

## Nicholas Evans

---

**From:** Tracey Watts <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 23 August 2017 19:56  
**To:** Ext PlanningPolicy  
**Cc:** Jason Watts  
**Subject:** Revision to Draft Local Plan & Objection to Site SOM 2 MBC /023/16

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Categories:** Red Category

Dear Sir or Madam,

As a resident of Somerby I write to advise that I consider Melton Borough Council (MBC) have failed to properly consider the various objections I submitted to the Council on the draft MBC Local Plan in respect of the above site SOM 2 MBC /023/16. Those objections were contained in my letter dated 28<sup>th</sup> November 2016 and in subsequent e-mail 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2017.

MBC has failed to provide a fair and objective review of the significant evidence in support of the objection to SOM 2 put forward not only by myself but a considerable number of other resident and interested parties. The proposed revision to the draft local plan in relation to SOM 2 has failed to take into account properly substantiated objections submitted as part of the public consultation.

I wish to be invited to the review by the Planning Inspectorate and wish to address the Inspectorate with my various objections.

I will not repeat those objections here in detail but outline some of the objections I raised regarding the inclusion of SOM2 in the SHLAA:-

- Development of SOM 2 will lead to the destruction of important cultural heritage assets. The topography of SOM 2 of the Croft field indicates evidence of previous earthworks and medieval activity. The proposed development of SOM 2 is contrary to NPPF in relation to safeguarding heritage. New evidence is coming together all the time regarding the importance of this site and its place in the wider setting of this historic part of Somerby.
- Traffic and safety concerns of increasing the number of dwellings in Somerby at SOM 2. The High Street in Somerby is wholly incapable of supporting the increase in traffic. By its own admission, in the Melton Local Plan adopted in June 1999, MBC stated in respect of Somerby "The street scene along High Street is particularly marred by traffic congestion. This is mainly caused by excessive levels of on-street parking. There are no areas to the rear of High Street that could be effectively used to provide off-street parking facilities. Furthermore, the Highway Authority has no proposals to alleviate the problem." I fail to see what has changed in the intervening 17 years other than to comment that increased car ownership, recent other housing development in Somerby, and increased "through traffic" have all exacerbated the problem.
- Incorrect designation of Somerby as a Service Centre. The analysis which MBC uses to support its case is flawed. There are other many other villages which are more deserving of the designation but from a simple geographic perspective Somerby suits MBC's agenda. Consequently MBC's analysis is tailored to suit the desired outcome. As an example the analysis which designates the small village shop as one of the reasons for Somerby to be designated a service centre does not take into account its location (on a blind 90 degree bend with inadequate parking available).
- Lack of adequate public transportation. A poor infrequent existing service which only survives through subsidy. The long term prognosis of this service is it will be axed in 2018. This SOM 2 site will not promote sustainable modes of transport in accordance with NPPF. It will simply increase single occupancy car journeys.
- Lack of job opportunities in the immediate area surrounding Somerby. MBC is unable to provide any evidence in respect of local job opportunities to support the development of SOM 2. Virtually all existing

residents either work in Melton Leicester or Oakham. Further houses will mean more road journeys on already inadequate rural roads to the centres of employment in Leicester, Melton, Nottingham and Oakham.

- The infrastructure such as sewerage/drainage system of Somerby is already unable to cope with the existing houses let alone any further significant increase in dwellings. The lack of gas supply to the village is also an important factor. It is not acceptable for MBC to simply advise that such points are of no concern to them and statutory authorities will cope. These issues should be taken into account.
- The access of SOM 2 MBC /023/16 onto High Street is at the junction of the Newbold Road, close to The Field , is on an extremely sharp bend and is dangerous. A site of earlier accidents.
- Somerby School does not have any off road car parking or its own green space and is totally unsuitable for further expansion. The footpath on High Street ( adjacent to the School) is narrow, inadequate and incapable of improvement due to width restrictions.

In summary SOM 2 seeks to put a development of un-needed houses in a location which has no employment opportunities, unlikely to have public transport in the near future, in a dangerous location and, crucially, will result in the destruction of important cultural heritage assets. MBC is failing in its duty to properly consider the implications of such a development. It is simply absurd to contemplate SOM 2 as a site when there are other more suitable sites (without such issues) available in the Borough.

On any reasoned and objective review the site of SOM 2 MBC/023/16, which contains significant cultural heritage assets, should be omitted from the SHLAA and the draft MBC Local Plan.

Yours sincerely,

Jason Watts