



**MELTON LOCAL PLAN – PRE SUBMISSION DRAFT  
(NOVEMBER 2016)**

For official use only

Respondent Ref:

Date Received:

Melton Borough Council proposes to submit the Melton Local Plan (MLP) to the Secretary of State of Communities and Local Government for independent examination. Before submitting the MLP, the Council is required to publish the document and invite the public to make representations on its 'soundness'. The MLP, once adopted will be the development plan for Melton Borough.

This form has two parts:

- Part A: Personal Details
- Parts B and C: Your representation(s).

When making representations, **please use a separate Part B form for each policy or paragraph you wish to comment on. Before completing the form you should read the accompanying Guide to Making Representations.** Please ensure that your representation relates to the correct test of soundness (details can be found in the Guide to Making Representations)

Completed forms should be returned to the address below no later than **Monday 19<sup>th</sup> December, 2016. Representations received after this deadline will not be accepted.**

Planning Policy Team  
Regulatory Services  
Melton Borough Council  
Parkside, Station Approach  
Melton Mowbray  
Leicestershire  
LE13 1GH

Alternatively, you can access this form on the Council's website <http://www.melton.gov.uk/localplan/site/index.php> and print it out or complete it electronically and e-mail your response to [planningpolicy@melton.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@melton.gov.uk)

Representations can also be made via the Council's on-line consultation portal - <https://meltonboroughcouncil.citizenspace.com>

**PART A: ABOUT YOU/YOUR ORGANISATION** (If you are an agent, please complete the personal details of your client in 1 and complete agent's details in 2).

**1. Personal Details**

Full Name:

Richard D Chandler

Organisation (if applicable)

Address:

[Redacted Address]

Email:

[Redacted Email]

Contact Number:

[Redacted Contact Number]

**2. Agent's Details (If applicable)**

Full Name & Company:

David A Haston, Haston Reynolds Ltd

Organisation/Client Representations on Behalf Of

Richard D Chandler

Address:

Woodlands Barn  
Walton  
Telford  
Shropshire

Postcode:

TF6 6AN

Email:

[Redacted Email]

Contact Number:

[Redacted Contact Number]

Number of Representations Enclosed:

1

Signature:

[Redacted Signature]

Date:

19 December 2016

For official use only	
Respondent Ref:	Representation Ref:
Name/Organisation:	

**PART B: YOUR REPRESENTATION** (This section will need to be completed for each representation made. Please photocopy or download from the council's website Part B of the form as required.)

**3. Which part of the Melton Local Plan: Pre-Submission Draft does your representation relate to?** (Please enter the paragraph/policy number)

Paragraph:  Policy:  Policies Map:

**4. Do you consider that the Melton Local Plan: Pre-Submission Draft is?** (Please tick the appropriate box)

- |                                      |     |                          |    |                                     |
|--------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------|----|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Legally Compliant:                | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 2. Sound:                            | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Complies with Duty to Co-operate: | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

*\*The considerations in relation to the Local Plan being "sound" are explained in paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework. If you have entered "No" in relation to 4(2), please go to question 5. In all other circumstances, please go to question 6*

**5. Do you consider that the Melton Local Plan: Pre-Submission Draft is unsound because it is not any of the following?** (Please tick the appropriate box)

- |                        |                          |              |                                     |              |                                     |                                    |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Positively Prepared | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. Justified | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3. Effective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 4. Consistent with National Policy | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**6. Please give details of why you consider the Melton Local Plan: Pre-Submission Draft 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 the Melton Local Plan: Pre-Submission Draft or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments. (Please continue onto a separate sheet if you require more space)

Please see attached sheet (6 pages).

**7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan: Pre-Submission Draft legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 5 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: Pre-Submission Draft 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. (Please continue onto a separate sheet if you require more space)

Include the Canal Farm site (LONG5) delivering 40 dwellings, within the list of allocated housing sites under Policy C1(A) – Housing Allocations instead of within the list of Reserve Sites under Policy C1 (B).

Identify the Canal Farm site as a Housing Allocation Site on the Long Clawson (Housing Policies) Map.

**Please note:** Your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence necessary and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on this original representation.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector based on the matters and issues they identify at the examination.



8. 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? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Written Representations ☐

Participate at the Oral Examination ☒

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

It is considered that the matters raised within this representation have a fundamental bearing on the decision as to which sites in Long Clawson should be allocated and that they cannot be adequately dealt with by way of written representations.

**Please note:** The Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

### PART C: WHO YOU REPRESENT

To help us collate the responses to this consultation, we would be grateful if you could tell us which category best describes who you are representing (Please tick the appropriate box)

Melton Borough Resident ☐

Planning Agent/Planning Consultant ☐

Developer ☐

Utility/Service Provider ☐

Government Organisation ☐

Amenity Group ☐

Other Organisation ☐

Residents Group ☐

Business ☐

Town/Parish Council ☐

Other (Please state)

Do you want to have further involvement in the Melton Local Plan? (Please tick the appropriate boxes)

If you wish to be notified at the address/e-mail provided in Part A 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 in Part A 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

☒

If you/your organisation **do not** wish to be included in future consultations on the Melton Local Plan

☐

Thank you for taking the time to submit representations on the Melton Local Plan: Pre Submission Draft (November 2016). It should be noted that representations cannot be treated as confidential.

**PRE SUBMISSION DRAFT MELTON LOCAL PLAN  
REPRESENTATIONS BY R D CHANDLER, HIGHFIELD FARM, HOSE LANE, LONG CLAWSON**

**Response to Question 6**

The identification of Long Clawson as a Service Centre is appropriate and properly reflects the level and range of services and facilities within the settlement.

The principle of site allocations within Long Clawson and other Service Centre settlements is also supported.

The methodology used by the Council in arriving at the number of dwellings proposed for Long Clawson is noted.

It is noted that four sites in Long Clawson (LONG1, 2, 3 and 4) are proposed for Housing Allocations, whilst the Canal Farm site (LONG5) is proposed to be a Reserve Site.

The selection of sites for housing allocations in Long Clawson is however considered to be flawed, with insufficient regard having been given to significant benefits that would be derived from the allocation of the Canal Farm site (LONG5) within the *Site Assessments by Settlements* (Document SS51), whilst weight appears to have been attached to constraints in the delivery of that site which can be readily overcome.

Accordingly, it is considered that the Canal Farm site (LONG5) should be identified in the Local Plan as a Housing Allocation site rather than as a Reserve Site.

An Illustrative Masterplan for the redevelopment of the site has been prepared (in connection with an outline planning application) for up to 40 dwellings. A copy of the Illustrative Masterplan is attached for ease of reference (Drawing H0009-02-A3-SK-01).

Turning to the specific details within the *Site Assessments by Settlements*, the following observations are made in respect of the Canal Farm site:

**Meeting Identified Need**

The Council's Assessment of the Canal Farm site confirms that, in common with all of the other sites in Long Clawson, the development of the site will meet an identified need through the delivery of market and affordable housing.

However whilst each of the four sites proposed for allocation (LONG1, 2, 3 and 4) and the majority of the other sites assessed have been attributed a score of ++ (strong positive), the Canal Farm site has only been attributed a score of + (positive).

There does not appear to be any logical reason why the Canal Farm site should be attributed a lower score than the other sites given that it would deliver both market and affordable dwellings and in terms of the number of units, it sits comfortably within the range delivered by the sites proposed for allocation.

In light of the above, the assessment is flawed and overall performance of the Canal Farm site has been understated.

**PRE SUBMISSION DRAFT MELTON LOCAL PLAN  
REPRESENTATIONS BY R D CHANDLER, HIGHFIELD FARM, HOSE LANE, LONG CLAWSON**

Loss of Employment or Other Beneficial Use

One of the fundamental drivers behind the redevelopment of this site is its inherent unsuitability for accommodating the dairy herd of 300 milking cows and the need to relocate the enterprise to a more appropriate location on the farm. The background to current situation is provided at Section 2.1 of the attached Planning, Design & Access Statement (PDAS), whilst the benefits to the agricultural business from the residential redevelopment of the site are set out in paragraph 6.12.9 of the PDAS.

The redevelopment of the utilitarian Canal Farm site would help to provide the capital funding necessary to facilitate the relocation of the dairy herd and thereby secure the long term future of the agricultural business, together with the direct and indirect employment that it generates. Relocation would also facilitate the expansion of the dairy enterprise which cannot realistically be done at the Canal Farm site.

Accordingly, rather than attributing a – (negative) score, this Issue should have generated a ++ (strong positive) score.

In light of the above, the assessment is flawed and overall performance of the Canal Farm site has been understated.

Access Including Public Footpath Access

The Council has attributed a score of – (negative) to the Canal Farm site by virtue of a Highways objection to the outline planning application. The Assessment also notes a public right of way across the north of the site.

A detailed response has been submitted to the Highways Authority and the LPA (including a proposal for a financial contribution towards highway verge trimming at the junction between Canal Lane and Hose Lane despite this being an operation which is already the responsibility of the Highways Authority) which it is anticipated will resolve the Highways Authority's site specific concerns.

Contrary to commentary within the Council's Assessment, a public footpath does not cross the north of the site. A public footpath does pass to the north of the site and footpaths converge to the north east of the site. This is considered to be a positive attribute of the site given that the proposal includes a connecting permissive path which will facilitate and encourage pedestrian public access to the wider countryside to the north and north east of the village.

Accordingly, rather than attributing a – (negative) score, this Issue should have generated a + (positive) or ++ (strong positive) score.

In light of the above, the assessment is flawed and overall performance of the Canal Farm site has been understated.

**PRE SUBMISSION DRAFT MELTON LOCAL PLAN  
REPRESENTATIONS BY R D CHANDLER, HIGHFIELD FARM, HOSE LANE, LONG CLAWSON**

Heritage Assets

The assessment undertaken by Mayfield CA confirms that there are no designated buildings within the site, nor are there any designated buildings within the vicinity of the site and as a consequence there is no threat to the setting of any listed building. Furthermore the Mayfield CA assessment indicates that the archaeological potential of the site can only be assessed as low.

The Council's Assessment notes that the corner of the Canal Farm site abuts the Long Clawson Conservation Area and attributes a score of + (positive) in respect of this issue.

The Council's Assessment for site LONG2 similarly notes that that site adjoins the southern boundary of the Long Clawson Conservation Area. However, rather than just abutting at a single corner point, the full western, northern and eastern boundaries of the LONG2 site abut the Conservation Area. Notwithstanding this, the LONG2 site has been attributed a score of ++ (strong positive) within the Council's Assessment, despite that site's much greater physical interface with the Conservation Area

The Council's Assessment for site LONG3 notes that that site is adjacent to the Long Clawson Conservation Area, with some impact upon the setting of 3 listed buildings (of which two are II\*) and a Scheduled Ancient Monument which the NPPF confirms are designated heritage assets of the highest significance. Notwithstanding the striking differences in the heritage environment, the Council has assessed LONG3 as a + (positive) i.e. exactly the same score as the Canal Farm site.

Accordingly, the score for Canal Farm in respect of Heritage Issues should be ++ (strong positive). It certainly cannot be lower than that for LONG2 and has to be higher than that for LONG3.

Furthermore, the removal of a significant range of unsightly utilitarian farm buildings, concrete walled silage clamps, concrete yards and a slurry lagoon from the vicinity of the Conservation Area should warrant a higher score than that attributed to LONG2.

In light of the above, the assessment is flawed and overall performance of the Canal Farm site has been understated.

Flooding / Drainage

Unlike sites LONG1, LONG2 and LONG4, the Canal Farm site is already developed with a large range of utilitarian farm buildings, silage clamps, concrete yards etc.

Unlike those other sites, the redevelopment of the Canal Farm site will result in little if any overall increase in impermeable area and inherently will not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.

**PRE SUBMISSION DRAFT MELTON LOCAL PLAN  
REPRESENTATIONS BY R D CHANDLER, HIGHFIELD FARM, HOSE LANE, LONG CLAWSON**

Notwithstanding this, all surface water generated within the site would be attenuated on-site within an attenuation pool with a 1:100 year + 30% capacity and an outfall restricted to no more than 5 litres per second as set out in the attached Flood Risk Assessment.

The redevelopment of the Canal Farm site would consequently provide a significant improvement when compared with the existing situation.

Whilst the Council's Assessment has attributed a score of ++ (strong positive) to the Canal Farm site on this Issue, it has attributed exactly the same score to the LONG1 and LONG2 even though the Canal Farm site significantly out-performs them.

Whilst the Canal Farm score on this Issue is appropriate, all of the other sites (perhaps with the exception of LONG3) should have a lower score.

Landscape Designations

The Council appears to have confused 'Landscape designation' with 'Landscape classification' and has inappropriately used the Influence Report classifications as assessment criteria in their own right.

Indeed, the Council has, even then, not applied its criteria logically, attributing a score of - - (strong negative) to the Canal Farm site on the basis that the LCZ1 classification has a medium overall landscape sensitivity to residential development whilst attributing the same - - (strong negative) score to LONG1, 2, 3 and 4 despite the relevant LCZ2 designation having a medium to high landscape sensitivity to residential development. On that basis alone, the Canal Farm site should attract a higher score than all of the other four sites.

This criterion is not however suitable as an assessment tool given that it does not have regard to site specific factors such as whether the site is an undeveloped field or already contains a range of prominent built structures.

The attached Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Canal Farm site is more helpful in the consideration of Landscape Value (Local Level Value), Landscape Susceptibility (Low landscape susceptibility to accommodating the development proposed), effect on existing landscape features (medium beneficial), effects on landscape character (medium beneficial), with an overall scale of landscape/townscape effect assessed as medium beneficial over a medium geographical area and a long term period.

Furthermore, the redevelopment of the Canal Farm site would see not only the establishment of 180 metres of new hedgerows and 70 new native broadleaved trees on site, it would also deliver the establishment on a further 32 native broadleaved hedgerow trees off-site in other fields controlled by the applicants (see attached drawing H0009-02-A3-PL-05). This would be of long term benefit to the local landscape, well beyond the immediate setting of the site. The establishment of these off-site hedgerow trees would help to strengthen the character of the 'Village Pastures' landscape which was adversely affected by the loss of field hedgerow elm trees during the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

**PRE SUBMISSION DRAFT MELTON LOCAL PLAN  
REPRESENTATIONS BY R D CHANDLER, HIGHFIELD FARM, HOSE LANE, LONG CLAWSON**

On that basis, the Canal Farm site could reasonably expect to have a score of + (positive).

In light of the above, the assessment is flawed and overall performance of the Canal Farm site has been understated.

Visual Impact

The Council's Assessment attributes a score of + (positive) to sites LONG3, 4 and 5 on this Issue.

The commentary in each case however seems to focus on whether the development would be *'reasonably well related to the existing built-up form of the village.'*

This level of assessment is quite frankly too simplistic. Even at a basic level, one would have expected to see at least some acknowledgement that the Canal Farm site was already developed with a large range of unsightly utilitarian buildings. On that basis alone, it would have been reasonable to expect a higher score for the Canal Farm site than that for LONG4.

A detailed assessment of visual impact for the Canal Farm site is provided within the attached LVIA.

In light of the above, the assessment is flawed and overall performance of the Canal Farm site has been understated.

Noise or other pollutants

An Environmental Risk Assessment for the Canal Farm site has previously been submitted to the Council. This recommends: remediation of the former and existing agricultural fuel tank areas to reduce hydrocarbon levels in surface layers at those locations; undertaking an asbestos survey prior to demolition of the farm buildings and decommissioning of the slurry lagoon.

None of the recommendations are onerous, but any works that are required will help to improve the local environment and as such the scheme could be viewed as delivering beneficial environmental effects, particularly compared with the development of virgin greenfield sites.

Furthermore, the redevelopment of the Canal Farm site would facilitate the relocation of intensive agricultural operations and activities to a more appropriate location away from private residential properties. The re-development of the Canal Farm site would therefore deliver potentially significant benefits in terms of reductions in noise (machinery, equipment and cattle), odour (silage, fresh faeces and urine from cows together with stored slurry and dirty water) and agricultural vehicle movements within the immediate vicinity of the village.



**PRE SUBMISSION DRAFT MELTON LOCAL PLAN  
REPRESENTATIONS BY R D CHANDLER, HIGHFIELD FARM, HOSE LANE, LONG CLAWSON**

On that basis, the Canal Farm site should attract a score of ++ (strong positive) rather than +(positive) and should have a higher score than any of the other four sites.

In light of the above, the assessment is flawed and overall performance of the Canal Farm site has been understated.

Viability

The Council's Assessment fails to attribute any score to the Canal Farm site in respect of viability, although it does note flood risk and heritage constraints, neither of which is a constraint on this site at all.

The Canal Farm site should therefore attract a score of ++ (strong positive) in common with LONG1, 2 and 3.

In light of the above, the assessment is flawed and overall performance of the Canal Farm site has been understated.

Overall Summary

The Council's Assessment confirms that the site is suitable for allocation.

Given that the Council's Assessment has under-scored the Canal Farm site in relation to numerous Issues, it is evident that the Assessment for each of the five sites needs to comprehensively reviewed. It is considered that as a result of that review, the Canal Farm site will be shown to be significantly more suitable than the current Assessment portrays and that the Canal Farm site should be allocated for housing rather than being identified merely as a Reserve Site.

The allocation of the Canal Farm site would also offer the opportunity to more closely match adjusted settlement requirement (127) to housing allocations, particularly if the Canal Farm site was to replace one of the larger sites within the village.