similar lines to those examples shown in the Draft North Kilworth NP and the draft Great Glen NP albeit adapted to the circumstances at Asfordby.	Policy A24 concerns infrastructure and developer contributions.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Melton Borough Council	A24	There needs to be some re-examination of this policy so that it complies with the latest CIL Regulations, especially CIL Regulations 1.22 and 1.23. When discussing developer contributions, the tests set out by 1.22 of the CIL regulations are especially important.	Paragraph 7.25 already states that 'developments identified in the Plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and burdens that their viable implementation is threatened. Contributions are governed by the provisions of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010'. Similarly, Policy A24 states 'To ensure the viability of housing development, the costs of the Plan's requirements will be applied flexibly where it is demonstrated that they are likely to make the development undeliverable.'	The first sentence of the final paragraph of Policy A24 be deleted.
Leicestershire County Council	Employment	The Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan's comprehensive and positive assessment of local and more strategic employment opportunities with the plan area is welcomed. The plan appears to strike a good balance between recognising the opportunities of growth for local	Noted	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		businesses and residents, while also ensuring any potential localised negative impacts on the community are mitigated against.		
The Coal Authority	A26	The Coal Authority supports the recognition in Policy A25: Holwell Works and Holwell Business Park of the need to consider ground stability and avoid built development over or within the influencing distance of the 2 mine entries in the business park.	Noted	No change
Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust	A26	We object to any development of the Holwell Iron Works at Asfordby Hill as it is a Local Wildlife Site. It is one of the best Local Wildlife Sites in the whole of Leicestershire. It contains populations of rare invertebrates and plants such as the Dingy and Grizzled Skippers, Deptford Pink and Yellow Wort.	A Local Wildlife Site has been designated at Asfordby Hill and has previously been the subject of consultation with the Leicestershire Wildlife Trust. The site is offered special protection by Neighbourhood Plan Policy A7. The need to protect its biodiversity importance is also recognised by criterion E of Policy A27.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Jelson Ltd	A27	Policy A26 (Holwell Business Park) seeks the redevelopment of land to the south of Holwell Works for mixed use development comprising B1, B2 and B8 uses along with no more than 100 dwellings. The residential element is considered to be enabling development i.e. necessary to make a scheme viable. We note that the site is contaminated and that previous proposals for the site have failed to happen. We do have significant concerns about both the principle of residential development in this location and the way that the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to control its delivery. In general terms Asfordby Hill is not considered to be a sustainable location for significant residential development. The settlement has very limited services and facilities. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges this and the draft policy seeks to improve the sustainability of the settlement by requiring provision of a general store,	The Parish Council has been working with Pegasus Group, on behalf of Rotherhill Developments, to secure a mixed-use development at the Holwell Business Park site. The Holwell Works site should be retained partly for employment purposes, but should also include housing and improved community facilities as set out in a Draft Masterplan. This Masterplan has been developed following extensive consultation with the Parish Council and the local community. We agree the provision of such a new general store would be critical to sustainability and this is a requirement of criterion B of Policy A26. We also agree that it is essential that any residential development is brought forward only as a necessary part of a comprehensive scheme including	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		space. Whilst that might be a laudable aim, we are concerned that the requirement for such elements of additional facilities might render any residential scheme (and indeed any overall mixed use scheme) unviable. It is also unclear whether there is market interest in the provision of a general store in Asfordby Hill. As the provision of such a store would be critical to sustainability it is essential that the delivery of a store can be demonstrated before any permission is granted for residential dwellings. It is also essential that any residential development is brought forward only as a necessary part of a comprehensive scheme including employment related development. We note that Holwell Business Park is identified in the Draft Melton Local Plan Emerging Options as an existing employment site. Draft Local Plan Policy EC4 deals specifically with the site. It	employment related development. This is the purpose of criterion C of Policy A26. The landowner has expressed an intention to sell the site for development. There is a reasonable prospect that the site will be developed within the plan period.	

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		advises that proposals to change the use of the site to non-employment uses will not be permitted except where: • it can be demonstrated that the site is no longer economically viable for employment purposes in the long term; • it would support the main use of the site for employment purposes; • the proposal is for wholesale redevelopment of the site for other uses where there are alternative employment facilities available in strategically advantageous locations. The Draft Local Plan therefore only allows re-use of employment land for residential use if specific tests can be met. The Neighbourhood Plan does not include these tests and accordingly Policy A26, as currently drafted, is not in conformity with the strategic policies of the Draft Local Plan and the basic conditions of the Localism Act have not been met in this regard. We would recommend that Policy A26 is reworded to incorporate the following		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		pre-requisites to support residential development: • demonstration that the same tests included in draft Local Plan EC4 can be passed in respect of any non-employment development; • clarification that residential development will only be supported where it forms part of a comprehensive development including 3.23 ha of Business, General Industrial and Storage and Distribution Uses; • evidence that a general store on the site is viable (including evidence of market demand); and • a phasing strategy that ensures that the general store and an element of employment uses will be delivered prior to the first housing occupations. In the light of the above, we have significant doubts about the suitability and deliverability of the Holwell site for residential development. Even if delivery could be achieved the Plan would need to incorporate significantly more		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		safeguards to prevent the delivery solely of an isolated and unsustainable housing estate. Accordingly, the strategy in the Neighbourhood Plan should not rely on this site in order to meet the housing needs for Asfordby.		
Mrs Cawthorne	a27	I've lived up Asfordby Hill for 45 years and along main road between entrance to Holwell Works. Houses, bungalows for older people to view over Melton is so lovely. I had all that until they built opposite me so I can't see Melton now. There is also plenty of room. But a big thing is a bust stop is needed as older people cannot walk to Main Road. It really should be a lovely housing estate. Houses are needed-rental houses also, and view over the place where they test trains is just an eyesore. Other than that, football pitch and Holwell Bowls Club is OK-leave them alone where it is. No parking on roadside on bingo nights and football home games. There will be a dreadful pile-up, yet play park is lovely	We want the redevelopment of the site for employment uses to go ahead so that it can provide job opportunities for local people. We recognise that new housing development may be required to enable this to happen, but if there is to be a significant amount of new housing development, additional services and facilities are required to enhance the sustainability of Asfordby Hill. The Community has identified, for special protection, green spaces of particular local significance. Local Green Spaces identified include the green square that is surrounded by houses on Welby	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		where it is. This big piece of land at the back of where I am- need to sop cars coming round as it is really a place for people to hang washing, but younger ones don't do that so it would be lovely for kiddies up here and there are lots growing up- and it is safe. Kiddies across by the school are not safe at all-children need play and it would be nice. Other than that places to employ people and to train people near the cement works. there were two houses there long ago, also a bungalow near the entrance. It is an eyesore, so I really so hope people will also say the same.	Road, South Street, West Side and St Johns Road.	
S Eades & D Rose	A27	In terms of the proposal that was exhibited at the 'drop in session' on 2 March we have no real objections but we do have a couple of concerns. The development of a brownfield site rather than development of more green sites is a positive. The mix of industry & houses was acceptable. The provision of a small shop	The concerns about the impact of potential noise, pollution and disturbance are noted. These are concerns for existing residents and may impact on the new residents of the proposed mixed development too.	A new criterion be added to Policy A27 to ensure that the development does not significantly adversely affect the amenities of

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		was a positive. However, as residents who are located on the north side of Melton Road, our concerns are with the type of industries that will be allowed and the potential noise / air pollution and operating hours etc. that would result. We would also like to see a covenant in place that protects the area that was shown designated as wildlife / green space so that future developments cannot take place on this area.		existing and new residents in the area.
Mrs D Summerland	A27	What you have suggested for Asfordby Hill sounds good. As long as we get a play area on both sides of main road. And it would be nice to have a shop on the Hill again, because when I was little we had three shops on Welby road and now there are none.	Noted	No change
Miss R Patel	A27	Fine- I think the site does need to be utilised - looks ugly.	Noted	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
Leicestershire County Council	A27	Note South Street is an un-adopted road	Noted	No change
Pegasus Group on behalf of Rotherhill Developments	A27	The identification of the Holwell Business Park site under policy A27 of the Pre-Submission Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission (January 2016) for mixed use development is supported. Holwell Works is a significant brownfield redevelopment opportunity for the Neighbourhood Plan area. Outline planning permission was granted for the development of the site by the erection of 35,080 sq. metres of B1(c), B2 and B8 industrial, and warehouse units, on 30th June 2010. Planning permission to extend the time period for implementation was granted on 15th April 2013. The Holwell Works site should be retained partly for employment purposes, but should also include housing and improved community facilities as set out in the Draft Masterplan (dated 26th	The Limits to Development will be amended once development is completed.	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		January 2016 Reference EMS.2390-001F) attached to this representation. This Masterplan has been developed following extensive consultation with the Parish Council and the local community, and will deliver the following mix of uses on the site: • Employment Development – Approximately 2.3 hectares of B1, B2 and B8 employment uses • New Retail Unit – Approximately 500 sq. metres to be located on the Welby Road frontage of the site • New Community Building located off Welby Road • New Public Open Space to include equipped play provision • Up to 100 dwellings. The proposed areas of public open space relate well to the adjacent ecological area and will be accessible to local residents. These facilities will provide a natural extension to the sports field, bowling green and allotments. Surveillance over the play area and new		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		community building will be provided by the new dwellings proposed on Parcel C. Vehicular access is proposed from Welby Road to serve both the public open space and the new community building. Pegasus attended a Consultation Event arranged by Asfordby Parish Council on 22 February 2016 to explain our proposals for the site and to discuss any concerns raised by local residents. The proposals outlined in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan for the Holwell Work site were well received, and we look forward to continuing to work positively with the local community to development our proposals for this site. It is suggested that the Neighbourhood Plan should take the opportunity to amend the Limits to Development around Asfordby Hill to include the mixed use development defined by Policy A26 within the village envelope. In summary, it is considered that Holwell Works is a significant brownfield redevelopment opportunity for the		

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		Neighbourhood Plan area. The mix of uses proposed in Policy A26 provides a viable and deliverable development opportunity which will deliver the additional services and facilities which are required to enhance the sustainability of Asfordby Hill. For these reasons, Policy A27 is supported and the Holwell Works site should be allocated for a mixed use development as generally shown on the attached Master plan.		
Melton Borough Council	A27	With the size and scale of this proposal, reference should be made earlier and more clearly in the document. At present it is rather tucked away. Given it is the largest single proposal in the plan it should certainly be more evident and given the appropriate discussion. At the very least the housing element should be amplified in the Plans housing section. With regards to infrastructure it should be highlighted that this development is closer to a different school to that	Holwell Business Park is a mixed use development, but will be mainly for employment uses. We have accepted that some housing provision will be needed to enable the redevelopment of the site for business uses to go ahead. As a consequence, it is appropriate for the relevant policy to be located in the 'Jobs' section of the plan. Notwithstanding the housing provision is referred to in Policy	No change

Representor	Policy/ Paragraph etc.	Representation	Response	Proposed Revisions to the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan
		mentioned at A24. Moreover, more reference to the strategic effect of the allocation on road capacity and how this fits in to the overall Transport Strategy may better alleviate an Inspectors concerns.	A11. In 2009, a planning application (09/00356/OUT) was submitted by Rotherhill (Asfordby) Syndicate for the development of 36,152m2 of industrial and warehouse units called Holwell Business Park. The proposed development was found to be acceptable in terms of highway and transportation. Planning permission was granted in 2010 and an extension of time was agreed in April 2013. Although permission has recently lapsed, the Highway authority have been consulted and have not objected to the proposal.	
Leicestershire County Council	A29	Any future application for the site which the CHA is asked to comment on would have to be assessed on its own merits.	Noted	No change