

Response ID ANON-13H4-7YYJ-K

Submitted to **Melton Local Plan Pre-Submission Draft**

Submitted on **2016-12-12 16:07:53**

About you

1 What is your name?

Name:

Dr Neil James Fortey

2 What is your email address?

Email:

[REDACTED]

3 Are you responding as an individual, consultee, stakeholder or other?

Resident

If Consultee, Stakeholder, or Other, please give details here. :

4 Address

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Please select your age:

[REDACTED]

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – The Spatial Strategy

1 CH4Q1: Do you consider that Chapter 4 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

2 CH4Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH4Q3: Please give details of why you consider Chapter 4 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Chapter 4 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

There is a glaring inconsistency with regard to the classification of Easthorpe (containing site EAST1) as a 'Rural Hub' while neighbouring Muston is not placed in this class. Easthorpe has been an integral part of Bottesford parish for over 200 years. Most of its historic extent had been become consumed into Bottesford before 1900 and what remained was and still is a small village with no facilities beyond what it has by virtue of being part of Bottesford. It is apparent that Muston qualifies better as a rural hub than Easthorpe in that it (Muston) has traditionally been a separate village, formerly a separate parish, and retains its own parish church, communal building (formerly the village primary school) and better access to employment than Easthorpe in that it is on the No.6 bus route to Bottesford and Grantham whereas Easthorpe has none of these services. Thus the classification of Easthorpe as a separate rural hub while Muston is classified as a rural settlement is absurd and demeaning, resulting in Muston being protected against development pressure whereas Easthorpe is not protected and indeed serves

as a means to augment the housing allocated to Bottesford of which it is part.

4 CH4Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make Chapter 4 legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make Chapter 4 legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

To achieve consistency and fairness in housing development allocation the stronger identity and services in Muston must be recognised by grading it as a Rural Hub whereas Easthorpe should not even be treated as a separate settlement in that it is to all intents and purposes a part of Bottesford. Otherwise there is the possibility of appearing to manipulate the new housing allocations unfairly.

Policy SS1 - Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development

1 CH4PSS1Q1: Do you consider that Policy SS1 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

2 CH4PSS1Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH4PSS1Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy SS1 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy SS1 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH4PSS1Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy SS2 – Development Strategy

1 CH4PSS2Q1: Do you consider that Policy SS2 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

2 CH4PSS2Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH4PSS2Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy SS2 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy SS2 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH4PSS2Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy SS5 – Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood

1 CH4SS5Q1: Do you consider that Policy SS5 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

2 CH4SS5Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH4SS5Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy SS5 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy SS5 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH4SS5Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy C1 (A) – Housing Allocations

1 CH5PC1(A)Q1: Do you consider that Policy C1 (A) is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

2 CH5PC1(A)Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

2) Justified, 3) Effective, 4) Consistant with National Policy

3 CH5PC1(A)Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy C1 (A) – Housing Allocations is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy C1 (A) – Housing Allocations or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

The housing allocated to Bottesford includes sites that fall within flood risk zones and as such should not be accepted. Alternative sites within Bottesford have not been identified and indeed are unlikely to be identified in view of the pervasive flood hazard in this low lying area. Other sites should be sought in order to avoid building in environmentally unacceptable locations and these should be in other centres if needs be.

4 CH5PC1(A)Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

A proper assessment of housing development should be made taking into account areas of known flood risk. Sites must be selected in accordance with due diligence regarding flood risk and re-allocation of some of the present development sites be undertaken if needs be.

Policy C1 (B); Reserve Sites

1 CH5PC1(B)Q1: Do you consider that Policy C1 (B); Reserve Sites is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

2 CH5PC1(B)Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH5PC1(B)Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy C1 (B); Reserve Sites is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy C1 (B); Reserve Sites or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH5PC1(B)Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy C7 – Rural Services

1 CH5PC7Q1: Do you consider that Policy C7 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

2 CH5PC7Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH5PC7Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy C7 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy C7 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH5PC7Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy C9 – Healthy Communities

1 CH5PC9Q1: Do you consider that Policy C9 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

No

2 CH5PC9Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH5PC9Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy C9 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy C9 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

The policy fails for Bottesford for a variety of reasons.

There is already a perceived lack of green spaces and facilities for cycling and other recreational activities within the parish and the Draft Plan concentrates too

much on increasing housing without provision for enhanced facilities, e.g. there is no park, no swimming facility, no tennis facility, no dedicated cycling routes (in spite of the efforts made by SusTrans to create a safe crossing of the A52 consistently thwarted by weak council support). There has been no improvement of streets, safe crossing, bus shelters, traffic access to local schools in order to cater for the population expansion in Bottesford since 1960 such that the village is cluttered and around its shops can be dangerous for old persons or children getting around, and this will be made considerably worse by the influx of newcomers taking up the proposed new housing. Bottesford is being expanded to become a small town but with inadequate planning for infrastructure and recreational facilities necessary to make it a healthy place to live.

4 CH5PC9Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

The central street plan of Bottesford should be redesigned to meet the needs of present and future population. Street calming and safe crossings should be introduced, on street parking by shoppers should be discouraged by well planned provision of parking areas, safe secure crossings should be created at key locations for instance where elderly person from sheltered housing need to cross roads to access shops and medical facilities. A network of safe cycling routes should be created as part of the Melton Plan in order to encourage better use of cycling rather than local motor car journeys which worsen congestion and environmental factors such as air quality, noise and light pollution. The cycling network should be integrated into borough wide and national networks of cycling routes to encourage leisure, health and sensible alternative transport usage. In general the Draft Plan should be revised as necessary in order to create strategic planning of the village centre and adjoining areas in order to balance the need for housing with the parallel need for a good environment that will encourage healthy living and reduce pollution and consumption of fossil fuels.

Policy EN1 – Landscape

1 CH7PEN1Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN1 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

2 CH7PEN1Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH7PEN1Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN1 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EN1 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

In Bottesford the allocated housing area BOT5 is inappropriate because it will disfigure the landscape on the northern approach to the village on the road from Normanton and Long Bennington. This is an important view because it provides a handsome aspect of the open historic rural character of the village and of the settlement grouped around its landmark church spire. It is important to conserve as far as possible within the constraints placed on the planning views which allow the village to retain a sense of its heritage place in the landscape and the beauty of its rural setting.

4 CH7PEN1Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Site BOT5 should be removed from consideration for future housing on the aesthetic grounds set out above.

EN8 – Climate Change

1 CH7PEN8Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN8 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

No

2 CH7PEN8Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH7PEN8Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN8 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EN8 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

With regard to EN11 - the development sites at Rectory Farm, on Grantham Road and east of Belvoir Road are located on low lying farm land at risk of flooding as witnessed consistently during periods of high rainfall and especially intervals of excessive rainfall when large areas of standing water develop and there is also ponding on the roadways of Belvoir Road at its junction with the A52 (an existing motoring safety hazard that will be worsened by runoff from development in the adjoining fields). The ongoing development on Belvoir Rd involves raising the houses above the natural soil level and this will be required for further development of new housing or industrial buildings, which will worsen the risk from runoff affecting existing housing in proximity to the new developments and there is no protection for such properties. Additionally, the Rectory Farm site is underlain by over 2 m of unconsolidated postglacial sand which will make deep foundations necessary as already seen when a new house was built at the northern end of Pinfold Lane at the western end of the proposed Rectory Land site, and the extensive construction of deep foundations may well complicate ground flow leading to subsurface ponding and periods of flooding even if the River Devon is enclosed in barriers where it crosses the site.

4 CH7PEN8Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

In order to make the plan sound it is important to ensure that development of housing and industrial units does not take place in locations known to be prone to flooding especially where the engineering involves raising the level of houses to create an impermeable raft above the natural soil level being the level at which adjoining existing houses have been built historically. In the case of Rectory Farm at Bottesford there may be additional problems due to the deep unconsolidated sand that underlies the site and it would be a wise precaution to remove this site from those earmarked for development.

Policy EN11 – Minimising the Risk of Flooding

1 CH7PEN11Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN11 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

No

2 CH7PEN11Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

2) Justified, 3) Effective, 4) Consistent with National Policy

3 CH7PEN11Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN11 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EN11 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

The policy takes insufficient regard of flood risk in Bottesford where risk is high in view of the history of flooding, the physiographic characteristics of the parish, flood risk assessments by the Environment Agency, proximity to the River Devon and its flood plain of homes in the established village and conservation area (including my own) and the concomitant risk to the property and wellbeing of the population of the parish. Bottesford has 413 properties in Flood Zone 3 and is one of the highest risk villages in the whole of the East Midlands. Many have no flood defences and are therefore in the undefended Flood Zone 3a as defined on page 125 of the Pre-Submission Draft Plan.

There is a duty on the planning process to take due account of these risks and it is clear that this has not been done and that indeed the protection of the population of Bottesford is being disregarded recklessly.

Melton Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2015) states that 22% of suggested development sites in Bottesford are in flood zones including a high proportion of the Rectory Farm site. It also recognises that the Grantham Canal is another risk factor along with engineered risks such as impermeable surfaces arising from housing, roads and other engineered infrastructure. The Environment Agency Flood Map indicates Zone 2 and Zone 3 risk areas that include the whole area of Bottesford and Easthorpe, which would make this one of the least suitable or sustainable areas in the borough of Melton for large scale housing development yet

the Draft Plan blatantly ignores this.

4 CH7PEN11Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Paragraph 7.22.3 of the Plan states "sites at risk of flooding can only be allocated for development if there is insufficient land available in areas with lesser or no flood risk". There is wide national recognition and concern regarding increasing frequency of flooding episodes and it is apparent that the catastrophic flooding experienced in low lying areas such as Sedgemoor and the Vale of Eden among many others in recent years reflects climate warming and its consequent climatic instability and enhanced atmospheric moisture loading.

Much of Melton Borough is comprised of land of raised elevation and lesser proximity to at risk water courses than Bottesford and other sites in the Vale of Belvoir. There are many sites in Melton Borough where flood risk is lower than that at Bottesford. It is of great importance that development sites be selected in order to avoid increased flood risk to new and existing residential areas and it is clear that this will require a revision of the Draft Plan to take these factors into account. As it stands it creates unacceptable risks for residents, industry and infrastructure and is therefore unsustainable.

Rectory Farm, Grantham Road Clay Pit and adjacent areas have been designated as Flood Zone 3b - any development on these sites will put the village at higher risk of flooding.

Policy IN1 –Transport & Strategic Transport Infrastructure

1 CH8PIN1Q1: Do you consider that Policy IN1 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

No

2 CH8PIN1Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3) Effective

3 CH8PIN1Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy IN1 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy IN1 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

The Draft Plan concentrates its attention on Melton town and is inadequate with regard to Bottesford. Here the primary and secondary schools both enjoy a wide and expanding catchment that creates the need for a large and growing number of school bus and private transport journeys to and from the schools each day, leading to absurd levels of congestion at critical times in Barkestone Lane, High Street and residential streets. This is already a major problem that has not been addressed, and the prospect of accommodating a large number of new children must be met by planning improved access to the schools in a way that will make the present number of car journeys unnecessary, something that the concentration of new housing in Bottesford will make difficult or impossible without improved planning.

The situation is analogous to that experienced with regard to health care facilities in Bottesford where the existing two small GP surgeries are served by totally inadequate parking accessible only via congested back streets and the proposed new housing will make these facilities even more inadequate for the enlarged population.

Bottesford has streets that were built over 50 years ago and are seriously congested at certain times of day, with excess on street parking and lack of traffic calming measures. The village continues to be a 'rat run' short cut between the A52 and the A1 for heavy commercial vehicles despite the narrowness of village centre streets, air pollution and lack of protection for people and properties within the village conservation area.

Bus services are poor and have become significantly poorer in the last few years owing to the withdrawal of services to Newark, Bingham and Nottingham, apparently because of failure of the three counties which surround the village to agree a coherent regional network for the provision of services resulting in difficulty of access to shops, workplaces, health and cultural services and activities. Rail services are also poor in respect of evening and Sunday services and in respect of modern station facilities. The inevitable result is increased reliance on private car journeys along the congested corridor of the A52 and other more rural routes leading to pollution and the other negative effects of unnecessary car use.

4 CH8PIN1Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

The Draft Plan should be delayed pending a thorough and wide ranging survey of current and future traffic needs in Bottesford to meet safety, health and access

requirements for the population as well as people coming into the village to use its educational, health and shopping facilities. The Plan should specify encouragement of the creation of a coherent regional transport framework of bus and rail services to enable flexible access to local towns and their facilities and reduce reliance on the motor car.

IN3: Broadband

1 CH8PIN3Q1: Do you consider that Policy IN3 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

2 CH8PIN3Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH8PIN3Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy IN3 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy IN3 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH8PIN3Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Examination

1 EXQ1: Can your representation seeking a change be considered by written representations or do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

Written Representations

If you wish to speak at examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary::

2 EXQ2: Moreover please indicate if you wish to continue to be involved in the Local Plan (Please tick appropriate boxes).

If you wish to be notified at the address/e-mail provided when the Melton Local Plan is submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government, If you wish to be notified at the address/e-mail provided when the Inspector's Report is available to view, If you wish to be notified at the address/e-mail provided in Part A when the Melton Local Plan is adopted, If you/your organisation wish to be included in future consultations on the Melton Local Plan

Acknowledgement

1 I understand the above statement and agree I have complied with its requirements

I agree