

FOCUSED CHANGES RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED: Focused Change 10

Representor Name	Focused Change /Policy Ref	Summary of Representation	MBC Response
Michelle Galloway (obo Davidsons)	FC10	Make it clear within the policy that contributions to secondary education provision will be required from all sites within the Longfield Academy Catchment area, not just the developments coming forward from the Southern SUE.	It is standard practice that any development within the catchment would have to pay standard tariffs for schools places if there is no capacity, to make this clear within the policy would be superfluous.
Julie Moss (Bottesford Forum)	FC10	<p>Concern that the growth in school age children cannot be accommodated at either primary or secondary level; that the primary school cannot be expanded and that children from The Vale will be denied spaces as a result of growth in Bottesford.Education</p> <p>Concern that the growth in school age children cannot be accommodated at either primary or secondary level; that the primary school cannot be expanded and that children from The Vale will be denied spaces as a result of growth in Bottesford.</p> <p>Questions</p> <p>8. How can Melton Borough Council justify using the figures of 0.239 and 0.167 children per household requiring primary and secondary school places respectively?</p> <p>9. What is Melton Borough Council's plan for extending or building new schools?</p> <p>10. How is Melton Borough Council going to address secondary education for children in the surrounding villages if all the places will be taken up by children from Bottesford?</p> <p>11. How does Melton Borough Council propose that these step-changes to the local educational establishment are funded and planned?</p>	<p>The local education authority has been consulted at each stage of the plan and has not raised concerns that the schools in Bottesford can accommodate the growth proposed, through a combination of excess spare capacity and expansion. This would be achieved through normal planning mechanisms, e.g. s106.</p> <p>School rolls are volatile and the most recently provided position is set out in the Service Centres Update to site assessments (May 2017). However time horizons are limited to 5 years and an individual evaluation will be carried out when each application comes forward, as is the current practice and approach. The calculations carried out by the LEA take account of exiting and future demand from the entire catchment are (not just Bottesford) and development will be required to create capacity 'over and above' (where, and in the quantities, necessary)there is no question of children from elsewhere in the catchment ('The Vale') being denied spaces. The 'coefficients' (0.239 and 0.167 children) for the calculation of quantities of school places have been provided by the Local Education Authority and are the same methodology that the LEA themselves routinely use to calculate demand and subsequently contributions to capacity.</p> <p>Health service providers have been consulted at each stage of the Plan,. None have advised that their capacity is not, or cannot be expanded, to serve the proposed level of growth. 'Focussed Changes' proposes a reduced level of growth in Bottesford that previous iterations, which can only assist with these issues. Details are provided in the updates to site assessments ('Service Centres Update to site assessments' May 2017)</p> <p>Provision for provision for expansion of capacity would be secured through normal provisions , e.g. s106</p>

<p>Julie Moss (Bottesford Forum) (cont)</p>	<p>FC10</p>	<p>Health and emergency services Local Health services are already stretched but will need to cope with an estimated extra 1512 resident. The two GP surgeries have merged and struggle to cope with the demand of the registered 3414 active patients, and under current rules need to accept new patients even though the waiting time for appointments is around two weeks. The usual arguments apply to Bottesford as do many other remote rural locations for ambulance services feeding into the main hospital centres of Nottingham And Boston. Fire Services are initially called from outside the County – Lincolnshire (Grantham full-time), Nottinghamshire (Bingham retained), and finally Leicestershire (Melton full-time) – as the number of houses increases there will be a naturally higher risk placed on the safety of the Parish residents. Questions 18. How will Melton Borough Council mitigate the risks to residents’ health in relation to surgery capacity? 19. With even a slight increase in housing there is an associated increased risk of fire, so how does Melton Borough Council plan to mitigate the risk/emergency response? Personal safety and security There has been a recent marked increase in criminal activity that is related to remote rural locations. Question 23. With the recent increased investment through S106 how will Melton Borough Council ensure that subsequent CIL payments will improve the police coverage and effectiveness for the Bottesford?</p>	<p>Health service providers have been consulted at each stage of the Plan,. None have advised that their capacity is not, or cannot be expanded, to serve the proposed level of growth. ‘Focussed Changes’ proposes a reduced level of growth in Bottesford that previous iterations, which can only assist with these issues. Details are provided in the updates to site assessments (‘Service Centres Update to site assessments’ May 2017)Provision for provision for expansion of capacity would be secured through normal provisions , e.g. s106 The LRFS have advised that their services have sufficient capacity to serve the level of growth proposed without expansion being provided by development. The Police Authority and PCC have been consulted on the Plan and have made representations advising as to the infrastructure requirements required to maintain service levels. These would be secured through normal planning mechanisms such as s106, which require that they finds collected are dedicated to the location concerned, in the same manner as the circa. £42,000 from the Belvoir Rd development has been assigned. Funds for operational matters (‘revenue’) would be secured from normal revenue funding mechanisms linked to population, e.g tax precepts.</p>
<p>David G. Adams</p>	<p>IDP</p>	<p>The IDP has been changed so much it cannot be considered reliable data.</p>	<p>The IDP is a live document, therefore it was expected to change and it will continue to change moving forward to best provide for the Borough in a fluid way. This is standard practice across all IDP’s.</p>
<p>Anthony Rivero</p>	<p>IDP</p>	<p>Needs to include access proposals forMelton Mowbray Rail Station - neither network rail or the train operating companies are funded to carry out such enhancements and thus other sources of funding are required. Provides suggested text.</p>	<p>ARUP confirm this is appropriate. Add to IDP "Melton Mowbray Station - provision of step free access to both platforms - responsibility for delivery Network Rail/Train Operating Company - Timescale 2019-2024 (subject to DfT approval)-Estimated Cost £2 million - Funding CiL, DfT, LEP - Essential (to comply with the Equality Act 2010)."</p>
<p>Heather Cowley</p>	<p>FC10</p>	<p>Not enough provision for a range of infrastrcture in Melton Mowbray before new development happens . Suggests Six Hills as an alternative.</p>	<p>Policies SS4 and SS5 as amemded by the focused changes, together with Policies IN1, IN2 and IN3 as amended by the focused changes, provide for the range of infrastrcture needed to support new development in Melton Mowbray. An alternative spatial straegy was not the subject of focused changes.</p>
<p>Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services</p>	<p>FC10.2</p>	<p>Compliant with respect to references to Anglian Water Services network infrastructure improvements.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Highways England</p>	<p>Transport FC11 & FC10 Infrastructure</p>	<p>No concerns raised, as per the Presubmission Response. No comments on CIL.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>Laurence Holmes</p>	<p>FC10</p>	<p>In line with previous representations, it is imperative that sufficient flexibility is retained within the wording of Policy IN2 to ensure that the strategic link road can be potentially delivered in sections, as it may be necessary link its delivery to separate planning permissions within the NSN.</p>	<p>The IDP is a live document and it will be updated as the plan progresses. If it becomes necessary to split the relief road in the IDP, this can be accomplished.</p>

Laurence Holmes	FC10	In line with previous representations, it is imperative that sufficient flexibility is retained within the wording of Policy IN2 to ensure that the strategic link road can be potentially delivered in sections, as it may be necessary link its delivery to separate planning permissions within the NSN.	The IDP is a live document and it will be updated as the plan progresses. If it becomes necessary to split the relief road in the IDP, this can be accomplished.
Martin Lusty	FC10	We support this section	Support noted
Ray Ranns	FC10	As a Financial plan for providing infrastructure to meet development needs FC10.2 is deficient. There is no distinction between what is rectifying elements that are currently inadequate for the existing population and what is required for the increased population. There is no indication whether ARUP have based their assessments on HEDNA or have based it on the politically inspired 44% increase in dpa above those figures.	The proposals in the IDP are designed to accommodate the delivery of Melton Local Plan. Therefore the IDP uses the housing requirement of 245dpa and the delivery of the allocations proposed in the Local Plan.
Shout 4 Residents		Infrastructure (Delivery Plan) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lack of current capacity of the schools and health services now, if the houses are built first how will those services cope. • When the homes are built. At what stage are the schools and doctor surgeries taken in 	Through Section 106 agreements, monies are acquired from developments to pay for extensions to/new facilities to allow services to cope. -Education and Healthcare are considered through the planning stage, with any money required agreed as part of a Section 106 agreement.
Andrea Fiford	Infrastructure Melton Mowbray	another GP surgery needed and guidance needed on impact/demand for new school places. Highlights a range of problems with the existing one. Also indicates that the maternity unit, community hospital and minor injuries unit are a great attribute that should be valued and protected.	Modificatons will be proposed to provided more clarify on the developer contributions needed for scholl places. The CCGs have been consultated during plan preparation but have been unable to provide detials of any firm proposals that can be reflected inthe plan or teh related IDP.