

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
<u>Chapter 7</u>				
A.Thomas	See 7.1.1.....'The Borough of Melton is an attractive rural area that has a rich natural environment and built heritage. The area is valued by residents and visitors for its pleasant and tranquil environment and accessible countryside. It is important that the Local Plan ensures that these characteristics are maintained.'	Do not impose new housing estates into existing villages.	In order for Melton to grow sustainably some growth is required in the villages.	None.
Carl Powell	Again you should include the Leicester Round footpath, this time under 'green infrastructure'. Not logical or effective to protect Jubilee Way and not the Leicester Round.	Add the Leicester Round to green infrastructure	EN3(13) supports proposals which retain and enhance public rights of way. The Melton GI Strategy does not identify the Leicestershire Round as Primary Green Infrastructure, although it does recognise its importance.	None.
Caroline Louise Stuart	Paragraph 7.2.1 references an updated Biodiversity and Geo-diversity Study (2015, 2016) of the Borough. Paragraph 7.2.2 however, suggests the study only 'surveyed the suitable site options for development in and around Melton Mowbray and the ten largest villages' to identify where notable areas of significant habitat were present. The Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan does not confirm which are the ten largest villages, though on the basis of 4.2.7 I would expect these to be Service Centres and not Rural Hubs. Gaddesby, as defined as a Rural Hub, would not be one of these ten largest villages. I fail to therefore see how a housing allocation can be proposed for Gaddesby, when the Council's Biodiversity and Geo-diversity Study has not even assessed the impact on the village. Paragraph 7.2.2 is inconsistent, misleading and flawed in its application to Gaddesby village. A large part of the GADD2 site is subject to flooding. Further investigation into surface water and foul drainage solutions is required. In respect of the GADD3 site, the ground is clay heavy and as a result there is a lot of surface water retention and run-off from fields. The Pre-		7.2.2 to be modified to reflect the additional site assessments which were carried out for all Service Centres and Rural Hubs in the 2016 update to the Biodiversity and Geo-diversity Study.	Modification to 7.2.2

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	<p>Submission Draft Melton Local Plan makes no mention of any attempts to improve drainage facilities for existing properties, in acknowledgement of the impact additional housing allocation would cause. This potential risk has not been properly assessed. there are more suitable lower risk areas than those put forward in Gaddesby; in this respect the housing allocations at GADD2 and GADD3 are at odds with Paragraph 7.22.1. In respect of Biodiversity, Paragraph 7.2.1 of the Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan states that 'The Local Plan seeks to maintain and improve the natural environment and ensure that development proposals minimise negative impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains where possible'. As acknowledged in Appendix 1 (p25), the GADD2 site is '...relatively close to a Local Wildlife site', including the Gaddesby Brook. Appendix 1 (p24) suggests a site specific policy for GADD2, supporting housing allocation though only on the basis that '...there are no adverse impacts on the nearby Local Wildlife Site located in proximity to the eastern boundary'. It is understood that Gaddesby Brook contains white clawed crayfish which are a protected species. To comply with paragraph 7.2.1, further information about the likely ecological impact of the development of GADD2 needs to be provided so a judgement about suitability of the site for development can be made.</p>			
Colin Love	<p>These are excellent objectives and full support is given to the Areas of Separation between Bottesford and Easthorpe and Bottesford and Normanton. Draft Plan has eroded a section of the Area of Separation between Easthorpe and Bottesford that was indicated in the Emerging Options document. The Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan consultation process has indicated Parish support for the Areas of Separation as originally shown in the Emerging Options document. The Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan consultations are confirming</p>		The Bottesford -Easthorpe AoS has not been amended.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	existing and identifying further Green Areas within the Parish..			
Howard Blakebrough	This policy, which is fine in principle, flies completely in the face of a number of rural, SHLAA approved sites which will, by their very size, adversely affect landscape character, topography, trees hedges and dark spaces. it should make a presumption in favour of smaller, more integrated developments rather than large (30+ houses) in small villages.	See above	Development proposals will be required to mitigate potential adverse impacts on landscape, biodiversity, heritage and green infrastructure assets through design solutions which will be assessed against the policies in this plan.	Delete GADD2
Martin Lusty	In the emerging Neighbourhood Plan we have identified additional sites as Local Green Spaces plus 'Important Open Spaces' and additional sites of 'Environmental significance'. These were assessed using methodology shown in document 'WOTWATA Consolidated Environmental Inventory'. This document will be emailed separately.	We request that the Local Plan choices reflect the views of local people as expressed in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Allow for additional sites as identified in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.	Paragraph 1.9 explains how Neighbourhood Plans and the Local Plan are related and sets out that joint working is taking place.	None.
Merrill Wheeler	The Pre Submission Draft Plan neither respects the natural environment nor the built heritage, interfering with pasture, hedgerow, ridge and furrow, historic church long view, overburdening country lanes, possibly interfering with ecology of pond and stream, as well as increasing light, noise and traffic pollution as well as increased health and safety risk from traffic.		Development proposals will be required to mitigate potential adverse impacts on highways safety, landscape, biodiversity, heritage and green infrastructure assets through design solutions which will be assessed against the policies in this plan.	None.
Michelle Colclough	The "Areas of Separation" will be defunct if the developers are allowed to effectively join Burton Lazars with Melton town. Tranquillity, green space, habitat and dark skies will be		Masterplanning of the South Sustainable Neighbourhood will require that the AoS between	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	destroyed if the number of houses proposed to the edges of Melton go ahead.		Burton Lazars and Melton Mowbray is respected in accordance with Policy EN4.	
Natural England	Natural England has made comments on previous iterations of the Melton Local Plan including the emerging options draft plan so we have nothing further to add here except to welcome the chapter on Melton Borough's Environment (Chapter 7), including the extensive references to the maintenance and enhancement of a coherent green infrastructure network. It would be inappropriate for Natural England to comment on potential site allocations. We should like to take this opportunity to reiterate the advice in our letter of 29 March 2016 (attached) reminding Melton Borough Council of its duty to protect nationally and internationally designated nature conservation sites from the impacts of development. These sites include the Grantham Canal, the River Eye and Frisby Marsh Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), amongst others, which are protected under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (As Amended).		Noted	None.
Peter Wheeler	The Pre Submission Draft Plan neither respects the natural environment nor the built heritage, interfering with pasture, hedgerow, ridge and furrow, historic church long view, overburdening country lanes, possibly interfering with ecology of pond and stream, as well as increasing light, noise and traffic pollution as well as increased health and safety risk from traffic.		Development proposals will be required to mitigate potential adverse impacts on highways safety, landscape, biodiversity, heritage and green infrastructure assets through design solutions which will be assessed against the policies in this plan.	None.
Peter Wheeler	The Pre Submission Draft Plan neither respects the natural environment nor the built heritage, interfering with pasture, hedgerow, ridge and furrow, historic church long view, overburdening country lanes, possibly interfering with ecology of pond and stream, as well as increasing light, noise and traffic pollution as well as increased health and safety risk from traffic.		Development proposals will be required to mitigate potential adverse impacts on highways safety, landscape, biodiversity, heritage and green infrastructure assets through design solutions	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
			which will be assessed against the policies in this plan.	
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	7.16.6 There also tends to be lower winter temperatures in rural areas leading to higher heating energy requirements. This is critically important for Bottesford where the 'travel to work' distance is the furthest to Melton Mowbray and public transport provision is of very poor quality and is likely to continue to be poor and even reduced. Thus, a strong argument that Bottesford is NOT good in terms of environmental sustainability. 7.16.10 Modern high density developments seem to leave little space for trees and gardens so this might be a challenge.		EN3(E) encourages tree planting in all new development.	None.
Richard Simon	7.16.6 There also tends to be lower winter temperatures in rural areas leading to higher heating energy requirements. This is critically important for Bottesford where the 'travel to work' distance is the furthest to Melton Mowbray and public transport provision is of very poor quality and is likely to continue to be poor and even reduced. Thus, a strong argument that Bottesford is NOT good in terms of environmental sustainability. 7.16.10 Modern high density developments seem to leave little space for trees and gardens so this might be a challenge.		EN3(E) encourages tree planting in all new development.	None.
Susan Love	7.1.4 and 7.1.3 and 7.1.5 Fully support the 'Influence' study on areas of separation and landscape sensitivity. I welcome the MLP as a means of ensuring that development comes without ruining the beautiful landscape and village settings which are a feature of the Borough. 7.1.6 Dark skies. Pleased to see the input from the astronomical societies has been recognised. Can there be a way of lighting new development which sends light downwards and restricts the light spoiling the starry sky?		Lighting of new development must be considered in accordance with Policy EN1 and D1.	None.
Terence Joyce	To build on SOM2 and SOM 3 would go against all policies set out in chapter 7.	Take SOM2 & 3 out of housing	Development proposals will be required to mitigate potential	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		allocation.	adverse impacts on landscape, biodiversity, heritage and green infrastructure assets through design solutions which will be assessed against the policies in this plan.	
<b><u>EN1</u></b>				
Andrew Gore obo Mary A Donovan	Policy EN1 should include Historic Landscapes in its criteria. For example historic park land, a notable feature in the Borough is not overtly cited in Policy EN1; in Somerby Parish, it is a major historic landscape feature with park land at Burrough Hall, Burrough Hill House and Pinarium, the Grove, Somerby House, Somerby Hall (relict) and Pickwell Manor. A representation, submitted to the 4 April 2016 consultation (Appendix 2) and to the Conservation Officer, commented that the Fringe Sensitivity Study was flawed because it did not assess important natural and historic landscape areas in Somerby LCZ 1 and 4, which resulted in their suitability for development being increased. An amendment to the study was submitted using the study's criteria. The amendment is not reflected in the Draft Plan and no feedback was given. Appeal Decision APP/Y2430/A/14/2221470 (Single Turbine/Southfields Farm/Somerby. The documented evidence supporting the Appeal Decision does not appear to have been considered in the judgement that allocations SOM2 and SOM3, and the outline/full planning applications, were acceptable for development.		Historic landscapes are intrinsic to Landscape Character as assessed in the Landscape Character Assessment and the Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study. At Table 3.2 in the latter, criteria set out how historic landscape is considered. LCZ2 in Somerby identifies relict designed landscape comprising minor (unregistered) parkland, but the Study does not identify this as a feature of LCZ1 or LCZ4.	None.
Anthony Maher	Currently no buffer zone or compliance is shown around the Country Park on the plans which adheres to the above.	Be more specific on the issue of protection for the country park.	SS5 en3(B) requires that there is a protection zone between the Country Park and future development. This will need to be present on masterplans of the North Sustainable Neighbourhood	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
			in accordance with SS5 m4.	
Carl Powell	I agree. Particularly pleased to see 'dark skies' mentioned again. I'm an amateur astronomer but everybody looks at the stars. Move to the city and you'll miss them.	none	Noted.	None.
Caroline Louise Stuart	With respect to site GADD2 and proposal for a site for 30 houses, the site boundaries are not defined or contained by physical features e.g. by hedgerow or surrounding development. The site's northern and eastern boundaries are exposed, meaning the proposed housing development is likely to have an adverse visual impact on the wider countryside. '(...)it is recognised that there are elements where sensitivity is reduced, due to intrusion by more modern development at the northern and southern fringes of the LCZ with the settlement. However, there is limited opportunity for mitigation through further development without further intrusion upon the parkland character of the landscape' AoS, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity & LGS Study'. The likely adverse impact of the proposed housing allocation upon the character of the settlement and surrounding landscape has not been properly considered through the site assessment process. GADD2 provides the only long view to and from the Church. With respect to the GADD3 site, this would have an adverse visual impact on the entrance to and exit from the village and on the wider countryside. The likely adverse impact upon the existing settlement and surrounding landscape has not been assessed. Policy EN1 is inconsistent in its application to Gaddesby village, a housing allocation would directly contradict point 4 (p98) in particular.		In respect of GADD3 development proposals would need careful design and layout in order to avoid adverse visual impacts when arriving from Rotherby Road.	Deletion of GADD2
Catherine J.G. Pugh	Housing built on BOT5 would spoil the precious views of the village which can be seen from Palmer's, or Beacon Hill. At present the view from the top of the hill gives a sweep across the conservation area of the village, clustered round St. Mary	Building on BOT5 would destroy the rural setting of the village and the distinctive	The design of development proposals for BOT5 will be required to be sensitive to its landscape setting and views into the village. This may be achieved through	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	the Virgin and its famous spire, to the ridge and Belvoir Castle.	character of its landscape and heritage. If Bottesford's famous church is not to disappear into a housing estate this site should not be considered.	appropriate size, scale, density, landscaping and lighting of the development.	
Colin Love	I support the Landscape and Fringe Settlement Sensitivity Study by Influence (commissioned by MBC) that emphasises the importance of areas of separation and minimising urbanising influences on settlement fringes. This is particularly relevant to the area to the south east of Bottesford and towards Easthorpe that they have identified as an area of high overall landscape sensitivity. Respecting this assessment of Landscape Character Zone 3 is of paramount importance to ensure the rural setting the Bottesford and Easthorpe.		Noted.	None.
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Asfordby Parish Council)	The Melton Local Plan (Publication version) Policy EN1 makes several references to the Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study. This effectively confers policy or Supplementary Planning Document status onto a document that has not been subject to the appropriate scrutiny.	Melton Local Plan (Publication version) Policy EN1 be amended by deleting references to the Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study.	It is recognised that future more up to date evidence may supersede that in the Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 where appropriate and this is reflected in a proposed modification to Policy EN5.	Modification to clarify that the 'Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study' can be superseded.
Dr Neil James Fortey	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	Site BOT5 should be removed.	The design of development proposals for BOT5 will be required to be sensitive to its landscape	None.



Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	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.		setting and views into the village. This may be achieved through appropriate size, scale, density, landscaping and lighting of the development.	
Howard Blakebrough	Reasons very much as in previous section. Developments which fit in with the local environment/topography etc. should be encouraged rather than single, large developments of houses which have a significant adverse effect on the landscape. This is especially true in villages.	See above	EN1 requires proposals to respond to design guidance set out in The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 in order to mitigate potential harm.	None.
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology )	Policies EN1 Landscape, EN 3 Green Infrastructure, EN6 Settlement Character and EN13 Heritage Assets are all mutually supportive. It is important to recognise the inter-relatedness of the environment, and similarly the multiple opportunities and shared beneficial outcomes presented by working across the various environmental areas.		Noted.	None.
Martin Lusty	In the emerging Neighbourhood Plan we have identified additional sites as Local Green Spaces plus 'Important Open Spaces' and additional sites of 'Environmental significance'. These were assessed using methodology shown in document 'WOTWATA Consolidated Environmental Inventory'. St Mary the Virgin Churchyard, Thorpe Arnold St Mary Magdalene Churchyard, Waltham Medieval village earthworks Waltham village playing field Thorpe Arnold cricket ground Churchyard extension Parish Council Allotments Fields to west of Bescaby Lane adjacent to Twells Road, opposite Doctors Surgery and the Manor. Fields South of Mill Lane and east of Manor Court and Fair Field Field 1357 east of Melton Road Village orchard off Goadby Road Disused railway line Malt House Green 'memorial garden' Field south of the Rectory and east of the A607 and north of Freeby Lane Copse and rough ground with small pond north of Goadby Road	We request that the Local Plan choices reflect the views of local people as expressed in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Allow for additional sites as identified in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.	Paragraph 1.9 explains how Neighbourhood Plans and the Local Plan are related and sets out that joint working is taking place.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
Melanie Steadman	4 of the 6 SHLLA sites in Long Clawson are not sensitive to historical areas of separation. They would all "crowd" in the village - block the view of the escarpment from the village, block the view of the historic village from the footpaths that criss-cross the vale and to stick 55 houses, at high density on one plot in a village that has an historic "linear design" is not being sensitive to the current setting.	Re-assessment of sites based on a thorough Sustainability Appraisal. More sensitivity to each village's individual characteristic instead of blanket policies that are not tailored to individual requirements of a settlement.	EN1 requires proposals to respond to design guidance set out in The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 in order to mitigate potential harm. LONG4 is within LCZ2 and at 4.126 the study states: "There is opportunity to accommodate some sensitively designed development in proximity to the existing settlement edge, which takes into consideration the existing, generally well integrated edge character of the historic settlement form;"EN6 supports proposals which do not harm settlement character.	None.
Michelle Colclough	Building on green field land should not be the first choice like it is here!		The housing requirement for Melton requires that greenfield land is developed.	None.
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	Supported		Noted.	None.
Richard Simon	Supported		Noted.	None.
Susan Love	Fully support the role of NPs in achieving these objectives.		Noted.	None.
Terence Joyce	Any build on SOM2 (Somerby) would have maximum negative effect on Policy EN1. Below is extract from my letter to Melton Borough Council Planners dated 23rd October 2016 : "This new proposal is arguably set among the most outstanding part of Somerby in terms of beauty and tranquillity ... as it comprises a riding school, grazing land, children's play area and local	Take SOM2 out of housing allocation.	EN1 requires proposals to respond to design guidance set out in The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 in order to mitigate potential harm. SOM2 is	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	country walks ,not to mention wild life. .”		within LCZ4 and at 4.198 the study states: "There is opportunity to accommodate some sensitively designed development in proximity to the existing settlement edge, which takes into consideration the existing, generally well integrated edge character of the historic settlement form;"	
Richard Crosthwaite (Gladman Developments)	Policy EN1 acknowledges that Melton is unconstrained by national landscape designations, and the approach of the policy to set out criteria against which development shall be assessed is welcomed; however, the terms of the policy set an unnecessarily high bar considering the absence of landscape designations in the Borough. At present the Policy could readily be misinterpreted as seeking no harm at all, as it includes phrases such as, “proposals will be supported where they do not adversely affect important landscape features...” It is rarely the case that development can occur without some adverse effect on landscape features (e.g. the removal of sections of hedgerow to allow for access). The test of the policy should therefore be that proposals shall be supported where they would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on important landscape features. Similarly, the tests of the policy should be to seek enhancement of the countryside where possible. It is often the case that landscape mitigation can be provided, but achieving an enhancement is somewhat subjective and it is not always possible. Finally, considering the absence of statutory and non-statutory landscape designations in the Borough, the approach of the policy should be one of conservation (i.e. managing change positively), rather than one of protection, which can be misinterpreted as being entirely preclusive of new development.	For ease of reference Policy EN1 is reproduced with suggested changes below: The character of Melton Borough’s landscape and countryside will be conserved and, where possible, enhanced by: 1. Ensuring new development is sensitive to its landscape setting and that it seeks, where possible, to enhance the distinctive qualities of the landscape character type (as defined in the Landscape Character	NPPF para 109 states: "The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes....". The countryside in Melton is valued by the local community, but does not benefit from any landscape designations, therefore the suggested changes are supported.	Modification as per suggested change.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		<p>Assessment); and            II. Requiring new developments to respect existing landscape character and features. Proposals will be supported where they do not have an unacceptable adversely affect effect upon important landscape features including: 1. Distinctive topography; 2. Important trees, hedges and other vegetation features; 3. Important ponds, watercourses &amp; other water areas; 4. Important views, approaches and settings. In addition, new developments will be supported where they: 5. Do not have an unacceptable</p>		

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		<p>adversely affect effect upon an area's sense of place and local distinctiveness; and</p> <p>6. Do have an unacceptable adverse effect upon areas of tranquillity, including those benefiting from dark skies, unless proposals can be adequately mitigated through the use of buffering..."</p> <p>...Neighbourhood Plans will be encouraged to use evidence provided in the 'Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study' to inform site allocations and design guidance, to ensure that the Borough's landscape will be</p>		

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		conserved and, where possible, enhanced.		
<b>EN2</b>				
Carl Powell	In this policy the Council places no clear specific obligation on itself or developers to offset housing development with 'net gains for nature' or 'habitat creation'. Housing development is almost always a net loss for 'nature' (brownfield sites a possible exception). You must increase the amount of protected habitat in some measured proportion to the amount of land on which you permit building.	I propose a percentage of land area derived from the size of all land allocated for building (possibly adjusted for assessed biodiversity value of the land lost).	It cannot be assumed that housing development will always result in net losses for nature or that greenfield land supports habitats more than brownfield. EN2 makes provision for mitigation and compensation of loss to any priority habitats and species caused by development proposals.	None.
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Asfordby Parish Council)	National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 117 requires Local Planning Authorities to 'identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation'. The local ecological network, as identified by Melton Local Plan (Publication version) Policy EN2 is not identified on the Policies Map.	The Melton Local Plan (Publication version) Policies Map be modified to identify the local ecological networks referred to in Policy EN2.	Ecological Networks are shown on the interactive policies map at a modified scale in order to show them as an indicative/strategic layer.	None.
LCC (Highways, Education, Early Years, Waste, Property Assets, LLFA, Libraries & Culture, LRERC)	Biodiversity, Leicestershire & Rutland Environmental Records Centre . Comments provided by the Leicestershire & Rutland Environmental Records Centre at the Options stage earlier in 2016 are still relevant and officers from the L&R Environmental Records Centre continue to liaise with officers at Melton Borough Council on these matters.		Noted.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
Lance Wiggins (on behalf of G S Developments (Leicester) Ltd	Biodiversity and Geodiversity seeks to achieve net gains for nature and provide for habitat creation as part of development proposals. The draft policy has set out as a criteria based policy, which includes criterion c) relating to the creation of new habitats, which is supported. My clients own land at Lake Terrace in Melton Mowbray, which is being promoted as a development site. It is envisaged that the creation of the development site will include the creation of a new and a replacement habitat following the removal of a section of the former railway embankment at the rear of the site. The former embankment has no statutory protection although it is understood that this area is designated as a local wildlife area. My clients will take advice from their ecological advisors on the make up of this new habitat to enhance that species diversity is increased as a result of the proposals.		Noted.	None.
Martin Lusty	In the emerging Neighbourhood Plan we have identified additional sites as Local Green Spaces plus 'Important Open Spaces' and additional sites of 'Environmental significance'. These were assessed using methodology shown in document 'WOTWATA Consolidated Environmental Inventory'. St Mary the Virgin Churchyard, Thorpe Arnold St Mary Magdalene Churchyard, Waltham Medieval village earthworks Waltham village playing field Thorpe Arnold cricket ground Churchyard extension Parish Council Allotments Fields to west of Bescaby Lane adjacent to Twells Road, opposite Doctors Surgery and the Manor. Fields South of Mill Lane and east of Manor Court and Fair Field Field 1357 east of Melton Road Village orchard off Goadby Road Disused railway line Malt House Green 'memorial garden' Field south of the Rectory and east of the A607 and north of Freeby Lane Copse and rough ground with small pond north of Goadby Road	We request that the Local Plan choices reflect the views of local people as expressed in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan . Allow for additional sites as identified in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.	Paragraph 1.9 explains how Neighbourhood Plans and the Local Plan are related and sets out that joint working is taking place.	None.
Michelle Colclough	How can building on green field land achieve "net gains" for nature. Remove the ridiculous management consultant speak!		It cannot be assumed that housing development will always result in net losses for nature or that	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
			greenfield land supports habitats more than brownfield. EN2 makes provision for mitigation and compensation of loss to any priority habitats and species caused by development proposals.	
Nick Sandford	We welcome the strong protection given to ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees in Policy EN2	n/a	Noted.	None.
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	Supported		Noted.	None.
Richard Simon	Supported		Noted.	None.
Susan Love	Insist on holes for hedgehogs at the bottom of panel fencing on new estates. Encourage the planting of hedges on new estates and discourage 6' panel fencing along back gardens which creates no new habitat for wildlife.	Add a policy on fencing on new estates - hedgehog friendly. And encourage more hedgerows on these estates for wildlife.	EN2(F) supports proposals which use fencing that incorporates holes for wildlife.	None.
Terence Joyce	Any build on SOM2 will have maximum negative effect on Policy EN2 as the whole of SOM2 is within and part of the "Primary Green Infrastructure" known as "Jubilee Way" . See my comments in policy EN3.	Take SOM2/3 out of housing allocation	Proposals for SOM2/3 will be required to retain and enhance Jubilee Way in accordance with EN3.	None.
<b>EN3</b>				
Andrew Gore obo Mary A Donovan	Burrough Hills, rather than Burrough Hill 'Country Park' should be defined and adopted as the primary GI space in the southern region of the Borough and its policies applied throughout. Burrough Hills includes Somerby Parish, particularly the escarpment landscapes including those west and south which join up with the High Leicestershire area of Harborough District.		Burrough Hill Country Park, as an Ancient Monument and important archaeological site is protected by Policy EN13. The Melton Green Infrastructure Strategy identifies Primary Green Infrastructure,	None.



Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	Landscape and other studies would support GI value, including the Melton & Rushcliffe Study which rates the Burrough Hills as having 'quiet remote rural qualities compared to other areas within the borough.' A representation outlining the GI assets of Somerby Parish, their contribution to tourism and community value was submitted 4 April, 2016 by Mrs. Ros Freeman and again appears to have been ignored by the Council. Burrough Hill Country Park is first and foremost an Ancient Monument and important archaeological site. The risk to Burrough Hill heritage value will increase with population growth unless addressed in the Plan. Enhancement schemes should be supported only where they preserve and enhance the Significance of this important heritage asset as a priority.		which does not include Burrough Hills. This does not mean that the GI assets of Somerby are ignored by the Local Plan. Important GI elements are identified in EN3 for retention and enhancement.	
Carl Powell	Should include the Leicestershire Round	Add the Leicestershire Round	The Jubilee Way, devised to mark the Queen's Silver Jubilee, connects the Leicestershire Round at Burrough Hill Country Park with the Viking Way at Woolsthorpe. Melton GI Strategy does not identify The Leicestershire Round as Primary Green Infrastructure, although it does recognise its importance. EN3(13) supports proposals which retain public rights of way.	None.
Charnwood Borough Council	Charnwood Borough Council notes and welcomes the inclusion of the River Wreake corridor as part of the green infrastructure network which connects with that also identified in the Charnwood Core Strategy as an infrastructure corridor.		Noted.	None.
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Asfordby	The Melton Local Plan (Publication version) Policies Map identifies some, but not all of the Melton Green Infrastructure Network referred to in Policy EN3.	The Melton Local Plan (Publication version) Policies Map be modified	EN3(2) Areas of Separation are not included but can be accessed on the policies map under Areas of Separation. All other Primary GI	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
Parish Council)		to identify the Melton Green Infrastructure Network referred to in Policy EN3.	areas are identified on the map using the Primary GI tab.	
David Adams	The proposed extent of the northern development and associated Link Road is contradictory to this stated desire of protecting and enhancing the Country Park. In the evidence base I found nothing from QE2 Fields in Trust.		SS5 en3(B) requires that there is a protection zone between the Country Park and future development. This will need to be present on masterplans of the North Sustainable Neighbourhood in accordance with SS5 m4.	None.
Friends of Melton Country Park	We consider that any development to the north and east of the country park will have a detrimental effect on the wildlife corridors and destroy the views from the east and north of the park. The park now has Qe2 fields in trust status and recently the whole of the park has been designated a local wildlife site. We do not wish to comment on any other aspects of the plan (IN1 aside) as we are only interested in the protection of the park. Attached in support of submission: Appendix (a) a list of flora and fauna recorded by Chris Hughes, a lecturer in ecology, on the land between the country park and Melton Spinney Road. Appendix (b) a bat survey carried out by Leicestershire and Rutland Bat group Appendix (c) a botanical report on Melton Country Park to support the application for Local Wildlife Site status for the whole of the park, compiled by Paul Greene-Master of Horticulture (RHS) - lecturer at Brooksby Melton College Appendix (d) pps 74 and 76 of the biodiversity report carried out by AMEC for the Core Strategy, which we believe is still relevant, with the paragraphs relating to the country park highlighted.		SS5 en3(B) requires that there is a protection zone between the Country Park and future development. This will need to be present on masterplans of the North Sustainable Neighbourhood in accordance with SS5 m4.	None.
Howard Blakebrough	Point 14 refers to the importance of preserving sports pitches, but yet in Somerby 023/16 is recommended to be built on the	Policy fine, just ensure that other	The NPPF does make allowances for the development of playing	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	existing play area and sports field.	elements of this plan are consistent with it	fields, however any subsequent planning application, despite allocation should have due regard for those caveats in paragraph 74 of the NPPF and Local Plan Policy EN3(14) and Policy EN7 which protect playing pitches.	
James Keith Hamilton	The “Leicestershire Round “ is the most prominent and well used public rights of way. Policy EN3/15 and 17 MBC have not undertaken any thorough research yet on potential archaeological sites and historic parkland. I strongly object to the following sites being included in the local plan for SOM 1,2 & 3 (Reserve site) for this reason.		The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 identifies relict designed landscape comprising minor (unregistered) parkland in LCZ2 in Sombery, but the Study does not identify this is as a feature of LCZ1 or LCZ4.	None.
John Coleman	Policy EN3 stresses the importance of inclusivity in any new or enhanced green infrastructure corridors and assets. To give practical effect to this, item (C) should be reinforced by adding the wording indicated in 4 below.	Item (C) provide high quality bridleways .....and villages; should be reinforced by adding the clause: such routes to be equally accessible to equestrians, walkers and cyclists wherever practicable.	No modification required, as it is not always appropriate to have rights of way equally accessible in this way.	None.
K Lynne Camplejohn	The policy does not make any reference to a neighbourhood plan, if there is one for that area, so it fails on duty to cooperate.	To comply with duty to cooperate include a reference to the neighbourhood plan.	Paragraph 1.9 explains how Neighbourhood Plans and the Local Plan are related and sets out that joint working is taking place.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	Policies EN1 Landscape, EN 3 Green Infrastructure, EN6 Settlement Character and EN13 Heritage Assets are all mutually supportive. It is important to recognise the inter-relatedness of the environment, and similarly the multiple opportunities and shared beneficial outcomes presented by working across the various environmental areas.		Noted	None.
Lilian Coulson	We support the principle of the policy as it encourages good practice and the retention and enhancement of green infrastructure in the local environment. If worked in a positive way in conjunction with policy EN4 (see our comments below), this could result in positive enhancements to the environment as part of development proposals and these opportunities should be exploited as part of good design wherever practicable. As referred to in our submission on policies C1(A) and C1(B), sites where such benefits can be accrued such as at my client's land adjacent to 8 Easthorpe Road, Bottesford, these opportunities to create new greenspace and improved safer footpath / cycle linkages for the benefit of the wider community should not be ignored and policies that encourage such opportunities must be a material consideration when assessing the benefits of such proposals in due course.		Noted	None.
Martin Lusty	In the emerging Neighbourhood Plan we have identified additional sites as Local Green Spaces plus 'Important Open Spaces' and additional sites of 'Environmental significance'. These were assessed using methodology shown in document 'WOTWATA Consolidated Environmental Inventory'. St Mary the Virgin Churchyard, Thorpe Arnold St Mary Magdalene Churchyard, Waltham Medieval village earthworks Waltham village playing field Thorpe Arnold cricket ground Churchyard extension Parish Council Allotments Fields to west of Bescaby Lane adjacent to Twells Road, opposite Doctors Surgery and the Manor. Fields South of Mill Lane and east of Manor Court and Fair Field Field 1357 east of Melton Road Village orchard off	We request that the Local Plan choices reflect the views of local people as expressed in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Allow for additional sites as identified in the emerging	Paragraph 1.9 explains how Neighbourhood Plans and the Local Plan are related and sets out that joint working is taking place.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	Goadby Road Disused railway line Malt House Green 'memorial garden' Field south of the Rectory and east of the A607 and north of Freeby Lane Copse and rough ground with small pond north of Goadby Road	Neighbourhood Plan.		
Michelle Colclough	Building a new bypass and extra road infrastructure is not particularly green.....		The MMDR will be part of The Melton Transport Strategy which includes Modal Shift Support, as set out in the IDP.	None.
Nick Sandford	We support the approach to maintaining and extending Melton's green infrastructure network which is outlined in this policy. The policy and supporting text sets out the wide range of benefits which can be provided by green infrastructure, of which trees and woodland are a key component. We particularly welcome your intention to use the Woodland Trust's Access to Woodland Standard as a means of calculating the amount of new woodland which may be required. Please contact us if you would like to discuss the implications of the access standard in more detail or if you would like to work with us and/or private developers on delivery of the new woodland. Although street trees are not included in the access to woodland standard, it is important to bear in mind that they can also be important in providing benefits to local people as part of new development.	n/a	Noted	None.
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	Supported		Noted	None.
Richard Simon	Supported		Noted	None.
Ros Freeman	In Somerby, we want to preserve the landscapes to the south and the historical parklands, we want to increase the already thriving tourist base, we want to enhance heritage settings Som3 as suitable(even as a reserve site) goes against this policy.	the policy must be adhered to by making the selection of sites	The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 identifies relict designed landscape	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		compliant and this is not the case for Som3	comprising minor (unregistered) parkland in LCZ2 in Sombery, but the Study does not identify this as a feature of LCZ1 or LCZ4.	
Sport England	We are particularly pleased to see references to the Playing Pitch Strategy. We support Policy EN3 part 14.		Noted	None.
Terence Joyce	SOM2 will have maximum negative effect on Policy EN3 as SOM2 is within and therefore part of the “Priority Green Infrastructure” known as “Jubilee Way”. As stated in last paragraph of EN3 Policy. Somerby already has two alternative sites in planning stage namely SOM1 and SOM3 also 12 in planning Church lane and 3 in Build Manor Lane. No planning application has gone in for SOM2.	The plan should recognise SOM2 is within “Jubilee Way” (Priority Green Infrastructure) and in doing so take SOM2 out of housing allocation.	Development proposals for SOM2 will be required to enhance and retain Jubilee Way as per EN3(4) and EN3(13).	None.
Tracey Watts	The whole of the SOM 2 site comes within the Primary Green Infrastructure area. This site is adjacent the very important footpath Leicestershire Round. This site should be promoted as a destination, with circular access and improved signage. In respect of Leicestershire Round the MBC Green Infrastructure strategy document states on page 71 “Planning policy should seek to refuse development deemed to compromise the network function and/or future function”. The Leicestershire Round is the County’s main long distance footpath. The Green Infrastructure Strategy for Melton Borough Nov 2011 page 25 states “Promoted paths such as the Melton Way, Leicestershire Round and National Cycle Network Routes are also important elements of Melton’s visitor infrastructure”. I believe there is a very strong case for the land under SOM 2 to be designated local green space due to its heritage and tranquil setting. SOM 2 will disrupt the movement of wildlife between the important local wildlife sites historic woods Owston, areas North of Somerby (Somerby Meadows) and between Somerby and Burrough. It is adjacent to important ecological sites the	I would argue for the extension of the existing Somerby Conservation area by at least one field which would fit with the “Enhanced Green Spaces within and around our settlements also allows for contact for people with nature and increases the permeability of urban areas for wildlife” Page 9 B of the Melton	. The Council acknowledges that its existing CAAs are due for revision and it proposed that the wording will be amended in para 7.23.2. Development proposals for SOM2 will be required to enhance and retain rights of way as per EN3(13). SOM2 does not meet the criteria for LGS designation, as it is an extensive tract of land. The integrity of the ecological network running to the western edge of Somerby will not be harmed by residential development to the south of Somerby, but development proposals will be required to enhance and mitigate for in accordance with Policy EN2 and the evidence in the Melton	Refer to Minor Modification for site specific policy SOM2: Add "A heritage assessment is provided with impacts assessed and suitable mitigation measures identified. This should pay particular attention to the effect of the development proposal on the Conservation Area, the setting of adjacent listed buildings and potential archaeological interests;" to Policy Som 2. Modification to para 7.23.2.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	Earthworks Grasslands, Somerby Meadow and Southfields Farm. SOM 2 is directly on the Ecological Network and is contrary to Policies EN3 and EN2. SOM 2 MBC/23/16 is noted as a ridge and furrow field however it also indicates evidence of previous earthworks and medieval activity. The site seems to be more complex than ridge and furrow containing interesting hollows and mounds.	Green Infrastructure Strategy 2011. I believe there is a very strong case for the land under SOM 2 to be designated local green space due to its heritage and tranquil setting.	Biodiversity and Geo-diversity Study for SOM2.	
<b>EN4</b>				
Mrs Joyce Noon - CPRE Leicestershire	We refer to the Areas of Separation (et al) Report (Part 1/ 2015, Part 2/ 2016 ) ( Influence ). The reports shows previous (recorded) adopted AOS maps, clearly identifying the areas with well-defined boundaries. Policy EN4. The revised maps show a 'zig-zag line' without boundaries. EN4 (C) Safeguard the individual character of Settlements: would be unable to be capable of protecting against the incursion of new development into open countryside and outside settlements.	CPRE would seek to amend the maps to those with defined boundaries.	Defined boundaries could prevent development which would neither harm character nor result in coalescence and are therefore considered to be an overly restrictive tool which is inconsistent with positive planning. AoS do not have a defined boundary because their purpose is not to prevent any development within the AoS, but to prevent development which would result in coalescence and harm to individual settlement character.	None.
Andrew Gore obo Mary A Donovan	Areas of Separation (AoS) for all Development Centres should be set in the Draft Plan. The AoS between Somerby and Pickwell is not defined in the Draft Plan. Largely historic park land, the Influence Study recommended it inappropriate for development. However, it is now subject to a residential/commercial planning application (hearing 22/12/16). It is probable that historic landscape, tranquillity,		Policy EN4 is a two-tier policy which firstly sets out that coalescence should be avoided between settlements. The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 assesses the area to	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	and local distinctiveness will be lost because no AoS policy has been set for rural Development areas.		the north of Somerby (LCZ2) as being of medium-high sensitivity with reduced opportunity for development. It is considered that Policy EN4 and Policy EN1 provide sufficient protection for the area of relict (unregistered) parkland north of Somerby without the need for defining an AoS.	
Anthony Paphiti	In order to preserve the character of Great Dalby and the historically significant Thor Missile site on the Melton Airfield, an area of separation should be established for the village. The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 concluded that an AoS between Great Dalby and Melton Mowbray was not required. This is inconsistent and arbitrary when one considers the case of Burton Lazars where an AOS has been approved.	To implement an Area of Separation between Great Dalby and the northern end of Melton Airfield to protect the village and the Historically significant Thor Missile site.	The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 concludes that an AoS between Great Dalby and Melton Mowbray is not justified. At 4.28 it states "The prominent topography, level of visual prominence and medium to large scale landscape pattern is sufficiently removed from the more intimate settlement pattern that it would be inappropriate for development that would lead to coalescence of the settlements". This is not inconsistent with the conclusion that the AoS between Burton Lazars and Melton Mowbray is required where the area is sensitive to development and important for maintaining the individual character of the two settlements.	None.
Colin Love	I fully support the concept of Areas of Separation, but the Bottesford and Easthorpe AoS has been eroded in this Draft Plan.	Given its categorisation both as an Area of	There has been no change in the Bottesford-Easthorpe AoS. It is of the same extent in both the	None.



Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		Separation and of a High Landscape Sensitivity, this eroded section be re-instated.	Emerging Options Draft Local Plan and the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.	
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Asfordby Parish Council)	Melton Local Plan (Publication version) Policy EN4 fails to identify land between Asfordby Hill and Asfordby Valley as an Area of Separation. Over 70% of households that responded to the Asfordby Parish Neighbourhood Plan survey wanted to see the countryside between settlements protected due to concerns about loss of community identity through the coalescence of settlements. The settlement of Asfordby Hill is distinctly separate from Asfordby Valley and is surrounded by open countryside. As the area between Asfordby Hill and The Valley slopes significantly and there are extensive views from the south, any development of this area would have an impact on the quality of the surrounding countryside and affect the existing relationship with the Valley. This matter was considered by Appeal Ref: APP/Y2430/A/14/2228080 Land adjacent to 39 Melton Road, Asfordby Hill, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire LE14 3QX where an appeal against a refusal to grant outline planning permission for 28 residential properties with associated parking facilities and new vehicular access off Melton Road, Asfordby Hill was dismissed. The inspector noted: 'New dwellings on the site would be largely contained in views from the south and east by existing dwellings, while the site is contained to the north by the railway. They would, however, even with landscaping to the front of the site, be clearly visible in the outlook from dwellings on Brook Crescent, and from the recreation ground, in Asfordby Valley below as well as from Melton Road on the approach to the village. They would markedly extend the built form of Asfordby Hill to the north, across the open hillside, and appear as an incongruous block of development that would be seen as an incursion into	Melton Local Plan (Publication version) Policy EN4 be modified to include the area between Asfordby Hill and Asfordby Valley.	The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 concludes that an AoS between Asfordby Hill and Asfordby Valley is not required. At 4.71 it states "The area identified within the ADAS (2006) report is considered to have limited sensitivity to development. The settlements have similar characteristics to each other and are perceptibly seen as one settlement. It is not necessary to designate this area".	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	the village's rural setting.'			
Diane Orson	Whilst I support the above policy I do not think it goes far enough	Separation between settlements is essential but within settlements existing green areas should not be compromised to such a way as they change that community	This issue is addressed through Policy EN5 and EN6.	None.
Dr Ian Chappell	NPPF Paragraph 154. "...Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan." The zig-zag lines used are not acceptable to describe Areas of Separation.	The zig-zag lines used to indicate Areas of Separation in the Melton Borough Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study (Influence, 2015) should not be repeated in the Local Plan documents but should be replaced by clearly delineated areas. This should particularly apply to Figure 7, The Southern Sustainable	Defined boundaries could prevent development which would neither harm character nor result in coalescence and are therefore considered to be an overly restrictive tool which is inconsistent with positive planning. AoS do not have a defined boundary because their purpose is not to prevent any development within the AoS, but to prevent development which would result in coalescence and harm to individual settlement character. Masterplanning of the South Sustainable Neighbourhood will require that the AoS between Eye Kettleby and Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars and Melton Mowbray are respected in accordance with Policy EN4.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		Neighbourhood Concept Map.		
Gareth Evans	Strongly agree with the protection of separate identities of Scalford and Thorpe Arnold.		Noted.	None.
Guy Longley, Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Development	For the Melton South Sustainable Neighbourhood, Figure 7 shows these Areas of Separation indicatively. It is considered that the proposed Areas of Separation should be more clearly defined. The annotations presented in Figure 7 are imprecise and do not reflect the evidence available that demonstrates that development to the South of Melton can take place without threatening the separate identities of Burton Lazars or Eye Kettleby. this is contained in our submissions to the Emerging Options plan and in support of Davidsons' outline application for 1,500 homes to the south of Melton.	The plan should be amended to show more clearly the land proposed to be included in Areas of Local Separation. For the proposed Areas of Separation between Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars and Eye Kettleby, land to the south of the proposed southern link road forming part of the Southern Sustainable Neighbourhood could be included as Areas of Local Separation.	The AoS in figure 7 are not indicative. AoS do not have a defined boundary because their purpose is not to prevent any development within the AoS, but to prevent development which would result in coalescence and harm to individual settlement character. Masterplanning of the South Sustainable Neighbourhood will require that the AoS between Eye Kettleby and Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars and Melton Mowbray are respected in accordance with Policy EN4.	None.
Gwynneth Whitehouse	The zig zag lines do not make the areas of separation clear. NPPF para 154 Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.	The areas of separation zigzags should be replaced with clear areas. The Southern Sustainable	Defined boundaries could prevent development which would neither harm character nor result in coalescence and are therefore considered to be an overly restrictive tool which is	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		Concept map shows substantial development into two areas of separation.	inconsistent with positive planning. AoS do not have a defined boundary because their purpose is not to prevent any development within the AoS, but to prevent development which would result in coalescence and harm to individual settlement character. Masterplanning of the South Sustainable Neighbourhood will require that the AoS between Eye Kettleby and Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars and Melton Mowbray are respected in accordance with Policy EN4.	
James and Amanda Sparrow	The areas of separation indicated by the zigzag lines are very imprecise and do not appear to define the area where developments should not be permitted in accordance with EN4 and EN1. The proposed route of the bypass and the development of the South Melton SSN are indicated in the proposed areas of separation.	NPPF. 154 - It should be clearly set out exactly where the area of separation is and where no development will be permitted. NPPF 157 7/8 - The area of separation should be a clear so as to reduce the impact of light and sound pollution to Eye Kettleby.	Defined boundaries could prevent development which would neither harm character nor result in coalescence and are therefore considered to be an overly restrictive tool which is inconsistent with positive planning. AoS do not have a defined boundary because their purpose is not to prevent any development within the AoS, but to prevent development which would result in coalescence and harm to individual settlement character. The bypass will not affect separation of settlements and is considered appropriate development within the AoS. Development proposals will be required to consider	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
			amenity including light and sound pollution in accordance with Policy D1 and para 9.4.11.	
James Keith Hamilton	7.4.1 I would argue that other areas of separation shall be between a. Somerby and Pickwell b. Somerby and Cold Newton c. Somerby and Burrough on the Hill	7.4.1 I would argue that other areas of separation shall be between a. Somerby and Pickwell b. Somerby and Cold Newton c. Somerby and Burrough on the Hill	It is not considered that theses areas are under development pressure such that a risk of coalesnce between settlements exists.	None.
Lilian Coulson	The problems with soundness relate to its application and its interpretation on the proposals map. The policy could be used to refuse applications on windfall sites which are otherwise policy compliant, yet applications on equivalent sites which are allocations would be supported by planning policy officers. Examples are proposed allocations BOT1, BOT2, EAST1, EAST2, and BOT5. There is every reason to assume any new proposals within these areas will be rejected, despite the precedent of the proposed allocations within the Area of Separation.	The Areas of Separation as shown on the proposals maps and the policy itself need to be reviewed and reworded to maintain the positive spirit that it is intended to be used in.	It is not reasonable to assume that all windfall development will be refused which falls within an AoS. The use, size, scale and design of any development proposal and its ability to protect separation, tranquillity and character as set out in Policy EN4, will determine whether proposals are refused or permitted.	None.
Michael Maffei	The area of separation between Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars will be contrary to the National Planning guidance. This is supported by the Secretary of States decision to overrule the Aylesbury (Bierton) application.	See comments above regarding by - pass etc.	It is assumed that the representor is referring to APP/J0405/A/14/2219574: TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 – SECTION 78 APPEAL BY HALLAM LAND MANAGEMENT LTD: LAND EAST OF A413 BUCKINGHAM ROAD AND WATERMEAD, AYLESBURY APPLICATION REF:	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
			13/03534/AOP which was dismissed in part due to concerns that the proposals would result in the coalescence of Aylesbury and Bierton. An Area of Separation between Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars has been identified in the Local Plan in order to prevent coalescence of those settlements and is not contrary to the NPPG as stated.	
Michelle Colclough	I cannot see how the areas of separation will be present with the number of homes proposed to be built to the North and South side of the town. There seems to be a housing area proposed in the midst of the area of separation for Burton Lazars.		Masterplanning of the South Sustainable Neighbourhood will require that the AoS between Eye Kettleby and Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars and Melton Mowbray are respected in accordance with Policy EN4.	None.
Miss Beth Johnson (Chair)	The zig-zag lines used are not acceptable to describe Areas of Separation. NPPF Paragraph 154: ".... Only policies that provide a clear indications of how a decision maker should react to a developments proposal should be included in the plan."	The zig-zag lines used to indicate Areas of Separation in the 'Melton Borough Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study (Influence, 2015)' should not be repeated in the Local Plan documents but should be replaced by clearly	Defined boundaries could prevent development which would neither harm character nor result in coalescence and are therefore considered to be an overly restrictive tool which is inconsistent with positive planning. AoS do not have a defined boundary because their purpose is not to prevent any development within the AoS, but to prevent development which would result in coalescence and harm to individual settlement character. Masterplanning of the South Sustainable Neighbourhood will	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		delineated areas. This should particularly apply to Figure 7, The Southern Sustainable Neighbourhood Concept Map which presently indicates substantial encroachment of development into two Areas of Separation.	require that the AoS between Eye Kettleby and Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars and Melton Mowbray are respected in accordance with Policy EN4.	
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	This policy is strongly supported. It was very disappointing to see in the Draft Melton Local Plan that there are already proposals to erode and downgrade both of the Areas of Separation identified near Bottesford.		There has been no change in the Bottesford-Easthorpe AoS. It is of the same extent in both the Emerging Options Draft Local Plan and the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.	None.
Richard Simon	This policy is strongly supported. It was very disappointing to see in the Draft Melton Local Plan that there are already proposals to erode and downgrade both of the Areas of Separation identified near Bottesford.		There has been no change in the Bottesford-Easthorpe AoS. It is of the same extent in both the Emerging Options Draft Local Plan and the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.	None.
Robert Galij BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI, Planning Director - Barratt David Wilson	Concern is expressed this Policy is being misapplied to prevent additional residential development on land east of Belvoir Road, Bottesford (SHLAA Site ref. MBC/012/13).It would be wrong to rule out, in principle, development at this particular location without proper testing, including mitigation, through the planning process.	Confirmation is sought over the extent of the Area of Separation between Bottesford and Easthorpe on the	The Aos between Bottesford and Easthorpe is identified in the Local Plan because evidence in the Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 supports it. Site assessment work and Sustainability	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
Homes North Midlands		southern side of the Settlement i.e. between Belvoir Road and Castle View Road, Easthorpe embracing land north of the A52 and whether sufficient flexibility is provided to consider additional residential development this particular location.	Appraisal carried out to support the Local Plan did not support the allocation of housing within the AoS. The SA site assessment states for Objective 5 (landscape) "This area has high sensitivity to residential development given its intimate/small scale character and largely intact landscape patterns. ... A significant negative effect is therefore expected on this SA objective. This negative effect is uncertain given that the design of any development proposed for the site is unknown at present". A large part of the site is the subject of a planning application and will be assessed as part of the determination of the planning application. Hence there is the opportunity to establish if it is possible to make residential development acceptable in accordance with Policy EN4. The AoS does not have a defined boundary because its purpose is not to prevent any development within the AoS, but to prevent development which would result in coalescence and harm to individual settlement character.	
Robert Hobbs	NPPF Paragraph154. "... Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan."The zig-	The zig-zag lines used to indicate Areas of Separation	Defined boundaries could prevent development which would neither harm character nor result in	None.



Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	zag lines used are not acceptable to describe Areas of Separation.	in the Melton Borough Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study (Influence, 2015) should not be repeated in the Local Plan documents but should be replaced by clearly delineated areas. This should particularly apply to Figure 7, The Southern Sustainable Neighbourhood Concept.	coalescence and are therefore considered to be an overly restrictive tool which is inconsistent with positive planning. AoS do not have a defined boundary because their purpose is not to prevent any development within the AoS, but to prevent development which would result in coalescence and harm to individual settlement character. Masterplanning of the South Sustainable Neighbourhood will require that the AoS between Eye Kettleby and Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars and Melton Mowbray are respected in accordance with Policy EN4.	
Susan Hobbs	NPPF Paragraph 154. "... Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan."The zig-zag lines used are not acceptable to describe Areas of Separation.	The zig-zag lines use to indicate Areas of Separation in the Melton Borough Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study (Influence, 2015) should not be repeated in the Local Plan	Defined boundaries could prevent development which would neither harm character nor result in coalescence and are therefore considered to be an overly restrictive tool which is inconsistent with positive planning. AoS do not have a defined boundary because their purpose is not to prevent any development within the AoS, but to prevent development which would result in coalescence and harm to individual	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		documents but should be replaced by clearly delineated areas. This should particularly apply to Figure 7, The Southern Sustainable Neighbourhood Concept Map.	settlement character. Masterplanning of the South Sustainable Neighbourhood will require that the AoS between Eye Kettleby and Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars and Melton Mowbray are respected in accordance with Policy EN4.	
Susan Love	Fully support the AoS policy.		Noted.	
Wayne Hickling	NPPF Paragraph154. “....Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.” The zig-zag lines used are not acceptable to describe Areas of Separation.	The zig-zag lines used to indicate Areas of Separation in the Melton Borough Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study (Influence, 2015) should not be repeated in the Local Plan documents but should be replaced by clearly delineated areas. This should particularly apply to Figure 7, The Southern Sustainable	Defined boundaries could prevent development which would neither harm character nor result in coalescence and are therefore considered to be an overly restrictive tool which is inconsistent with positive planning. AoS do not have a defined boundary because their purpose is not to prevent any development within the AoS, but to prevent development which would result in coalescence and harm to individual settlement character. Masterplanning of the South Sustainable Neighbourhood will require that the AoS between Eye Kettleby and Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars and Melton Mowbray are respected in accordance with Policy EN4.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		Neighbourhood Concept Map.		
Robert Galij BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI, Planning Director - Barratt David Wilson Homes North Midlands	Bottesford and Easthorpe - Area of Separation. Concern is expressed over whether the "Area of Separation" depicted on the Policies Map is preventing any further residential development east and south of the "BOT1" Housing Allocation. This prospect should not be ruled out, at this stage in the Local Plan process, without proper testing and assessment, including mitigation.	Confirmation is sought over whether the "Area of Separation" is restricting additional housing on land east of Belvoir Road, Bottesford and whether, together with associated Policy EN4, they are sufficient flexibility to consider any potential development proposals coming forward.	See response to ANON-13H4-7YPR-J above.	None.
Michelle Colclough	There seems to be a housing area proposed in the midst of the area of separation for Burton Lazars.		See response to ANON-13H4-7Y4H-C above.	None.
Lilian Coulson	The proposals map appertaining to Bottesford requires amendment. Inadequate housing land is allocated to meet the requirements of the overriding policy SS2 when it is translated down to settlement specific proposals in C1(A) and also CI(B). Also whilst policies EN3 and EN4 describe the Area of Separation between Bottesford and Easthorpe as something to be preserved and not built upon, various housing allocations are 'washed over' by this Zone which makes its purpose less certain. Additional clarification is required on these matters for the Plan to be found sound and its policies justified and effective for the foreseeable future. If my client's land at		AoS do not have a defined boundary because their purpose is not to prevent any development within the AoS, but to prevent development which would result in coalescence and harm to individual settlement character.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	Bottesford - a relatively small site of 1.57 ha - were to be added to the proposals map as a housing allocation (with the expectation that it would provide a well designed housing development in character with the rest of the Service Centre) this would satisfy many of the concerns raised. I will provide additional information on the site by separate email (as previously provided in response to the Melton SHLAA 2016) for the Inspector's assistance and consideration.			
<b>EN5</b>				
ALAN HART	Sewstern requires its own neighbourhood plan. We must protect our local green spaces.		Policy EN5 supports the designated of further LGS in Neighbourhood Plans	None.
Alison Cathie	In the 1999 Melton Plan there were 3 protected open areas within Sewstern. Melton Council employed Influence consultants to assess these 3 local green spaces. Influence rated these areas, with 2 of the 3 receiving a proposed strategy of "Reinforce", with the third receiving a strategy of "Manage". Influence recognised the paddock area as "contributing to the open texture and setting of the village". It is these small open spaces spread throughout the village that gives it its unique character. The 3 areas in question within Sewstern meet all the criteria in Paragraph 77 of the national planning framework in the opinion of the local people. Opening these areas up to further development places a huge strain on the village infrastructure. There is already a flooding issue within the locality of school lane and Main Street. The sewage system already at breaking point. There is a risk of making traffic movement through the village almost impossible when people are forced to park both sides of the narrow village lanes. The local primary school is already at what is perceived as being an acceptable safe working level of pupils to teacher / classroom sizing. Further development within any protected areas would increase the risk factor at the local school. Sewstern Village is in the process of formulating a	These small open spaces should be afforded the protection they were afforded within the previous plan.	The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 assigned a rating of 2 to Area 1 and a rating of 3 to Areas 2 & 3. Para 3.34 of the study states that a rating of 2 is assigned to sites which do not fully meet the established criteria but may have the potential to become LGS in future. A rating of 3 is assigned to sites which do not have the potential to meet the criteria. It is considered that if Area 1 is improved it could potentially be offered protection through designation as LGS in a future Sewstern Neighbourhood Plan. All areas have the potential to be protected through Policy EN6 where they contribute positively towards settlement character.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	neighbourhood plan that will serve these concerns along with other areas identified as important open green spaces such as the grassed play area attached to the village hall and allotments.			
Andrew Gore obo Mary A Donovan	The Melton Plan should clearly state that Neighbourhood Plans (NP) are encouraged to designate Local Green Spaces according to the criteria in NPPF paragraph 77, supported where appropriate by evidence from other studies. Please note Somerby Parish NP has completed and rated the Local Green Spaces for each village, according to NPPF, para 77 criteria. The Somerby village Local Green Space assessment in the Melton Draft Plan, Fringe Study Annexe 1, is neither robust nor justified with regard to proximity, community value and functionality of Local Green Spaces. In particular, Burrough Road Paddocks (the site subject of planning application 16/00615/OUT) is not correctly described for proximity, character, signs of positive usage, relationship to settlement. Our client requests that a meeting is held on this document before it is accepted as evidence for the Local Plan.	Policy EN5 as worded appears to place professional consultations above local evidence. This is not consistent with the NPPF and should be rephrased.	The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 was adopted as evidence to support the Local Plan at the Full Council meeting of 24.09.2015. The Somerby Local Green Space Assessment was not included with representations made to the Pre-Submission Local Plan, so no comment can be made about it. However, it is recognised that future more up to date evidence may supersede that in the Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 where appropriate and this is reflected in a proposed modification to Policy EN5.	Neighbourhood Plans are encouraged to designate additional Local Green Space as evidenced by the Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study or other appropriate up to date evidence document.
Colin Love	The development of the Rectory Farm site in Bottesford has the potential of establishing a new Green Space and riverside walk. The Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group is currently in the advanced stage of endorsing existing, and identifying additional, Green Spaces within the Parish to be designated in the Neighbourhood Plan.		Noted.	None.
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Asfordby Parish	The Melton Local Plan (Publication version) Policy EN5 refers to the Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study. This effectively confers policy or Supplementary Planning Document status onto a document that has not been subject to the appropriate scrutiny. Local	Melton Local Plan (Publication version) Policy EN5 be modified by deleting the last	The Melton Local Plan Issues and Options consultation (6 October 2014-12 January 2015) gave local communities the opportunity to suggest Local Green Space in their	Neighbourhood Plans are encouraged to designate additional Local Green Space as evidenced by the Areas of Separation,

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
Council)	Green Space designation is a way to provide special protection against development for green areas of particular importance to local communities. Local communities have not been engaged in the preparation of the Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study so this part of the Study is fundamentally flawed.	paragraph.	area for designation in the Local Plan. All spaces suggested were assessed in the Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015. The Emerging Options consultation gave local communities further opportunity to suggest Local Green Space and this was assessed in the Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study Part 2 2016. It is recognised that that future more up to date evidence may supersede that in the Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 where appropriate and this is reflected in a proposed modification to Policy EN5.	Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study or other appropriate up to date evidence document.
Craig Petch	In the 1999 Melton Plan there were 3 protected open areas within Sewstern. Melton Council employed Influence consultants to assess these 3 local green spaces. Influence rated these areas, with 2 of the 3 receiving a proposed strategy of "Reinforce", with the third receiving a strategy of "Manage". Influence recognised the paddock area as "contributing to the open texture and setting of the village". It is these small open spaces spread throughout the village that gives it its unique character. The 3 areas in question within Sewstern meet all the criteria in Paragraph 77 of the national planning framework in the opinion of the local people. Opening these areas up to further development places a huge strain on the village infrastructure. There is already a flooding issue within the		The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 assigned a rating of 2 to Area 1 and a rating of 3 to Areas 2 & 3. Para 3.34 of the study states that a rating of 2 is assigned to sites which do not fully meet the established criteria but may have the potential to become LGS in future. A rating of 3 is assigned to sites which do not have the potential to meet the criteria. It is considered that if Area	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	<p>locality of school lane and Main Street. The sewage system already at breaking point. There is a risk of making traffic movement through the village almost impossible when people are forced to park both sides of the narrow village lanes. The local primary school is already at what is perceived as being an acceptable safe working level of pupils to teacher / classroom sizing. Further development within any protected areas would increase the risk factor at the local school. Sewstern Village is in the process of formulating a neighbourhood plan that will serve these concerns along with other areas identified as important open green spaces such as the grassed play area attached to the village hall and allotments.</p>		<p>1 is improved it could potentially be offered protection through designation as LGS in a future Sewstern Neighbourhood Plan. All areas have the potential to be protected through Policy EN6 where they contribute positively towards settlement character.</p>	
David Farrow	<p>In the 1999 Melton Plan there were 3 protected open areas within Sewstern. Melton Council employed Influence consultants to assess these 3 local green spaces. Influence rated these areas, with 2 of the 3 receiving a proposed strategy of "Reinforce", with the third receiving a strategy of "Manage". Influence recognised the paddock area as "contributing to the open texture and setting of the village". It is these small open spaces spread throughout the village that gives it its unique character. The 3 areas in question within Sewstern meet all the criteria in Paragraph 77 of the national planning framework in the opinion of the local people. Opening these areas up to further development places a huge strain on the village infrastructure. There is already a flooding issue within the locality of school lane and Main Street. The sewage system already at breaking point. There is a risk of making traffic movement through the village almost impossible when people are forced to park both sides of the narrow village lanes. The local primary school is already at what is perceived as being an acceptable safe working level of pupils to teacher / classroom sizing. Further development within any protected areas would increase the risk factor at the local school. Sewstern Village is in the process of formulating a neighbourhood plan that will</p>	<p>See previous comments that need incorporating within the plan to ensure it meets the above criteria.</p>	<p>The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 assigned a rating of 2 to Area 1 and a rating of 3 to Areas 2 &amp; 3. Para 3.34 of the study states that a rating of 2 is assigned to sites which do not fully meet the established criteria but may have the potential to become LGS in future. A rating of 3 is assigned to sites which do not have the potential to meet the criteria. It is considered that if Area 1 is improved it could potentially be offered protection through designation as LGS in a future Sewstern Neighbourhood Plan. All areas have the potential to be protected through Policy EN6 where they contribute positively towards settlement character.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	serve these concerns along with other areas identified as important open green spaces such as the grassed play area attached to the village hall and allotments.			
Elizabeth Wheatley	In the 1999 Melton Plan there were 3 protected open areas within Sewstern. Melton Council employed Influence consultants to assess these 3 local green spaces. Influence rated these areas, with 2 of the 3 receiving a proposed strategy of "Reinforce", with the third receiving a strategy of "Manage". Influence recognised the paddock area as "contributing to the open texture and setting of the village". It is these small open spaces spread throughout the village that gives it its unique character. The 3 areas in question within Sewstern meet all the criteria in Paragraph 77 of the national planning framework in the opinion of the local people. Opening these areas up to further development places a huge strain on the village infrastructure. There is already a flooding issue within the locality of school lane and Main Street. The sewage system already at breaking point. There is a risk of making traffic movement through the village almost impossible when people are forced to park both sides of the narrow village lanes. The local primary school is already at what is perceived as being an acceptable safe working level of pupils to teacher / classroom sizing. Further development within any protected areas would increase the risk factor at the local school. Sewstern Village is in the process of formulating a neighbourhood plan that will serve these concerns along with other areas identified as important open green spaces such as the grassed play area attached to the village hall and allotments.	See previous comments that need incorporating within the plan to ensure it meets the above criteria.	The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 assigned a rating of 2 to Area 1 and a rating of 3 to Areas 2 & 3. Para 3.34 of the study states that a rating of 2 is assigned to sites which do not fully meet the established criteria but may have the potential to become LGS in future. A rating of 3 is assigned to sites which do not have the potential to meet the criteria. It is considered that if Area 1 is improved it could potentially be offered protection through designation as LGS in a future Sewstern Neighbourhood Plan. All areas have the potential to be protected through Policy EN6 where they contribute positively towards settlement character.	None.
Elizabeth Wheatley	In the 1999 Melton Plan there were 3 protected open areas within Sewstern. Melton Council employed Influence consultants to assess these 3 local green spaces. Influence rated these areas, with 2 of the 3 receiving a proposed strategy of "Reinforce", with the third receiving a strategy of "Manage". Influence recognised the paddock area as "contributing to the	See previous comments that need incorporating within the plan to ensure it meets the above criteria.	The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 assigned a rating of 2 to Area 1 and a rating of 3 to Areas 2 & 3. Para 3.34 of the study states that a rating	None.



Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	<p>open texture and setting of the village". It is these small open spaces spread throughout the village that gives it its unique character. The 3 areas in question within Sewstern meet all the criteria in Paragraph 77 of the national planning framework in the opinion of the local people. Opening these areas up to further development places a huge strain on the village infrastructure. There is already a flooding issue within the locality of school lane and Main Street. The sewage system already at breaking point. There is a risk of making traffic movement through the village almost impossible when people are forced to park both sides of the narrow village lanes. The local primary school is already at what is perceived as being an acceptable safe working level of pupils to teacher / classroom sizing. Further development within any protected areas would increase the risk factor at the local school. Sewstern Village is in the process of formulating a neighbourhood plan that will serve these concerns along with other areas identified as important open green spaces such as the grassed play area attached to the village hall and allotments.</p>		<p>of 2 is assigned to sites which do not fully meet the established criteria but may have the potential to become LGS in future. A rating of 3 is assigned to sites which do not have the potential to meet the criteria. It is considered that if Area 1 is improved it could potentially be offered protection through designation as LGS in a future Sewstern Neighbourhood Plan. All areas have the potential to be protected through Policy EN6 where they contribute positively towards settlement character.</p>	
Holly Burrows	<p>In the 1999 Melton Plan there were 3 protected open areas within Sewstern. Melton Council employed Influence consultants to assess these 3 local green spaces. Influence rated these areas, with 2 of the 3 receiving a proposed strategy of "Reinforce", with the third receiving a strategy of "Manage". Influence recognised the paddock area as "contributing to the open texture and setting of the village". It is these small open spaces spread throughout the village that gives it its unique character. The 3 areas in question within Sewstern meet all the criteria in Paragraph 77 of the national planning framework in the opinion of the local people. Opening these areas up to further development places a huge strain on the village infrastructure. There is already a flooding issue within the locality of school lane and Main Street. The sewage system already at breaking point. There is a risk of making traffic</p>	<p>See previous comments that need incorporating within the plan to ensure it meets the above criteria</p>	<p>The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 assigned a rating of 2 to Area 1 and a rating of 3 to Areas 2 &amp; 3. Para 3.34 of the study states that a rating of 2 is assigned to sites which do not fully meet the established criteria but may have the potential to become LGS in future. A rating of 3 is assigned to sites which do not have the potential to meet the criteria. It is considered that if Area 1 is improved it could potentially be offered protection through</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	movement through the village almost impossible when people are forced to park both sides of the narrow village lanes. The local primary school is already at what is perceived as being an acceptable safe working level of pupils to teacher / classroom sizing. Further development within any protected areas would increase the risk factor at the local school. Sewstern Village is in the process of formulating a neighbourhood plan that will serve these concerns along with other areas identified as important open green spaces such as the grassed play area attached to the village hall and allotments.		designation as LGS in a future Sewstern Neighbourhood Plan. All areas have the potential to be protected through Policy EN6 where they contribute positively towards settlement character.	
Martin Lusty	In the emerging Neighbourhood Plan we have identified additional sites as Local Green Spaces plus 'Important Open Spaces' and additional sites of 'Environmental significance'. These were assessed using methodology shown in document 'WOTWATA Consolidated Environmental Inventory'. St Mary the Virgin Churchyard, Thorpe Arnold St Mary Magdalene Churchyard, Waltham Medieval village earthworks Waltham village playing field Thorpe Arnold cricket ground Churchyard extension Parish Council Allotments Fields to west of Bescaby Lane adjacent to Twells Road, opposite Doctors Surgery and the Manor. Fields South of Mill Lane and east of Manor Court and Fair Field Field 1357 east of Melton Road Village orchard off Goadby Road Disused railway line Malt House Green 'memorial garden' Field south of the Rectory and east of the A607 and north of Freeby Lane Copse and rough ground with small pond north of Goadby Road	Allow for additional sites as identified in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.	Policy EN5 supports the designated of further LGS in Neighbourhood Plans	None.
Michael Maffei	The important objections have already been made by Historic England (English Heritage) in respect of the Roman Road and former Leper Hospital.		Noted.	None.
Michelle Colclough	There will be vast areas of green field land lost. It cannot be justified by retaining a postage stamp of grass and calling it "green space".		It is not clear which areas of greenfield land are being referred to. Policies EN1, EN2, EN3, EN4, EN5, EN6 and EN7 all afford protection to the landscape and/or	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
			open space within the context of the requirement for the Local Plan to be positively prepared.	
Mr P J F SPringett	In the 1999 Melton Plan there were 3 protected open areas within Sewstern. Melton Council employed Influence consultants to assess these 3 local green spaces. Influence rated these areas, with 2 of the 3 receiving a proposed strategy of "Reinforce", with the third receiving a strategy of "Manage". Influence recognised the paddock area as "contributing to the open texture and setting of the village". It is these small open spaces spread throughout the village that gives it its unique character. The 3 areas in question within Sewstern meet all the criteria in Paragraph 77 of the national planning framework in the opinion of the local people. Opening these areas up to further development places a huge strain on the village infrastructure. There is already a flooding issue within the locality of school lane and Main Street. The sewage system already at breaking point. There is a risk of making traffic movement through the village almost impossible when people are forced to park both sides of the narrow village lanes. The local primary school is already at what is perceived as being an acceptable safe working level of pupils to teacher / classroom sizing. Further development within any protected areas would increase the risk factor at the local school. Sewstern Village is in the process of formulating a neighbourhood plan that will serve these concerns along with other areas identified as important open green spaces such as the grassed play area attached to the village hall and allotments.	See previous comments above in 3.CH7PEN5Q3 that need incorporating within the plan to ensure it meets the above criteria.	The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 assigned a rating of 2 to Area 1 and a rating of 3 to Areas 2 & 3. Para 3.34 of the study states that a rating of 2 is assigned to sites which do not fully meet the established criteria but may have the potential to become LGS in future. A rating of 3 is assigned to sites which do not have the potential to meet the criteria. It is considered that if Area 1 is improved it could potentially be offered protection through designation as LGS in a future Sewstern Neighbourhood Plan. All areas have the potential to be protected through Policy EN6 where they contribute positively towards settlement character.	None.
Mrs Elaine Exton	Local Green Spaces convenient to village amenities should be released for development or villages will not allowed to grow during the term of the Local Plan. Previous restrictions have led to an increase of only 5 dwellings in the last 70 years in Sewstern. [See Supporting Documents - No 56]These areas are not of such great importance within villages surrounded by		Policy EN5 protects Local Green Space designated in the Local Plan from inappropriate development. Policy EN6 protects green space which contributes positively to the character of a settlement from	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	miles of public footpaths, bridleways and nature conservation areas. Families can walk, ride or cycle along the Viking Way, King Street Lane and Old Sewstern Lane. Buckminster: A beautiful conservation village, carefully managed and protected by the Local Private Estate. Sewstern: Not enough opportunity to build family homes with 21st century eco-friendly facilities unless land is released.		inappropriate development. There is the opportunity to deliver housing through the development of sites not protected through Policies EN5 and EN6 in accordance with Policy SS3.	
Natural England	Natural England has made comments on previous iterations of the Melton Local Plan including the emerging options draft plan so we have nothing further to add here except to welcome the chapter on Melton Borough's Environment (Chapter 7), including the extensive references to the maintenance and enhancement of a coherent green infrastructure network.		Noted.	None.
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	Supported		Noted.	None.
Richard Simon	Supported		Noted.	None.
Richard Vincent	In the 1999 Melton Plan there were 3 protected open areas within Sewstern. Melton Council employed Influence consultants to assess these 3 local green spaces. Influence rated these areas, with 2 of the 3 receiving a proposed strategy of "Reinforce", with the third receiving a strategy of "Manage". Influence recognised the paddock area as "contributing to the open texture and setting of the village". It is these small open spaces spread throughout the village that gives it its unique character. The 3 areas in question within Sewstern meet all the criteria in Paragraph 77 of the national planning framework in the opinion of the local people. Opening these areas up to further development places a huge strain on the village infrastructure. There is already a flooding issue within the	See comments in 3 above that need incorporating within the plan to ensure it meets the above criteria.	The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 assigned a rating of 2 to Area 1 and a rating of 3 to Areas 2 & 3. Para 3.34 of the study states that a rating of 2 is assigned to sites which do not fully meet the established criteria but may have the potential to become LGS in future. A rating of 3 is assigned to sites which do not have the potential to meet the criteria. It is considered that if Area	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	<p>locality of school lane and Main Street. The sewage system already at breaking point. There is a risk of making traffic movement through the village almost impossible when people are forced to park both sides of the narrow village lanes. The local primary school is already at what is perceived as being an acceptable safe working level of pupils to teacher / classroom sizing. Further development within any protected areas would increase the risk factor at the local school. Sewstern Village is in the process of formulating a neighbourhood plan that will serve these concerns along with other areas identified as important open green spaces such as the grassed play area attached to the village hall and allotments.</p>		<p>1 is improved it could potentially be offered protection through designation as LGS in a future Sewstern Neighbourhood Plan. All areas have the potential to be protected through Policy EN6 where they contribute positively towards settlement character.</p>	
Stuart Mogg	<p>In the 1999 Melton Plan there were 3 protected open areas within Sewstern. Melton Council employed Influence consultants to assess these 3 local green spaces. Influence rated these areas, with 2 of the 3 receiving a proposed strategy of "Reinforce", with the third receiving a strategy of "Manage". Influence recognised the paddock area as "contributing to the open texture and setting of the village". It is these small open spaces spread throughout the village that gives it its unique character. The 3 areas in question within Sewstern meet all the criteria in Paragraph 77 of the national planning framework in the opinion of the local people. Opening these areas up to further development places a huge strain on the village infrastructure. There is already a flooding issue within the locality of school lane and Main Street. The sewage system already at breaking point. There is a risk of making traffic movement through the village almost impossible when people are forced to park both sides of the narrow village lanes. The local primary school is already at what is perceived as being an acceptable safe working level of pupils to teacher / classroom sizing. Further development within any protected areas would increase the risk factor at the local school. Sewstern Village is in the process of formulating a neighbourhood plan that will</p>	<p>See previous comments that need incorporating within the plan to ensure it meets the above criteria.</p>	<p>The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 assigned a rating of 2 to Area 1 and a rating of 3 to Areas 2 &amp; 3. Para 3.34 of the study states that a rating of 2 is assigned to sites which do not fully meet the established criteria but may have the potential to become LGS in future. A rating of 3 is assigned to sites which do not have the potential to meet the criteria. It is considered that if Area 1 is improved it could potentially be offered protection through designation as LGS in a future Sewstern Neighbourhood Plan. All areas have the potential to be protected through Policy EN6 where they contribute positively towards settlement character.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	serve these concerns along with other areas identified as important open green spaces such as the grassed play area attached to the village hall and allotments.			
Susan Love	Support the role of NPs to achieve these objectives.		Noted.	None.
Trudy Toon - Clerk	The field between Main Street and Church Lane, Gaddesby is an area of Green open space within the village. Could this area remain a designated open space in the new Melton Local Plan.		The Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 assigned a rating of 2 to Area 5, the large field between Main Street and Church Lane. This has the potential to be designated as LGS in future and Policy EN5 supports this in a Neighbourhood Plan.	None.
Gladman Developments	Gladman are concerned that the proposed policies are inconsistent with national policy. There are likely to be circumstances over the plan period where sustainable proposals can be brought forward within the locations identified. Paragraph 77 of the Framework sets out the national policy position in relation to the designation of local green space. The PPG provides additional guidance by stating: "There are no hard and fast rules about how big a Local Green Space can be because places are different and a degree of judgement will inevitably be needed. However, paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green area concerned is not an extensive tract of land. Consequently blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate. In particular, designation should not be proposed as a 'back door' way to try to achieve what would amount to a new area of Green Belt by another name." (ID: 37-015-20140306) . The Council must ensure that any proposal (being made through this plan or a future neighbourhood plan within its administrative boundary) fully aligns with national policy and		EN5 does not designate any LGS which is an extensive tract of land or which is a back door attempt at designating Green Belt. EN5 does not prevent development which would harm not harm key features, value, functionality and character of LGS.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	that there is a robust rationale for any such designations.			
<b>EN6</b>				
Andrew Gore obo Mary A Donovan	The Policy is positive in approach. However the wording of points 2 and 3 is unclear. In Historic England's 'The Settings of Heritage Assets. Historic Environment Good Practise Advice in Planning Note 3', six actions are defined which constitute ways in which new developments contribute to the setting and key features of heritage assets including conservation areas. This guidance, supported by NPPF para 137, should be included in the Policy, and if not met development should be considered environmentally unsustainable and refused.		Modification proposed	Justification to EN6 at 7.6.3 will make reference to HE Advice Note 3.
Colin Love	The Policy EN6 objective 4 has been strongly supported by Bottesford residents through the Neighbourhood Plan consultations. Bottesford has very pleasant rural approaches from all directions and the residents have indicated very clearly that they do not want these approaches compromised by new developments. (NP evidence available).		Noted.	None.
Dermot Daly	As commented in previous sections the unjustified and significant increase of housing (50% including windfall and developments since 2011) in Bottesford over the term of the Local Plan will impact the character of rural village of significant character and history. It is not a Town and should not become one.	Regarding Bottesford the authority should conduct the necessary investigation to impact on village character . It is not necessarily the general public that should be stating the answers to these challenges. It is the responsibility of the authority to suggest, discuss, consult and change	The Melton Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 and Conservation Area Appraisals provide evidence to support this policy. It is appropriate for Neighbourhood Plans to provide a finer grain by further identifying individual features which contribute towards settlement character.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		on an iterative basis.		
Emilie Carr (HE)	The policy is welcomed and supported.		Noted.	None.
Grimston, Saxelbye & Shoby Parish Council	The character of small villages should be preserved.		The purpose of EN6 is to protect character.	None.
Helen Hartley, Nexus Planning (on behalf of Richborough Estates)	It is considered that this policy is unsound in that it is not justified. Richborough Estates consider the wording of the policy is open to interpretation such that it will prove meaningless and will not contribute towards effective decision-taking. Policy EN6 states development should not harm open spaces which 'contribute positively to the individual character of a settlement' or 'form a key entrance and/or gateway to a settlement'. There is not clear definition of these phrases such that they could be applied to a wide range of open spaces. Through other policies, the Pre-Submission Draft Plan identifies Green Infrastructure (Policy EN3), Areas of Separation (Policy EN4) and Local Green Space (Policy EN5). It is considered unnecessary and not justified to seek to identify another level of protected spaces/ features through proposed Policy SS6.	For the reasons set out above, we consider Policy EN6 is not justified and therefore unsound, with regards to the tests in paragraph 182 of the Framework. As such, it should be deleted in its entirety.	The Local Green Space designation does not adequately protect all open space which contributes positively to settlement character. Evidence to support EN6 can be found in the Melton Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study 2015 Annex 1 and the Conservation Area Appraisals.	None.
Howard Blakebrough	We agree with the principle, but the practice, especially with the SHLAA land and settlement allocation is not consistent with it. The imposition of large developments on smaller villages flies completely in the face of all that is being proposed.	Stop large single developments in smaller villages where they would have just the adverse effect that the policy is seeking to avoid	It is considered that major housing development within settlements can designed sensitively such that is does not harm settlement character.	None.
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	Policies EN1 Landscape, EN3 Green Infrastructure, EN6 Settlement Character and EN13 Heritage Assets are all mutually supportive. It is important to recognise the inter-relatedness of the environment, and similarly the multiple opportunities and		Noted.	None.



Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
)	shared beneficial outcomes presented by working across the various environmental areas.			
Melanie Steadman	The SHLLA sites in Long Clawson do not meet any of these criteria (1-4) and yet the Planning Officers have recommended "permit" on them all. If the Council are not will to enforce or consider these policies when making planning decisions or allocating sites then they are of little or no use at all. Large, high density sites have been put forward, which are not sensitive to the individual characteristics of settlements.	No large sites in any of the villages. Nothing above 10 - 15. Less dense sites to retain the rural character and more sensitivity to the landscape.	It is considered that major housing development within settlements can designed sensitively such that is does not harm settlement character.	None.
Merrill Wheeler	Harm would be done to the historic rural nature of the village with its grade 1 listed church view over the historic ridge and furrow fields were GADD 2 to be realized. Art Historian Nicholas Pevsner singled out this church as a crown jewel and it should be protected as such.2. GADD3 would harm open area that contributes positively to the character of the settlement at a village entry from open country along a rural lane.		It is considered that major housing development within settlements can designed sensitively such that is does not harm settlement character.	None.
Michelle Colclough	The Saint-Lazarus hospital conservation site is at risk due to the proposed building of houses on the South side of Melton.		Noted. The Council is procuring specialist heritage advice regarding potential harm to the Scheduled Monument.	None.
Peter Wheeler	Harm would be done to the historic rural nature of the village with its grade 1 listed church view over the historic ridge and furrow fields were GADD 2 to be realized. Art Historian Nicholas Pevsner singled out this church as a crown jewel and it should be protected as such.. GADD3 would harm open area that contributes positively to the character of the settlement at a village entry from open country along a rural lane. As members of the Gaddesby Community group we believe the proposed GADD2 and GADD3 developments unnecessary unless the 2017 housing needs survey deems this village to require new build in addition to the 6 new infill houses and the 14 permitted dwellings for the yet unbuilt GADD1 site. The 38% increase		It is considered that major housing development within settlements can designed sensitively such that is does not harm settlement character.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	would indisputably change the nature of the village.			
Peter Wheeler	Harm would be done to the historic rural nature of the village with its grade 1 listed church view over the historic ridge and furrow fields were GADD 2 to be realized. Art Historian Nicholas Pevsner singled out this church as a crown jewel and it should be protected as such.2. GADD3 would harm open area that contributes positively to the character of the settlement at a village entry from open country along a rural lane.		It is considered that major housing development within settlements can designed sensitively such that is does not harm settlement character.	None.
R H B Ranns	Weight should be given to Conservation and Heritage appraisals in the Neighbourhood Plan.		EN6 ensures that weight is given to such appraisal in a Neighbourhood Plan.	None.
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	Supported		Noted.	None.
Richard Simon	Supported		Noted.	None.
Ros Freeman	The Policy is not sound or effective because Som3 is on the entrance to the village at the point where the village character is currently defined- the equestrian history of the village and current character is reflected in the Grove Stud, Grove mansion and the paddocks setting and the heritage of this place. This is a key gateway.	Remove SOM3 from the proposals.	It is considered that major housing development within settlements can designed sensitively such that is does not harm settlement character.	None.
Susan Love	Settlement character - Brian Quinn and Professor Colin Haylock from CABE were very helpful in identifying the 'character' of Bottesford for the Steering Group. It has e.g. very rural, gradual approaches and fingers of countryside extending into the village. The Rectory Farm site was selected by the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group following advice from our independent consultants from CABE (Brian Quinn and Professor Colin Haylock* ) who walked the village, helped us to establish		Noted.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	<p>an idea of the village 'character', and ran several workshops with us. This is an email from Brian Quinn sent to the Steering Group confirming the consultants' view of Rectory Farm - "... we felt that that site was a particularly sensible location for the scheme given the principles we had talked through in the workshops –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to preserve the arrival experience on the principal routes into Bottesford (avoiding the “wall of development” feel). This site would effectively not be directly visible from any of the principal routes.</li> <li>• to benefit from proximity and easy walking and cycling access to the village centre and yet accommodate a significant amount of housing.</li> <li>• the benefit of delivering the housing in sufficient volume to be a distinctive extension to the village and in particular to help deliver wider benefits such as the delivery of meaningful new public space and opening up public access to the north bank of the river.</li> <li>• The proximity to the commercial area to the East also brought potential long term benefits, if it was relocated to a periphery location nearer the bypass, to redevelop this area for further housing which would reduce the volume of HGVs coming through the village.</li> <li>• To have a site that was less prone to flood risk than the site to the south of the village hall. " (26 April, 2016) *President of the Royal Town Planning Institute in 2012</li> </ul> <p>St Mary's Church and views of Belvoir Castle are significant features of the village and development on the edges is mainly low density and gradual with taller and more dense building near the centre.</p>			
Terence Joyce	I question the SOUNDNESS: of this policy with regard Somerby (SOM). SOM2 is adjacent centre of conservation area (some part is within) and any modern build will have maximum negative effect on period properties such as the 17th Century Charity House Which is well within the vicinity of SOM2.	Therefore to Satisfy SOUNDNESS take SOM2 out of housing allocation.	It is considered that major housing development within settlements can designed sensitively such that is does not harm settlement character.	None.
<b>EN7</b>				
James Keith Hamilton	7.14.3 The indoor swimming facilities are not correctly recorded. The aged facilities are not going to last and		A fully NPPF compliant Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy is	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	vulnerable to closure at short notice. I attach a copy of “Melton BC Indoor Sports Assessment, April 2011” which indicates of 10% shortfall in swimming pool demand according to Sport England recommendations. Waterfields is also in a flood plain. The car parking is also shared and on a steep slope making it difficult to access for disabled. The report is now 5 years out of date.		underway which will assess existing provision and determine the quantum and location of facilities required, including pools.	
Michelle Colclough	Where is the provision for North and South side developments?		This is set out in Policy SS4, SS5 and the IDP.	None.
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	Supported		Noted.	None.
Richard Simon	Supported		Noted.	None.
Sport England	<p>We are particularly pleased to see references to the Playing Pitch Strategy and the emerging Built Sports Facilities Strategy. Whilst we generally support policy EN7 we are concerned about the use of standards particularly for the provision of sports facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relationship with Evidence Base. Conventional standards can be crude and rigid in nature and not have a direct relationship with the evidence base or deliver facilities that are responsive to identified needs. Issues include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Range of Facilities: A sports evidence base will identify a range of facility needs for a wide variety of sports, and within each sport, for a variety of facilities. A single one size fits all quantitative standard for outdoor sport for instance which many authorities have traditionally applied would not reflect the range and complexity of needs deriving from a robust strategy and would not be robust if applied directly to inform and justify provision within major new developments or to inform and justify developer contributions;</li> <li>Supporting Facilities: The use of standards often fails to account for the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		Noted. Modification proposed regarding the use of standards.	Modification proposed at paragraph 7.15.3 to provide clarity on the use of standards.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	<p>need for (and the associated costs of) supporting infrastructure such as clubhouse, parking and access provision which would need to be delivered as part of a new facility. Again, without accounting for such infrastructure this reduces the robustness of a quantitative standards based approach; - Qualitative and Accessibility Needs: The use of standards fails to account for the fact that many of the priority projects identified in strategies and actions plans in evidence base documents to meet both current and future facility needs, relate to improving the quality or accessibility of existing sports facilities rather than the provision of new facilities. In this context, the application of standards can be inflexible as they are based entirely around new provision for meeting needs rather than enhancing existing provision (which the evidence base may prioritise and which may be more appropriate in practice meeting the needs of a new development). Please also see the draft note attached.</p>			
Susan Love	<p>New allotment space needs a larger than 50 house development for its provision. It could be conditioned as part of the Rectory Farm development in Bottesford if the whole site is used. Land adjacent to the industrial estate could be used for this purpose. What better use for the ridge and furrow in the eastern part of the site area than to be used for allotments on the development? This would make the preservation of ridge and furrow meaningful by returning it to its original use for food production.</p>		Noted. EN7 identifies the need for new allotment provision in Bottesford.	None.
<b><u>EN8</u></b>				
Anthony Paphiti	<p>This is generally supported, but with reservations concerning the policy for renewable energy and allocation of sites for development. I have made further comment in the section on EN10</p>		Noted.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
Catherine J.G. Pugh	<p>The proposed development sites on Belvoir Road, Grantham Road and Rectory Farm are all on land which is covered by water in periods of heavy rainfall. Building on these sites will necessarily mean the water will flow elsewhere. While developers may protect new housing from flooding, for example by constructing a raised platform as they have done already on Belvoir Road, this will inevitably increase the risk of flooding in other areas of the village and on the roads into the village. A large part of Bottesford is built on what is locally referred to as 'running sand'. This means that buildings, particularly older and listed buildings, are especially sensitive to changes in the water-table. A rise in the water table causes 'heave', a decline subsidence. Residents have already suffered from severe flooding, partly because the building up of the banks of the River Devon to permit building on the water meadows for the housing developments of the 1960s and 70s was done with little or no regard to the consequences. As a result water was driven into the drains, gardens, houses and streets in other parts of the village. If the extent of the development proposed for Bottesford goes ahead, it would appear that this mistake is likely to be repeated.</p>	<p>'National planning policy requires a risk based sequential approach to floodrisk, avoiding high risk areas and steering development to areas at lower risk.'</p> <p>The extensive flooding in Bottesford and Muston in 2201 and 2007 and the frequent closure of roads in the village due to flooding are surely evidence that this is a high risk area and climate change only increases the risk. The Local Plan states that Melton Borough Council will ensure that 'development proposals do not increase flood risk and will seek to reduce flood risk to others.' The proposal to build</p>	<p>EN11 requires that development proposals do not increase flood risk to others.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		over 400 new houses in the area, many on sites which are known to flood already, is not consistent with this promise.		
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Asfordby Parish Council)	The Melton Local Plan (Publication version) Policy EN8 is unnecessary as it simply cross refers to other Local Plan Policies.	Melton Local Plan (Publication version) Policy EN8 be deleted.	It is considered necessary to set out how the Local Plan will contribute towards the mitigation of and adaptation to climate change in a separate policy with full justification.	None.
Dermot Daly	Please refer to earlier section comments in respect of flooding.	Regarding Bottesford, the authority should conduct the necessary investigation to the impact of flooding, traffic, supporting services, public transport.	The Melton SFRA and Melton Transport Strategy support the growth identified in the Local Plan.	None.
K Lynne Camplejohn	The policy does not make any reference to a neighbourhood plan, if there is one for that area, so it fails on duty to cooperate.	To comply with duty to cooperate include a reference to a neighbourhood plan.	Paragraph 1.9 explains how Neighbourhood Plans and the Local Plan are related and sets out that joint working is taking place.	None.
LCC (Highways, Education, Early Years,		It is suggested that the climate change requirements take		Modification proposed

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
Waste, Property Assets, LLFA, Libraries & Culture, LRERC)		account of viability.		
Michelle Colclough	Building houses on the edges of towns will vastly increase the number of vehicles in the area. People will not use the public transport as it is not sufficient to get to places of work, which are unlikely to be in Melton! People will use cars to drive to and from the town centre, causing even more traffic problems than there are now.		The Melton Transport Strategy includes Modal Shift Support, as set out in the IDP.	None.
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	Supported.		Noted.	None.
Richard Simon	Supported		Noted.	None.
Terence Joyce	Any build on SOM2 will have maximum negative effect on Policy EN8 as the whole of SOM2 is within “Priority Green Infrastructure” known as “Jubilee Way”. Primary Green Infrastructure (especially in rural green field sites) are important to combat climate change and ensure maximum Rain Dispersion etc. Even small parcels of green field sites such as SOM2 play an important part in the overall plan to tackle these important world wide issues.	With regard to Somerby, to make this policy SOUND:Take SOM2 out of housing allocation	EN3 does not prevent development within areas identified as Strategic Primary Green Infrastructure as long as proposals retain important elements identified in policy EN3 (10-17) or can provide mitigation.	None.
<b>EN9</b>				
Andrew Astin	Please refer to accompanying Cover Letter submitted via email. Draft Policy EN9 sets out the councils approach to ensuring energy efficient development. Development is supported where they demonstrate they meet a number of criteria subject to viability. The policy is not effective as the wording is restrictive	Please refer to accompanying Cover Letter submitted via email.	Modification of policy such that it is clear what is required in a design and access statement for major development	Modification as set out in the Schedule. Bullet points replaced.



Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	and overcomplicated. The policy should make it clear when the policy applies, as the policy is currently worded to apply to all types of development proposed, (i.e. a minor shopfront alteration or installation of an ATM). The policy should be re-worded to take account of the need to meet the requirements on a case-by-case basis; which takes into account local considerations and the nature of the development proposed as well as viability.			
Anglian Water	We support the requirement to phase development to ensure that there is wastewater treatment capacity available to serve new developments. This would be consistent with the requirement for the foul sewerage network set out in Policy EN11 (as amended).		Noted.	None.
Colin Love	This is generally very good. However, it is weak when, in reference to home offices , cycle storage and charging points for electric cars the requirement, as currently written, it only requires these to have been 'considered' within development proposals. Given the laudable and fundamental objectives on energy conservation and carbon emissions within this Local Plan, there is every reason why these should be mandatory on developers. The cost, at the construction stage, would be minimal whilst post construction, home owners would face potential installation difficulties and greater expense. Development applications that will install ground source heating at the build stage should be given preferential consideration.		EN9 cannot make it a requirement to provide for office space, cycle storage and charging points. EN10 provides particular support for renewable energy proposals which will benefit local communities.	None.
K Lynne Camplejohn	The policy does not make any reference to a neighbourhood plan, if there is one for that area, so it fails on duty to cooperate.	To comply with duty to cooperate make reference to a neighbourhood plan.	Paragraph 1.9 explains how Neighbourhood Plans and the Local Plan are related and sets out that joint working is taking place.	None.
LCC (Highways, Education,		With regard to the energy efficiency requirements	EN9 does not require standards over and above those in Building Regulations.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
Early Years, Waste, Property Assets, LLFA, Libraries & Culture, LRERC)		contained within this policy it is suggested that development meets current Building Regulations standards rather than a higher policy led target.		
Merrill Wheeler	Proposing a 38% increase in housing for a commuter dormitory village is inefficient with regard to transport. Better to develop more accessible brown sites within Melton. Any new housing should be constructed with state of the art energy efficiency. There is no visual or auditory impact in tapping geothermal energy.		The Melton Transport Strategy includes Modal Shift Support, as set out in the IDP. EN9 cannot ask for energy efficiency standards beyond what is required in Building Regulations.	None.
Peter Wheeler	Proposing a 38% increase in housing for a commuter dormitory village is inefficient with regard to transport. Any new housing should be constructed with state of the art energy efficiency. There is no visual or auditory impact in tapping geothermal energy.	Better to develop more accessible brown sites within Melton. Any new housing should be constructed with state of the art energy efficiency.	The Melton Transport Strategy includes Modal Shift Support, as set out in the IDP. EN9 cannot ask for energy efficiency standards beyond what is required in Building Regulations.	None.
Peter Wheeler	Proposing a 38% increase in housing for a commuter dormitory village is inefficient with regard to transport. Better to develop more accessible brown sites within Melton. Any new housing should be constructed with state of the art energy efficiency. There is no visual or auditory impact in tapping geothermal energy.		The Melton Transport Strategy includes Modal Shift Support, as set out in the IDP. EN9 cannot ask for energy efficiency standards beyond what is required in Building Regulations.	None.
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP	Supported.		Noted	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
Steering Group				
Richard Simon	Supported		Noted	None.
<b>EN10</b>				
Mrs Joyce Noon - CPRE Leicestershire	NPPF 154: Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.	Areas suitable for Energy Generation have been identified as 'General areas' following a Landscape Sensitivity Study. Are these too vague and based on evidence not relating to the impact on other issues? A proper assessment of areas suitable for wind energy should be implemented	EN10 identifies areas suitable for wind energy production as evidenced by the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014.	None.
A.Thomas	25 metre wind turbines are in appropriate are higher than any natural features in the landscape and it is inappropriate to site a large industrial machine where they can be seen from miles around.	Wind turbines up to a maximum of 15 metres in situations only where y can't be seen from more that a mile away.	The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 assesses the capacity of the landscape to accommodate change and the its sensitivity to change as a result of wind energy development. The landscape in Melton is diverse and it would be inappropriate to set a blanket limit on turbine height which applies to	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
			all areas. EN10 identifies areas which might be suitable for wind energy development subject to an individual scheme meeting the policy criteria. This would require the submission of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment to accompany any planning application. The scheme would also need to receive the backing of any affected community in order to be consented.	
Andrew Gore obo Mary A Donovan	Representations for this Policy have been made in the 4 April 2016 Submission (Appendix 2) and by the SMART Decentralized Energy and Large Scale Renewable Energy consultation. These representations note it is not a requirement to identify suitable sites for renewable energy technologies as part of a local Plan unless as an aid to securing them. In addition, legislation has made clear the weight of local opinion on renewable energy sites. The Melton Draft Plan proposes a site in Great Dalby for wind turbines. There is a lack of evidence in relation to the affects of the wind turbines on the heritage significance of Burrough Hill and its sensitive panoramic views, a primary landmark identified by the Melton and Rushcliffe Sensitivity Study. Given the weight of past objections to wind turbines in the rural areas of Melton Borough, this policy which assigns turbine sites without a requirement to do so is not justified and raises questions as to whether community consultation responses have been duly considered.		The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 does not assess heritage. It would be necessary to address these issues at the planning application stage when proposals would be required to demonstrate that the development will not harm the significance of heritage assets or their settings. Whether the proposal had community backing or not would also be determined at the pre-application and planning application stage.	None.
Anthony Paphiti	The M&RLSS does not do is explain how it arrives at its conclusions in relation to sensitivity to turbine heights, thereby placing them in their respective categories. Table 2.1 is re-cycling "Data supplied by the Councils (dated 1st August 2014)"	Remove the proposal to designate areas for renewable energy.	Table 2.1 sets out operational and consented schemes and those in planning as of 1.08.14. It does not inform the turbine heights	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	<p>as an authority for the propositions it sets out in its table of turbine heights, without any empirical analysis. Where are the expert opinions from landscape experts etc. that support the classifications, especially of Landmarks and Views identified by Borough Councillors (Appendix 5 to M&amp;RLSS)? From the correspondence at Annex 4, there are subjective assessments submitted by Parish Councils, but no mention of how these are then translated into the conclusions of the M&amp;RLSS. There is mention (16th August 2013 – an interestingly worded letter) of Halcrow and Bayou Blue Environment being appointed to produce guidance on renewable "wind energy", but it is not clear that their actual findings were ever subjected to public scrutiny. That Study " has been used to inform policy on renewable energy such that it complies with the ministerial statement issued in June 2015 by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Paragraph: 033 Reference ID: 5-033-150618)" - this alludes to one aspect of the MLP which has been misunderstood. The designation of areas is not something that the Council "has" to do. The Minister said, "When determining planning applications for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, local planning authorities should only grant planning permission if: the development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a local or neighbourhood plan". James Wharton MP, the former Planning Minister, has said, "The new planning tests announced in the June 2015 written statement reflect our view that in future wind turbines should only get the go-ahead when local people have said they want them, and where. I can confirm that the statement does not require local planning authorities to identify suitable areas for wind energy development in their local plans." The Council has chosen to designate areas and, by so doing, has provided a magnet to potential developers to direct their applications to these areas. The MLP does not recognize that the Council, as a public</p>	<p>Re-visit the designation of turbine heights. These are arbitrary groupings. For example, to state that a turbine of height 50m, in clusters of 4 or 5, is wholly damaging to the landscape and visual impact. The M&amp;RLSS should be applied commensurate with the sensitivities of the local landscape, heritage and population. The approval of turbines above 35m should require exceptional justification. The presumption should be in favour of solar over wind power, as the former is less obtrusive and damaging to the landscape and bird-life, has no known</p>	<p>assessed against landscape sensitivity in Table 4.1. The opinions of Borough Councillors and Parish Councillors are taken into consideration within the assessment for each Landscape Character Unit under the 'Important Landmarks and Views' section. Halcrow and Bayou Blue Environment coordinated the responses from Parish Councils which are collated in Appendix 4 and were used to inform the assessment for each Landscape Character Unit under the 'Important Landmarks and Views' section. The LSS was adopted by the Council in 2014 as part of the Local Plan evidence base and from that time has been in the public domain. EN10 identifies areas which are suitable for wind energy development subject to an individual scheme meeting the policy criteria. Whether the proposal had community backing or not would be determined at the pre-application and planning application stage. EN10 is supportive of solar wind energy subject to proposals taking account of the policy criteria.</p>	

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	<p>authority, has a duty of care towards the community, which extends to protecting health as well as heritage, amenity and environment. Since 18 June 2015 it has been government policy that affected local communities should have the final say on whether to approve wind farms in their areas. However, what amounts to an "affected community" is not defined nor the degree of adverse impact necessary to amount to "affected". Therefore, the operation of consultation in relation to any development is such that it entitles those living some distance from a proposed development to exercise a view on a matter in respect of which they will experience little adverse effect (but an effect, all the same) and thereby gives their views an unjustified and unfair equivalence to those who are directly affected.</p>	<p>ill-health effects, can be more easily blended into the landscape by using non-reflective glass, is likely to meet with fewer objections from residents in the vicinity of its location - quite a contrast to turbines, which can be seen from miles away.</p>		
Bernard Taruvinga	<p>The land around LCU8 earmarked for wind turbines is located in one of the most beautiful, picturesque areas of Leicestershire full of wildlife and enjoyed by ramblers, walkers, tourists, cyclists etc. The area around Great Dalby and Gaddesby is therefore not suitable for wind farms, I do not support the plan to erect these on farmland near my home area.</p>		<p>EN10 identifies areas which are suitable for wind energy development subject to an individual scheme meeting the policy criteria. This would require the submission of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment to accompany any planning application.</p>	None.
Caroline Baker	<p>I am appalled that such a decision affecting so many villages can be taken without any apparent consultation of the electorate and so obviously against the wishes of all those who have consistently opposed the Hall Farm turbine in Thorpe Satchville. Please take this as my strongest opposition to prevent the despoliation of precious site already identified namely Burrough Hill [See supporting documents - No 58].</p>		<p>EN10 is a draft policy and won't be adopted until an examination of the Local Plan has determined that all the policies in the Local Plan are sound. EN10 identifies areas which are suitable for wind energy development subject to an individual scheme meeting the policy criteria. This would require the submission of a Landscape and</p>	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
			Visual Impact Assessment to accompany any planning application.	
David Johnston	<p>The potential size of these industrial turbines in the vicinity of a settlement like Thorpe Satchville will overwhelmingly and detrimentally affect the residents in terms of noise, with associated health concerns, as well as destroying the visual amenity namely the vista from points of interest such as the Fort at Borough on The Hill. The height of these turbines is significantly higher than is welcome, importantly there is no indication of a minimum distance from a settlement. In theory, the residents of a rural village could have a group of 50 Meter turbines on the edge of the village. The miniscule benefit that these may bring to the Melton Renewable Energy aspect of the Plan, will be vastly outweighed by the damage that these will cause to the rural aspect, heritage and the detrimental affect on our cultural historic landmarks and historical buildings. Whilst there may be a case for smaller wind turbines of e.g. of less than twenty meters to the tip to support farmers in generating energy for their endeavours, with the remainder being passed onto the national grid. As you will be aware the residents of this village are still awaiting the outcome of the decision from the Secretary of State for a turbine (already erected) that does not have the support of Melton Borough Council, the Planning Inspectorate or the community, which has blighted the local landscape since it was erected. Melton Borough Council must also listen to the people that these decisions potentially impact upon.</p>		<p>EN10 identifies areas which are suitable for wind energy development subject to an individual scheme meeting the policy criteria, including factors including amenity, heritage and landscape impact. If the Local Plan does not designate areas suitable for wind energy development, even small schemes to support farming would have to be refused, unless these have been identified in a Neighbourhood Plan. To date no Neighbourhood Plans have been adopted and no current draft plans suitable allocate areas. The evidence in the LSS supports the development of turbines in LCU8 of up to 50m subject to the policy criteria being met, which means that not all turbines up to this height will be suitable. The NPPG does not support the use of separation distances (Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 5-008-20140306).</p>	None.
Diane Orson	I do not think there is any justification for wind turbines as they are not efficient and where visible are a blot on the landscape	Solar panels should be encouraged on all new buildings with suitable roofing. Solar farms	EN10 supports solar development and much small scale solar development is covered by Permitted Development Rights.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		should be encourages on suitable land		
Dilys Shepherd	Not creating demand for bio-energy fuels known to result in net carbon emissions through production methods, transport requirements and/or loss of carbon sinks; However - you will create more journeys to and from Bottesford due to potentially increased housing and poor public transport to the communities where people work, shop and access facilities.		Noted.	None.
Elizabeth Taylor	It is no longer a legal requirement within National Policy for local authorities to identify suitable areas for wind energy development. The area-by-area descriptions of LCUs given in the table on page 122 (Table 18?) are not necessary. They are not allocations but give the impression that proposals which conform to the heights and densities described, would be approved. If policy EN10 identifies landscape areas including LCU8 in the adopted Melton Local Plan for wind turbine it will be very difficult to resist planning applications which follow.	The assessed housing need of the borough is much lower than the housing target, which has been inflated presuming that economic growth can be achieved. The housing figure has also been inflated to compensated for the lack of delivery in recent years. Land Study Melton Borough Council M94(e)/Final Report/June 2015.2.45 The employment forecasts are shown in Table 2. As Table 2 indicates, the	The areas identified in the table consist of just one of the criteria 1-18 which must be addressed for a scheme to be considered acceptable. The identification of areas does not mean that all proposals in LCU8 would be consented, not least because criteria 18 requires that the affected community must back any scheme.	Table 18 heading to be added.



Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		<p>Leicester and Leicestershire (HMA) Employment Land Study forecast a very low level of employment growth for Melton, a 300 jobs net increase over 2010-2031, a 1.3 percent change in 2010. In part this reflects a drop in employment from 2012, which is not fully reversed until 2031. An employment decrease if this severity and duration is not forecast for any of the other local authority areas of Leicester and Leicestershire.2.46 This is a far lower rate of growth than is forecast for any other local authority in Leicester and Leicestershire.The</p>		

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		<p>majority of employment for occupants of new housing in the Melton borough is likely to be largely located outside of the borough, leading to many more car journeys. This would not therefore be sustainable development.11.44 Discussions with the adjoining local authorities of Leicestershire, Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire, along with Rutland, indicate they all have sufficient land allocations (both existing and proposed) to meet projected needs. Therefore there is no immediate need for Melton to provide additional land.</p>		
Franchessca Hall	I disagree with the proposal of a wind farm in my area ( LCU8 ) and object to any applications .		The areas identified in the table consist of just one of the criteria 1-	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
			18 which must be addressed for a scheme to be considered acceptable. The identification of areas does not mean that all proposals in LCU8 would be consented, not least because criteria 18 requires that the affected community must back any scheme.	
Gordon Bigam	Government policy was changed to allow the local population to decide the desirability of any proposals for wind energy devices in their locality. This survey of the local population on a yes or no acceptance to the specific proposals has not been carried out. The proposals are extremely damaging to the region's environmental and visual heritage.	Carry out a door to door survey in each affected area for each proposal.	The support of any affected community is dependent on the details of any proposal. The pre-application or application stage is the appropriate point at which to determine community backing. The identification of areas in EN10 does not mean that all proposals in those areas would be consented.	None.
James and Amanda Sparrow	A designated area providing a blanket proposal for wind turbines of such scale and quantity in the rural borough would be hugely detrimental to the attractive agricultural landscape and local heritage assets. The council is not required to state designated areas for turbines.	The local community should have the final say on whether wind farms/turbines should go ahead in their areas. Each application should be judged separately on its merits and not just presumed in advance.	If the Local Plan does not designate areas suitable for wind energy development, even small schemes, for example, to support farming would have to be refused.	None.
John Coleman	The economic justification for intermittent and unpredictable forms of renewable power generation is coming under increasing critical scrutiny, nationally and internationally,	Delete the table on page 122.	The areas identified in the table consist of just one of the criteria 1-18 which must be addressed for a	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	because of the need for back-up generating capacity (usually fossil-fuelled). Wind turbines are also widely disliked by the public and have been subject to many strong protest campaigns within Melton Borough and elsewhere. It therefore seems perversely provocative to include the table of acceptable turbine heights on page 122, which gives the impression of acceptability for turbines in these locations.		scheme to be considered acceptable. The identification of areas does not mean that all proposals in LCU8 would be consented, not least because criteria 18 requires that the affected community must back any scheme.	
John Moore	There is no requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework nor in national Planning Practice Guidance for local plans to identify areas as suitable for wind energy development but if local councils choose so to do the PPG for Renewable and Low Carbon Energy makes it clear in paragraph 32 that suitable areas for wind energy development will need to have been allocated clearly in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan. Policy EN10 identifies Landscape Character Units (areas) which would be less sensitive than others to wind turbine development but it does not identify them as necessarily suitable, yet alone allocate them. Some of the Landscape Character Units cover an extensive land area containing different landscape features and different sensitivities to wind turbines. For example LCU8, High Leicestershire Hills, Great Dalby and Gaddesby Pastoral Farmland covers an area of approximately 60km square around the villages of Great Dalby, Thorpe Satchville, Ashby Folville, Barsby, Gaddesby, Kirby Bellars and Burton Lazars. This is much too large an area to be considered suitable for allocation. A single wind turbine application in the area covered by LCU8 was supported by neighbours but many others have seen sustained objections from the affected local communities (not least because of their impact on the landscape). I contend that without the backing of the affected local communities in LCU8 and elsewhere it would not be appropriate to list as suitable, let alone allocate, identified Landscape Character Units within Melton Local Plan policy EN10. The Written Ministerial	Policy EN10 should provide a criteria-based approach throughout the Local Plan area and to all identified renewable technologies. as below: Sensitively located renewable energy proposals appropriate for Melton, including biomass power generation, combined heat and power (CHP), hydro, wind, solar and micro generation systems, will be supported and considered in the context of sustainable development and	The NPPG Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 5-005-20150618 states: "There are no hard and fast rules about how suitable areas for renewable energy should be identified..... For example, landscape character areas could form the basis for considering which technologies at which scale may be appropriate in different types of location." Paragraph 7.20.12 of the justification to EN10 explains that areas of Low or Low-Moderate sensitivity are considered suitable for wind energy development, however this will be modified to more clearly explain how EN10(17) should be interpreted. If the Local Plan does not designate areas suitable for wind energy development, even small schemes for a single turbine, for example to support farming, would have to be refused. The support of any affected community is dependent on the details of any	Modification of paragraph 7.20.12 to make it clear that Criteria 17 allocates areas which are suitable for wind energy development, subject to the remaining criteria 1-18 being satisfied.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	<p>Statement from the Department for Communities and Local Government dated 18 June 2015 makes it clear that planning permission for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines should only be granted if the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed such that the proposal has their backing. Policy EN10 sits uncomfortably with other aspects of the Submission Draft Local Plan, in particular policy EN1 which seeks to enhance and protect the character of Melton Borough's landscape and countryside by, inter alia, “ensuring new development is sensitive to its landscape setting and enhances the distinctive qualities of the landscape character type (as defined in the Landscape Character Assessment”. In the accompanying text (paragraph 7.1.3) four of the twenty landscape character areas are identified for particular consideration including “the High Leicestershire Hills which is a classic landscape influenced by the requirements of sporting estates”.</p>	<p>climate change. Proposals for renewable energy technology, associated infrastructure and integration of renewable technology on existing or proposed structures will be assessed both individually and cumulatively on their merits taking account of the following factors: *</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Siting so as to gain maximum effect from wind/solar/water sources; *</li> <li>The surrounding landscape, townscape and heritage assets; *</li> <li>Residential and visual amenity; *</li> <li>Noise impacts; *</li> <li>Odour impacts; *</li> <li>Designated nature conservation, geo-diversity or</li> </ul>	<p>proposal and as such the pre-application or application stage is the appropriate point at which to determine community backing. EN1 and EN10 are not in conflict; EN(2) requires proposals to take account of the landscape.</p>	

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		biodiversity considerations, including potential impact on ancient woodland and veteran trees; * Ecology; * Aircraft movements and associated activities, including effects on radar, communications and navigational systems; * Electromagnetic transmissions; * High quality agricultural land; * Access for construction, maintenance and de-commissioning; * Not creating demand for bio-energy fuels known to result in net carbon emissions through production methods, transport requirements and/or loss of carbon sinks; * General safety in		

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		<p>terms of highways, power lines, icing, visual distraction; *  Transport movements for importation of biomass fuel. In the case of proposals for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, planning permission will only be granted if, following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing, and a bond is in place to cover de-commissioning. In developing proposals for new thermal generating stations,</p>		

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		<p>developers should consider opportunities for CHP and district heating from the very earliest point and it should be adopted as a criterion when considering locations for a project. Renewable energy proposals which will directly benefit a local community in the medium and long term and/or are targeted at residents experiencing fuel poverty will be particularly supported.</p>		
Leigh Higgins	<p>In broad this policy is nearly there. It needs tightening up to make effective.</p>	<p>1. Separation distances between settlements and the turbine. Maybe a relationship between turbine height and distance from nearest property or</p>	<p>The NPPG does not support the use of separation zones. Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 5-008-20140306: "Local planning authorities should not rule out otherwise acceptable renewable energy developments through inflexible rules on buffer zones or separation distances. Other than when dealing with set back distances for safety, distance</p>	<p>Modification of paragraph 7.20.15 to clarify how cumulative impacts should be taken into consideration.</p>



Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		<p>settlement (if you have evidence please submit)2. Encourage the turbines near Industrial Zones/Brownfield/ Business Parks (in planning terms this is positive).3. Tighter wording on valuing rural landscapes as turbines are seen as “industrial” structures so should this be considered against some of the commercial planning policies (similar to above).4. Cumulative impact – this is in the policy but I think we can get this A LOT tighter. How many is TOO many? Also should Melton consider turbines several kms away in this assessment I</p>	<p>of itself does not necessarily determine whether the impact of a proposal is unacceptable." The presence of turbines on brownfield sites or industrial/business parks does not in itself confer acceptability, as there may still be unacceptable impacts on residential and visual amenity and landscape, for example. The degree of subsidy or otherwise for a particular proposal is not a planning matter. A modification to paragraph 7.20.15 is proposed to clarify how cumulative impacts should be considered.</p>	

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		believe we should. Should we have a “density” factor of so many Turbines in a sq/km or in each of the LCU’s5. Consideration of self-sufficient turbines – i.e. no subsidy as this detracts from the economic side harming poorer households.		
Linda Moore	The inclusion of a list of LCUs based on the untested Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study would make draft policy EN10 unsound. Its authors considered it to be "merely a tool" to assist with planning decisions and not a definitive statement of suitability or unsuitability. Further, it was not subject to any public consultation. The Inspector at the Hazelton Farm appeal (APP/Y2430/W/15/3004564) referred to the Study is his decision letter but as it was “unclear what consultation has been undertaken” considered that it carried “only limited weight”. Melton Borough Council's decision to include wide-ranging LCUs as suitable for wind energy development in policy EN10 is not justified.	Removal of point 17 and list of LCUs.	The NPPG Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 5-005-20150618 states: "There are no hard and fast rules about how suitable areas for renewable energy should be identified..... For example, landscape character areas could form the basis for considering which technologies at which scale may be appropriate in different types of location". Borough and Parish Councils were consulted on important views in their parishes and these were taken into consideration in the assessment of each LCU. Policy EN10 allocates suitable areas in Table 18, but location within an allocated area is not sufficient reason for the grant	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
			of planning permission. All proposals for wind energy development within these allocated areas will need to demonstrate that they have satisfactorily met the remaining criteria 1-18.	
Lisa Stocks	Government policy regarding wind farm development since June 18th 2015 clearly states the duty of Councils to reflect the wishes of local people when granting planning permission for wind turbines. The letter also clearly refers to these obligations for Councils when drafting Local Plans including the allocation of sites. The action of Melton Borough Council in drafting this local plan in allocating sites for wind turbines CLEARLY goes against this policy. The Council are consulting on the Local Plan, NOT the allocation of specific areas for wind turbines. They are quite clearly trying to push this through without seeking the specific consent and views of local people to this plan. The groundswell of opinion against recent wind farm proposals was clear.	The Council should remove any reference to identified sites for wind farms in its local plans. There should be no identification of landscape areas in policy EN10 and references to areas identified as sites for wind turbines such as LCU8 should be COMPLETELY REMOVED from the Local Plan before adoption.	Historical opposition to planning applications in LCU8 does not mean that all wind developments will be unacceptable to the local community. For example, there is support for small-scale schemes located on farms. The pre-application or application stage is the appropriate point at which to determine community backing and this has been clarified through a modification to paragraph 7.20.12. If the Local Plan does not designate areas suitable for wind energy development, even these types of small scheme would have to be refused. The evidence in the LSS supports the development of turbines in LCU8 of up to 50m subject to the policy criteria being met, which means that not all turbines up to this height will be suitable. The identification of areas in EN10 does not mean that all proposals in those areas would be consented.	Modification of Paragraph 7.20.12: All proposals will be required to demonstrate that they have the backing of affected local communities through the submission of a consultation statement subsequent to the carrying out of a pre-application consultation.
Louise Pratt	This is an area of great NATURAL beauty and the prominence of	I request that this	EN10 identifies areas which are	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	wind turbines would impact greatly on the quality of life and the reason people live and visit the countryside. * Wind turbines are inefficient as far as renewable energy sources go * Do not provide any local jobs * Visual dominance would be overbearing * The objection submitted re the Crown Hill Wind Farm outlines in great detail information that would be relevant to this - please refer.	be removed from the Draft Local Plan.	suitable for wind energy development subject to an individual scheme meeting the policy criteria, including factors including amenity, heritage and landscape impact. The identification of areas in EN10 does not mean that all proposals in those areas would be consented.	
Merrill Wheeler	Any new housing should be constructed with state of the art energy efficiency. There is no visual or auditory impact in tapping geothermal energy.		The Local Plan cannot make it a requirement for new residential development to incorporate renewable energy technology.	None.
Michael Stocks	Government policy regarding wind farm development since June 18th 2015 clearly states the duty of Councils to reflect the wishes of local people when granting planning permission for wind turbines. The letter also clearly refers to these obligations for Councils when drafting Local Plans including the allocation of sites. The action of Melton Borough Council in drafting this local plan in allocating sites for wind turbines CLEARLY goes against this policy. The Council are consulting on the Local Plan, NOT the allocation of specific areas for wind turbines. They are quite clearly trying to push this through without seeking the specific consent and views of local people to this plan. The groundswell of opinion against recent wind farm proposals was clear.	The Council should remove any reference to identified sites for wind farms in its local plan. There should be no identification of landscape areas in policy EN10 and references to areas identified as sites for wind turbines such as LCU8 should be COMPLETELY REMOVED from the Local Plan before adoption.	Historical opposition to planning applications in LCU8 does not mean that all wind developments will be unacceptable to the local community. For example, there is support for small-scale schemes located on farms. The pre-application or application stage is the appropriate point at which to determine community backing and this has been clarified through a modification to paragraph 7.20.12. If the Local Plan does not designate areas suitable for wind energy development, even these types of small scheme would have to be refused. The evidence in the LSS supports the development of turbines in LCU8 of up to 50m subject to the policy criteria being met, which means that not all	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
			turbines up to this height will be suitable. The identification of areas in EN10 does not mean that all proposals in those areas would be consented.	
Michaela Kelly	I am so astonished that you are trying to find wind farm land without any mandate from the government. This village (Thorpe Satchville) is furiously against such action and I herewith add my objection to your scheme.		The NPPG supports the allocation of suitable areas for wind energy development in a Local Plan.	None.
Miss Beth Johnson (Chair)	National Policy does not require Local Authorities to identify suitable areas for wind energy development. This authority and a neighbouring authority have produced the Melton & Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study (2014). Paragraphs 7.20.10; 7.20.11 and 7.20.12 with Table 16 adequately clarify the relevance of the M&RLSS to this policy. The area-by-area descriptions of LCUs given in the table on page 122 (Table 18?) are not necessary. They are not allocations, yet they give the impression that proposals which conform to the heights and densities described there would be approved.	Policy EN10 point 17: Delete "These areas and acceptable turbine requirements are set out in the following below;" and remove the table on page 122 (Table 18?).	The areas identified in the table consist of just one of the criteria 1-18 which must be addressed for a scheme to be considered acceptable. The identification of areas does not mean that all proposals in LCU8 would be consented.	Modification of paragraph 7.20.12 to make it clear that Criteria 17 allocates areas which are suitable for wind energy development, subject to the remaining criteria 1-18 being satisfied.
Miss Elizabeth Johnson	Local Authorities are not required to identify suitable areas for wind energy development. This authority and a neighbouring authority have produced the Melton & Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study (2014). Paragraphs 7.20.10; 7.20.11 and 7.20.12 with Table 16 adequately clarify the relevance of the M&R LSS to this policy. The area-by-area descriptions of LCUs given in the table on page 122 (Table 18?) are not necessary. They are not allocations, yet they give the impression that proposals which conform to the heights and densities described there would be approved.	Policy EN10 point 17: Delete "These areas and acceptable turbine requirements are set out in the following below;" and remove the table on page 122 (Table 18?) altogether.	The areas identified in the table consist of just one of the criteria 1-18 which must be addressed for a scheme to be considered acceptable. The identification of areas does not mean that all proposals in LCU8 would be consented.	Modification of paragraph 7.20.12 to make it clear that Criteria 17 allocates areas which are suitable for wind energy development, subject to the remaining criteria 1-18 being satisfied.
MJ Caswell	We both became members of Belvoir Locals Oppose Turbines (BLOT), when BLOT was formed in 2007 to resist plans for a wind farm in the Vale of Belvoir. 7.19.2 "The planning For		It is accepted that much of Planning for Climate Change 2008 is now out of date in terms of data	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	<p>Climate Change Study” is cited together with ' recent planning applications '. This 2008 study is now over eight years old, its information is outdated and cannot be considered robust evidence to support the Local Plan. The Local Plan fails to make any mention of the significant public objections to the vast majority of wind turbine planning applications within Melton Borough. 7.20.2 The example of Hockerton wind turbine in Nottinghamshire is cited as only a positive example. 7.20.5 The Plan notes wind turbines can impact landscape, heritage and local people. The authority has evidence of these adverse impacts but has chosen not to include them in the local plan. 7.20.11 The Melton LSS landscape sensitivity study has shown how it has interpreted single turbines, however we find the term “cluster” has not been precisely or clearly defined at all in the study, and is therefore open to misinterpretation. The LSS landscape sensitivity study gives no base example of a spatial layout of wind turbine cluster. 7.20.15 Policy EN 10 - Energy Generation from Renewable Sources is a list of factors which must be taken into account in development proposals. The list is very basic and open to interpretation. Local people have been seriously concerned that their landscape, heritage and communities will be blighted by wind turbine developments. The Local Plan relies on the IT Power survey (2008), which considers a conservative (i.e. safe) separation from wind turbine development to be 400m. The wealth of evidence which has become available since 2008 clearly shows a nominal 400 m separation between wind turbine and a home is totally inadequate. Melton Borough Council specially commissioned a noise monitoring survey of the small wind turbine at Sproxton, following noise complaints from residents. The report from a reputable acoustic consultant (SproxWT131210) in December 2013 stated: It is concluded that the noise from the Sproxton Wind Turbine generates a highly disruptive and intrusive level of noise impact. This occurs not because of the decibel level but</p>		<p>on climate change, building regulations, national climate change policy and legislation and changes to permitted development rights for renewable technologies. However some of the report continues to be relevant, in terms of Melton Borough's suitability for renewable development. It continues to support large scale wind energy development, solely in terms of wind speeds, however, the data on separation distances is out of date and indeed the NPPG does not support the use of these(Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 5-008-20140306). Modern wind turbines have overcome many of the problems of amplitude modulation experienced with the first generation turbines and the etsu 97 test is still relevant and used. Table 4.2 of the LSS defines cluster sizes.</p>	

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	<p>due to its nature and character. In addition in 2015 Mr David Davis MP Stated in Parliament; In the last five years no planning application was refused on noise-related grounds, but there have been 600 noise-related incidents arising from wind farm operations. The majority of complaints arise as a result of amplitude modulation, which is the loud, continuous thumping or swishing noise regularly described by those living near wind farms. Numerous studies have identified that sleep is disturbed on a regular basis even at distances over 1 km away from turbines, yet under the ETSU standards turbines can be installed just 600 metres away from residential property. In December 2016 an Irish High Court Case (Shivnen &amp; Ors-V-Enercon Wind Farm Serves Ltd &amp; Anor 2011/9955 P.) has resulted in turbine manufacturer Enercon accepting full liability for causing nuisance to seven families who live up to 1km from the wind farm. It is reasonably foreseeable that if the Local Plan EN10 does not specifically provide reasonable or adequate noise protection for residents from wind turbines, the authority could find itself liable to significant financial costs.</p>			
Mr and Mrs J Dolan	<p>We wish to express our opposition and concern over the identification of the extensive land area which includes or borders the villages of Great Dalby, Thorpe Satchville, Ashby Folville, Barsby, Gaddesby, Kirby Bellars and Burton Lazars as suitable for wind farms comprising four or five turbines each up to 50 metres in height. This land area we believe is referred to as LCU8. Villagers in this area have fought and won to prevent previous schemes and we are surprised that no account of this has been taken in your future planning. It seems that councillors, politicians and bureaucrats need to start listening to the people they represent and work for!</p>		<p>Historical opposition to planning applications in LCU8 does not mean that all wind developments will be unacceptable to the local community. For example, there is support for small-scale schemes located on farms. The pre-application or application stage is the appropriate point at which to determine community backing and this has been clarified through a modification to paragraph 7.20.12. If the Local Plan does not designate areas suitable for wind energy development, even these types of</p>	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
			small scheme would have to be refused. The evidence in the LSS supports the development of turbines in LCU8 of up to 50m subject to the policy criteria being met, which means that not all turbines up to this height will be suitable. The identification of areas in EN10 does not mean that all proposals in those areas would be consented.	
Mr Gavin Simpson	In a letter in August 2016 from the Minister of State for Housing and Planning Gavin Barwell MP regarding the inclusion of these areas in the local plan, said that the local authorities did not need to identify suitable areas for wind energy development in their Local Plans. The NPPF does not include a requirement to identify suitable areas for wind energy development in a local plan.	Remove the LCU's from the policy.Add wording to reference the study, and that the areas MAY BE suitable. Not are.Consult on the study.	If the Local Plan does not designate areas suitable for wind energy development, even small schemes, for example, to support farming would have to be refused.	None.
Mr Russell Pride and Mrs Linda Pride	The Emerging Options consultation earlier this year resulted in a majority of respondents objecting to policy EN10 but those objections have been disregarded despite the Council now accepting that there is no requirement for them to identify areas as suitable for wind energy development in the local plan. However, if it is to be included it must allocate specific areas. EN10 does not do this, instead it identifies areas that may be suitable including for example LCU8 which encompasses all of Great Dalby, Gaddesby and Barsby, an area of approximately 19 square miles where the plan proposes clusters of up to 5 turbines of up to 50m height would be acceptable. Although there are many other constraints it seems quite inappropriate to even suggest that such a large area could accommodate possibly 100s of turbines. It is important to note that the	Some general recommendations in EN10 may be appropriate, but remove the table defining large areas and the acceptability of wind turbines.	EN10 identifies areas which are suitable for wind energy development subject to an individual scheme meeting the policy criteria, including factors including amenity, heritage and landscape impact. If the Local Plan does not designate areas suitable for wind energy development, even small schemes to support farming would have to be refused. The identification of areas does not mean that all proposals in LCU8 would be consented.	None.



Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	<p>Melton &amp; Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014, against which draft policy EN10 has been framed, was not subject to public consultation. As a result it has been found by planning inspectors to carry only limited weight in appeals. We therefore consider draft policy EN10 to be unsound in the way that it cites the Study as evidence to identify that Landscape Character Assessment Units judged as being of low or low-medium sensitivity ARE suitable for wind energy development for identified turbine heights and cluster sizes. The authors of the Study made it clear (paragraph 4.19 of the Study) that it provides an initial indication only of relative landscape sensitivities and it should not be interpreted as a definitive statement on the sensitivity of a particular location for a particular development.</p>			
Mrs V Taruvinga	<p>I write in respect of the above and note that Melton Borough Council is not required to identify suitable areas for wind farm development. I strongly object to the proposal to earmark the land area surrounding my home as suitable for energy regeneration from wind turbines. I live in an area which would be adversely affected by wind turbines on farmland surrounding Great Dalby &amp; Gaddesby.</p>		<p>EN10 identifies areas which are suitable for wind energy development subject to an individual scheme meeting the policy criteria. The identification of areas does not mean that all proposals in LCU8 would be consented.</p>	None.
Peter Caswell	<p>We both became members of Belvoir Locals Oppose Turbines (BLOT), when BLOT was formed in 2007 to resist plans for a wind farm in the Vale of Belvoir. 7.19.2 “The planning For Climate Change Study” is cited together with ' recent planning applications '. This 2008 study is now over eight years old, its information is outdated and cannot be considered robust evidence to support the Local Plan. The Local Plan fails to make any mention of the significant public objections to the vast majority of wind turbine planning applications within Melton Borough. 7.20.2 The example of Hockerton wind turbine in Nottinghamshire is cited as only a positive example. 7.20.5 The</p>		<p>It is accepted that much of Planning for Climate Change 2008 is now out of date in terms of data on climate change, building regulations, national climate change policy and legislation and changes to permitted development rights for renewable technologies. However some of the report continues to be relevant, in terms of Melton Borough's suitability for</p>	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	<p>Plan notes wind turbines can impact landscape, heritage and local people. The authority has evidence of these adverse impacts but has chosen not to include them in the local plan. 7.20.11 The Melton LSS landscape sensitivity study has shown how it has interpreted single turbines, however we find the term “cluster” has not been precisely or clearly defined at all in the study, and is therefore open to misinterpretation. The LSS landscape sensitivity study gives no base example of a spatial layout of wind turbine cluster. 7.20.15 Policy EN 10 - Energy Generation from Renewable Sources is a list of factors which must be taken into account in development proposals. The list is very basic and open to interpretation. Local people have been seriously concerned that their landscape, heritage and communities will be blighted by wind turbine developments. The Local Plan relies on the IT Power survey (2008), which considers a conservative (i.e. safe) separation from wind turbine development to be 400m. The wealth of evidence which has become available since 2008 clearly shows a nominal 400 m separation between wind turbine and a home is totally inadequate. Melton Borough Council specially commissioned a noise monitoring survey of the small wind turbine at Sproxton, following noise complaints from residents. The report from a reputable acoustic consultant (SproxWT131210) in December 2013 stated: It is concluded that the noise from the Sproxton Wind Turbine generates a highly disruptive and intrusive level of noise impact. This occurs not because of the decibel level but due to its nature and character. In addition in 2015 Mr David Davis MP Stated in Parliament; In the last five years no planning application was refused on noise-related grounds, but there have been 600 noise-related incidents arising from wind farm operations. The majority of complaints arise as a result of amplitude modulation, which is the loud, continuous thumping or swishing noise regularly described by those living near wind farms. Numerous studies have identified that sleep is disturbed</p>		<p>renewable development. It continues to support large scale wind energy development, solely in terms of wind speeds, however, the data on separation distances is out of date and indeed the NPPG does not support the use of these(Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 5-008-20140306). Modern wind turbines have overcome many of the problems of amplitude modulation experienced with the first generation of turbines and the etsu 97 test is still relevant and used. Table 4.2 of the LSS defines cluster sizes.</p>	

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	<p>on a regular basis even at distances over 1 km away from turbines, yet under the ETSU standards turbines can be installed just 600 metres away from residential property. In December 2016 an Irish High Court Case (Shivnen &amp; Ors-V-Enercon Wind Farm Serves Ltd &amp; Anor 2011/9955 P.) has resulted in turbine manufacturer Enercon accepting full liability for causing nuisance to seven families who live up to 1km from the wind farm. It is reasonably foreseeable that if the Local Plan EN10 does not specifically provide reasonable or adequate noise protection for residents from wind turbines, the authority could find itself liable to significant financial costs.</p>			
Peter Wheeler	<p>Any new housing should be constructed with state of the art energy efficiency. There is no visual or auditory impact in tapping geothermal energy.</p>		<p>The Local Plan cannot make it a requirement for new residential development to incorporate renewable energy technology.</p>	None.
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	<p>Supported in principle . However a survey carried out in November 2015 demonstrated a local resistance to Wind Turbines in the Vale of Belvoir particularly when they impacted on the environment or quality of the views, particularly of Belvoir Castle or Church Steeples. This is particularly the case with the ‘Lady of the Vale’ (St Mary’s Church in Bottesford) There was also a substantial resistance to Fracking in the area, certainly with regard to the lack of experience on the impact of such schemes in a relatively highly populated area like the UK. The use of Solar panels received the best result in terms of local acceptance. In the factors to be reviewed on a proposed scheme, Efficiency and Utilisation also needs to be considered..</p>		<p>EN10 supports solar energy development. Proposals would require the submission of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment to accompany any planning application. Efficiency of schemes is not a planning consideration.</p>	None.
Richard Randell	<p>As a resident of LCU8 I take exception to the suggestion that “Up to 50m as clusters of four/five turbines and in areas of varied, steeply sloping topography and small field patterns clusters of two/three” can be sited in the area. A wind turbine of 50m to tip height is an industrial giant quite out of keeping with the pastoral farmland identified in LCU8. A cluster of up to 5 such machines becomes a divesting effect on the charm of</p>	<p>LCU8 should be designated as “&lt;25m as a single turbine or clusters of one/two in larger scale areas”, and a separation</p>	<p>Historical opposition to planning applications in LCU8 does not mean that all wind developments will be unacceptable to the local community. For example, there is support for small-scale schemes located on farms. The pre-</p>	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	<p>this area of High Leicestershire. Smaller individual wind turbines of less than 25m are part and parcel of an agricultural economy that assists farmers to diversify and maintain their livelihood and are of a scale that fits with the nature of this countryside. There is no mention of the separation distance between wind turbines and inhabited dwellings so future applications could be sited unreasonably close to villages. We already have evidence that the siting of just one wind turbine causes immense harm to the nature of this pastoral farmland. The wind turbine at Hall Farm Thorpe Satchville (still unlawfully operating, since it does not have planning permission) dominates the landscape in every direction. Given that every attempt to erect large wind turbines within LCU8 has been met with strong and effective resistance it seems unlikely that future planning applications will meet the requirement of “demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing”.</p>	<p>distance of not less than 1km from inhabited dwellings should be included.</p>	<p>application or application stage is the appropriate point at which to determine community backing and this has been clarified through a modification to paragraph 7.20.12. If the Local Plan does not designate areas suitable for wind energy development, even these types of small scheme would have to be refused. The evidence in the LSS supports the development of turbines in LCU8 of up to 50m subject to the policy criteria being met, which means that not all turbines up to this height will be suitable. The identification of areas in EN10 does not mean that all proposals in those areas would be consented. The NPPG does not support the use of separation zones. Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 5-008-20140306: "Local planning authorities should not rule out otherwise acceptable renewable energy developments through inflexible rules on buffer zones or separation distances. Other than when dealing with set back distances for safety, distance of itself does not necessarily determine whether the impact of a proposal is unacceptable."</p>	
Richard Simon	Supported in principle . However a survey carried out in November 2015 demonstrated a local resistance to Wind		EN10 supports solar energy development. Proposals would	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	Turbines in the Vale of Belvoir particularly when they impacted on the environment or quality of the views, particularly of Belvoir Castle or Church Steeples. This is particularly true if St Mary's Church in Bottesford, known as the 'Lady of the Vale' is affected. The use of Solar panels received the best result in terms of local acceptance . In the factors to be reviewed on a proposed scheme, Efficiency and Utilisation also needs to be considered.		require the submission of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment to accompany any planning application. Efficiency of schemes is not a planning consideration.	
Robert Hobbs	NPPF paragraph 154: Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. They should address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change. Local Plans should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.	As per letter from the Department for Communities and Local Government to Clr J Simpson dated 26th August 2016 which states: "The new planning tests announced in the June 2015 written statement reflect our view that wind turbines should only get the go-ahead when local people say they want them and where. I can confirm that the statement does not require local planning authorities to identify suitable areas for wind energy	If the Local Plan does not designate areas suitable for wind energy development, even small schemes, for example, to support farming would have to be refused.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		development." Therefore LCU8 should be removed from the plan.		
Roy Powell	We were informed only yesterday of the above submissive draft plan with ref. to the energy generation and renewable sources policy EN10 and particularly LCU8 High Leicestershire area assessed suitability for Windfarms. As residents of Thorpe Satchville for over 40yrs, we and most villagers have objected to plans for wind farms (in fact against the Park farm and Hall farm turbines) and will oppose any future applications. With regard to LCU8 suitability we disagree with all assessment over rural as opposed to urban areas. We would remind the Council that High Leicestershire is in the Visit England Tourist Guide (re. Burrough Hill). Whether or not Low risk or Moderate risk, single or 4-5 clusters, 25m or 50m high turbines, these blots on the landscape will do nothing to promote local tourism, just the reverse.		Historical opposition to planning applications in LCU8 does not mean that all wind developments will be unacceptable to the local community. For example, there is support for small-scale schemes located on farms. The pre-application or application stage is the appropriate point at which to determine community backing and this has been clarified through a modification to paragraph 7.20.12. If the Local Plan does not designate areas suitable for wind energy development, even these types of small scheme would have to be refused. The evidence in the LSS supports the development of turbines in LCU8 of up to 50m subject to the policy criteria being met, which means that not all turbines up to this height will be suitable. The identification of areas in EN10 does not mean that all proposals in those areas would be consented.	None.
Susan Hall	I object entirely to the proposal of policy EN10 - I do not want any wind turbines in my area and as a resident in the village of Thorpe Satchville I will decline any wind turbine applications .		The areas identified in the table consist of just one of the criteria 1-18 which must be addressed for a scheme to be considered	Modification of Paragraph 7.20.12: All proposals will be required to demonstrate that they

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
			acceptable. The identification of areas does not mean that all proposals in LCU8 would be consented	have the backing of affected local communities through the submission of a consultation statement subsequent to the carrying out of a pre-application consultation.
Susan Hobbs	NPPF Paragraph 154. "Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. They should address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change. Local Plans should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan"	As per letter from The Department for Communities and Local Government to Cllr J Simpson dated 26th August 2016 which states:" The new planning tests announce in the June 2015 written statement reflect our view that wind turbines should only get the go-ahead when local people say they want them and where. I can confirm that the statement does not require local planning authorities to identify suitable areas for wind	If the Local Plan does not designate areas suitable for wind energy development, even small schemes, for example, to support farming would have to be refused.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		energy development."Therefore LCU8 should be removed from the plan.		
Susan Love	Fully support this section and particularly pleased to see the low wind turbine heights for the Vale of Belvoir.		Noted.	None.
Valerie Bailey	I am writing to lodge my disapproval for the above (LCU8). We live in a beautiful area and I object to the scenery being blighted by these huge wind turbines. We do not want these in or around Thorpe Satchville, Twyford etc.		The areas identified in the table consist of just one of the criteria 1-18 which must be addressed for a scheme to be considered acceptable. The identification of areas does not mean that all proposals in LCU8 would be consented.	Modification of Paragraph 7.20.12: All proposals will be required to demonstrate that they have the backing of affected local communities through the submission of a consultation statement subsequent to the carrying out of a pre-application consultation.
<b>EN11</b>				
ALAN HART	Sewstern has flooding. Three in 2016		Noted.	None.
Andrew Granger & Co Ltd	We fully support the objectives of Policy EN11: Minimising the risk of flooding. Given that the presumption in favour of sustainable development is the golden thread running through national and local planning policy, it is logical that this translates into development being located in areas that are not at high risk of flooding, and also that schemes do not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. With reference to the Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning, the subject site is not an area at significant risk of flooding.		Noted.	None.
Anglian Water	Anglian Water is generally supportive of Policy EN11 of the Local Plan as we support the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) to reduce risk of surface water and sewer flooding. However Policy EN11 requires the submission of a	It is therefore suggested that to make the policy effective the	EN11 requires a FRA for all development proposals over 1 hectare and proposals in flood Zones 2 and 3.	Modification as proposed re. capacity of foul water sewerage network.



Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	<p>Flood Risk Assessment which incorporates Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) for all sites located within flood zones 1 and 2 but not flood zone 3. It is considered that the requirement for SuDs should apply to all major development as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance and not just those located within Flood Zones 1 and 2. Reference is also made to the foul sewerage network following comments previously made by Anglian Water as part of the emerging options consultation. We welcome the reference to the foul sewerage network in Policy EN11 but consider it should amended to make it clear what the applicant is being asked to consider as part of the planning application process.</p>	<p>wording of Policy EN11 should be amended as follows: 'Proposals will need to demonstrate that there is capacity of within the foul water sewerage network has been considered or that capacity can made available prior to the occupation of the development.'</p> <p><u>UNDERLINING AND STRIKETHROUGH HAS NOT TRANSFERRED ACROSS.</u></p>		
Caroline Louise Stuart	<p>A large part of the GADD2 site is subject to flooding. Those who walk regularly on the footpath across the site can confirm that in wet weather most of the site is subject to standing water; Concerns exist that if the site were to be built, surface run-off would likely cause Gaddesby Brook to flood. Further investigation into surface water and foul drainage solutions is required before the Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan progresses any further. In respect of the GADD3 site, the ground is clay heavy and as a result there is a lot of surface water retention and run-off from fields. The Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan makes no mention of any attempts to improve drainage facilities for existing properties, in acknowledgement of the impact additional housing allocation would cause. This potential risk has not been properly assessed.</p>		<p>GADD2 is partially in Flood Zone 2 and will therefore require submission of a flood risk assessment in accordance with policy EN11 and which will address issues of surface water drainage and foul water sewerage. GADD3 will require submission of a surface water drainage strategy in accordance with policy EN12. A sequential test justifying the choice of site allocations will be submitted alongside the Local Plan in March 2017.</p>	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	Within the overall Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan housing allocations, it is felt that there are more suitable lower risk areas than those put forward in Gaddesby;			
Catherine J.G. Pugh	Bottesford is a high-risk village in Flood Zone 3, much of it in Flood Zone 3a. It is one of the least sustainable areas for the kind of large-scale development proposed in the Draft Local Plan. Bottesford suffered from flooding in 1999, 2001 and 2007. It goes on to say '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.' The lack of available land in areas of less flood risk has not been adequately demonstrated.	The Draft Local Plan appears to allow for building in high-flood risk areas, by stating that: 'Exceptionally, it may be appropriate to develop land at risk of flooding for sustainability reasons or to avoid economic or social blight in an area.' It is not clear what these 'sustainability reasons' might be, but what is surely obvious that increasing the already significant flood risk in the village will cause both economic and social blight.	A sequential test justifying the choice of site allocations will be submitted alongside the Local Plan in March 2017.	None.
Christopher Noakes	Requirements A,B, C not identified	Include appropriate references	Noted.	Policy modified accordingly.
Colin Love	The largest number of houses has been allocated to Bottesford - the settlement and area that has, according to the		A sequential test justifying the choice of site allocations will be	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	Environment Agency, the HIGHEST risk of flooding within the Borough. Applying the sequential approach contained within Policy EN11 across the Borough, Bottesford should be towards the tail-end of rural housing allocation.		submitted alongside the Local Plan in March 2017.	
David Adams	The town floods and bad areas are the traffic lights at Thorpe Road/Norman Way, Tesco Thorpe Road and adjacent fields towards Thorpe Arnold Hill and Melton Spinney Road including its junction with Thorpe Road. The drain maintenance in these areas is poor and the brook overflows its banks. Any additional development will exacerbate the situation.		All development proposals will need to meet the requirements of EN11 such that flood risk will not be increased.	None.
Dermot Daly	Please refer to earlier section comments in respect of flooding.	Regarding Bottesford, the authority should conduct the necessary investigation to impact of flooding.	This has been carried out in the Melton Level 1 and Level 2 SFRA 2015 and Addendum 2016.	None.
Diane Orson	Whilst the policy is sound in relation to the site that is assessed, more scrutiny needs to be taken into account for areas outside the site that may be impacted by any development of that site		EN11 also requires that development proposals do not increase flood risk to others.	None.
Dilys Shepherd	A significant number of homes in the Parish were severely flooded in 2001 therefore extra care should be given to building proposals Bottesford.		The Melton SFRA 2015 addresses historic flooding in the Borough.	None.
Dr Anthony H. Cooper	The policy does not take account of places where the surface water drainage infrastructure is inadequate (such as Long Clawson) and where surface water already causes and unacceptable flooding problem. It puts an onus on the developer via SuDS to match the natural runoff, but does not impose a clause to actually reduce the runoff or improve the drainage infrastructure. As such it is not a sustainable policy.	Make provision in the plan for improving the drainage through the village of Long Clawson before any further development is permitted in the village.	EN11 seeks to reduce flood risk as well ensuring flood risk is not increased. FRAs will be required to consider the potential to contribute to solutions for the wider area.	None.
dr brian		Fris 2 site needs a	A sequential test justifying the	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
kirkup		<p>sequential test performing by the council and the first part of that test is, avoidance, i.e. can the development be accommodated on a site with lower or no flood risk? Fris 4 fulfils these criteria, having no flood risk and is of adequate size, therefore Fris 2 fails the sequential test and Fris 4 should be preferred for development. Fris 4 should be promoted and Fris 2 should become the reserve site. It is also worth pointing out that the neighbourhood plans most recent village survey suggested Great lane, and Fris 4 as our preferred sites. Fris 2 came bottom as it did in our first</p>	<p>choice of site allocations will be submitted alongside the Local Plan in March 2017.</p>	

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		village survey earlier in 2016.		
Dr Neil James Fortey	The policy takes insufficient regard of flood risk in Bottesford where risk is high. Bottesford has 413 properties in Flood Zone 3 and many are in the undefended Flood Zone 3a. 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.	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 are many sites in Melton Borough where flood risk is lower than that at Bottesford. 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.	A sequential test justifying the choice of site allocations will be submitted alongside the Local Plan in March 2017.	None.
Elizabeth Crowther	Flash surface water has been in evidence in Long Clawson for over 30 years and MBC reports in 2003 and 2007 showed the inadequacy of the existing sewers and culverts both in maintenance and capacity. There is no investment shown in this infrastructure despite the significant housing increase proposed. This is essential infrastructure as described in IN2,	Introduce investment proposals to Appendix 1 for Long Clawson, with a developer	The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule identifies connections, reinforcements and/or improvements to water and waste infrastructure as essential infrastructure required to deliver	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	Priority 1.	contribution to cover upgrades to existing sewerage and culvert networks at The Sands and Claxton Rise.	the Local Plan.	
Geoff Platts	In the part of the policy " Development in defended Zone 3a will only be considered where it can be demonstrated that it meets requirement A) B) & C) above", yet in the text above within the policy there are no requirements A) B) or C).	Replace the bullet points within the Policy with the appropriate letters A) B) & C).	Noted.	Policy modified accordingly.
Geoffrey Foster	Proposed development site of Rectory Farm Bottesford is a flood zone 3b and thus designated to be used as an area for flood alleviation. Development on this site, or raising it to allow development will have a knock on flood effect on the rest of Bottesford. This area is now a 1:75 year flood risk area and not a 1:100, thus does not meet the requirement as potential development land.	Remove all proposals to build on flood zones.	A sequential test justifying the choice of site allocations will be submitted alongside the Local Plan in March 2017.	None.
Hazelton Homes	We fully support the objectives of Policy EN11.		Noted.	None.
James Keith Hamilton	Many of the sits showing housing and reserve sites fail the sequential test. The maps showing the flood zones have not caught up with recent events or acknowledge local conditions such as ground or topography. Similarly it does not acknowledge the SUDS is very expensive to provide and not reliable in the long term due to poor maintenance. The County Council are emptying road gullies once a year and with the growth of tarmac/ impervious surfaces the water run off is increasing worse as ditches are also not being maintained.		A sequential test justifying the choice of site allocations will be submitted alongside the Local Plan in March 2017. The SFRA 2016 Addendum updates the site assessments and provides climate change mapping subsequent to the Environment Agency's guidance changes in 2016.	None.
K Lynne Camplejohn	Incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems and considers their ongoing maintenance unless they are demonstrated to be not technically feasible	The phrase "unless they are demonstrated to	Policy EN12 makes provision for this and requires the applicant to provide evidence that a connection	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		be not technically feasible" is a potential get out for developers responsibility remove the phrase.	to a public surface water sewer is necessary where SuDS are technically not feasible.	
LCC (Highways, Education, Early Years, Waste, Property Assets, LLFA, Libraries & Culture, LRERC)	All types of flooding must be considered when identifying new development sites as detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) section 10, ' Meeting the challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change'. Developers should also consider The Sequential and Exception Tests as outlined in paragraph 21 of the Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014). In line with current government policy, (Sustainable drainage systems: Written statement - HCWS161, December 2014), Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be prioritised for managing surface water flows. Therefore appropriate space allocation for SuDS features should be included within development sites. These features should look to introduce blue green corridors to improve the bio-diversity and amenity of new developments, and surrounding areas where possible. Often ordinary watercourses and land drainage features (including streams, culverts and ditches) form part of development sites. LCC recommend that existing watercourses and land drainage (including watercourses that form the site boundary) are retained as open features along their original flow path, and are retained in public open space to ensure that access for maintenance can be achieved'. To achieve these aims the LCC in our role as the Lead Local Flood Authority would recommend that communities consider the following principles when assessing site allocation: • Locating development outside of River (Fluvial) Flood risk (Flood Zone 2 and 3) • Locating development outside of Surface water (Pluvial) Flood risk (updated Flood Map for Surface Water) • How potential SuDS features may be incorporated into the		Noted.	Modification to 2nd paragraph of policy such that the sequential approach applies to both fluvial and pluvial flooding.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	development to enhance the local amenity, water quality and biodiversity of the site as well as manage surface water runoff. • Watercourses and land drainage should be protected within new developments to prevent an increase in flood risk.			
Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	We fully support the objectives of the policy.		Noted.	None.
Lance Wiggins (on behalf of G S Development s (Leicester) Ltd	This policy is supported. The approach to the development of land at Lake Terrace (which is flood defended land) would mitigate flood risk on the application site by raising the level of land with material arising from the removal of the adjoining former railway embankment. The developer's consultants have been in discussions with the Environment Agency and the development has been modelled to ensure that flood risk would not be increased elsewhere.		Noted.	None.
Melanie Steadman	Any large development, wholly dependent on a SUDS system to prevent property flooding to others in the catchment, should not be allowed. To be completely dependent, on one system, managed, maintained and overseen by a company which may or may not be in business in 10 years time, with no fail-safe procedures/systems in place should a storm event occur is unsound.	Do not be completely dependent on SUDS to negate flooding further down the catchment.	EN11 requires that the maintenance of SuDS is considered. Where appropriate, MBC will take on responsibility for the maintenance of SuDS. Where SuDS is not technically feasible connection to a public surface water sewer is necessary.	None.
Peter Wilkinson	Supported. However, 'Defended' Flood Zone 2 should be a consideration, as this land designation states that there is even less risk of flooding than Flood Zone 2. Is there the possibility that "Defended Flood Zone 3A" referred to is a typo? Appropriate mitigation measures (as shown in the proposals for site MBC/004/16, Water Lane, Frisby on the Wreake), in addition to meeting the terms of this proposed policy, would deem site proposals sustainable and viable in regard to flood risk in Defended Flood Zone 2 areas. Regarding site	A greater flexibility and positive perception of sites located in 'Defended Flood Zone 2' should be provided, where it is demonstrated that proposed	"Defended Flood Zone 3A" referred is not a typo. It is not possible to treat proposals in defenced Flood Zone 2 as if they were in Flood Zone 1 because there is the residual risk that flood defences will fail. As such, proposals in defended flood zone 2 are required to be accompanied by a flood risk	None.



Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	MBC/004/16, the supporting Flood Risk Assessment states "the vulnerability of the development to flooding from all sources pose a low risk to the development subject to the recommended mitigation measures being implemented. The proposed surface water strategy will not increase flood risk at the site or elsewhere and provide betterment in terms of runoff rates during high intensity storms". The proposals are also deemed sufficient by the Lead Local Flood Authority in regards to flood risk, which the Environment Agency refer to as the lead statutory consultee for surface water management on this site.	dwellings are suitably located in the lowest risk areas on site, and a SUDS and improved green infrastructure mitigate any remaining risk of flooding. Site MBC/004/16 should be viewed acceptable in terms of flood risk given these comments and the supporting application documents (16/00740/OUT).	assessment.	
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	The extent of the Flood Zones 2 and 3 in Bottesford Parish is the greatest restriction to development in the area. The Environment Agency rates Bottesford as one of the highest flood risks in the East Midlands and that, subject to funding, they intended to undertake a thorough survey of the area in 2017. Consideration should be given to installing weirs in the reservoirs at Knipton, Denton and the lakes in the Belvoir Estate so designed as to maintain a level of additional capacity in those bodies of water. A regime of maintenance is necessary in those reservoirs and lakes to limit the impact of silt accumulation. The sequential approach to flood risk identified in Policy EN11 does not appear to have been followed.		A sequential test justifying the choice of site allocations will be submitted alongside the Local Plan in March 2017. Delivery of flood risk management infrastructure is the responsibility of the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority, with whom MBC work in partnership under the Duty to Cooperate.	None.
Richard Simon	The extent of the Flood Zones 2 and 3 in Bottesford Parish is the greatest restriction to development in the area. The Environment Agency rates Bottesford as one of the highest		A sequential test justifying the choice of site allocations will be submitted alongside the Local Plan	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	flood risks in the East Midlands and that, subject to funding, they intended to undertake a thorough survey of the area in 2017. Consideration should be given to installing weirs in the reservoirs at Knipton, Denton and the lakes in the Belvoir Estate so designed as to maintain a level of additional capacity in those bodies of water. A regime of maintenance is necessary in those reservoirs and lakes to limit the impact of silt accumulation. The sequential approach to flood risk identified in Policy EN11 does not appear to have been followed.		in March 2017. Delivery of flood risk management infrastructure is the responsibility of the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority, with whom MBC work in partnership under the Duty to Cooperate.	
Susan Love	Fully support all these objectives. There should be added a condition about development not increasing flood risk to neighbouring older properties which do not have the high floor levels and other flood resisting features. Pit and pipe drainage systems which create ugly attenuation feature , erroneously called 'ponds', should be avoided, and more sophisticated modern drainage systems with swales and underground tanks should be encouraged.	Modern drainage systems using swales and underground tanks should be used instead of pit and pipe drainage systems which create no amenity value. Properties near to new development should be assessed for flood risk in relation to their floor levels and flood protection features and new development not permitted if these older properties are put at greater risk from the development.	EN11 ensures that development proposals do not increase flood risk to others. EN12 requires that SuDS techniques mimic natural drainage patterns and achieve net gains for nature through the creation of ponds and wetlands wherever practicable. The Lead Local Flood Authority is responsible for approving the surface water drainage strategy for a proposal.	None.
The Leicester	We fully support the objectives of the policy.		Noted.	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
Diocesan Board of Finance				
<b>EN12</b>				
ALAN HART	There has been flooding in Sewstern on at least on average twice per year. This year there has been three floods. Sewage is a problem in this village. Pipes have collapsed and waste backs up pipes.		Noted. EN11 requires that proposals demonstrate that there is capacity within the foul water sewerage network.	None.
Anglian Water	Anglian Water welcomes the reference made to the inclusion of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) as part of major developments. We support the use of SUDs to reduce risk of surface water and sewer flooding.		Noted.	None.
Colin Love	Policy EN 12 must ensure that all SUDS schemes incorporated in to new housing development avoid the Pipe to Pit construction that is unsightly and can, with a deep sided pit, constitute a substantial danger. Developers should be required to design and install environmentally attractive SUDS - that compliment and enhance the quality of their setting.		EN12 requires that SuDS techniques mimic natural drainage patterns and achieve net gains for nature through the creation of ponds and wetlands wherever practicable. In addition SuDS will be expected to achieve a net decrease in surface water run-off rates including through green infrastructure provision such as planting of native trees and bushes.	None.
Dermot Daly	Please refer to earlier section comments in respect of flooding, unsustainable services and lack of justified housing allocations.	Regarding Bottesford, the authority should conduct the necessary investigation to impact of flooding.	This has been carried out in the Melton Level 1 and Level 2 SFRA 2015 and Addendum 2016.	None.
Dr Anthony H. Cooper	The policy for SuDS should include all developments, not just major ones (what is major). The provision of so called Windfall sites and expansion of villages by piecemeal growth mean that	Make it a provision that SuDS need to be installed for all	EN11 requires that all development proposals in Flood Zone 2 and 3 or which exceed 1	Define major development in justification at para

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	significant increases in developed size can occur without proper drainage management.	new properties.	hectare, should be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment which incorporates SuDS.	7.24.2
LCC (Highways, Education, Early Years, Waste, Property Assets, LLFA, Libraries & Culture, LRERC)	<p>All types of flooding must be considered when identifying new development sites as detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) section 10, ' Meeting the challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Costal Change'. Developers should also consider The Sequential and Exception Tests as outlined in paragraph 21 of the Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014). In line with current government policy, (Sustainable drainage systems: Written statement - HCWS161, December 2014), Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be prioritised for managing surface water flows. Therefore appropriate space allocation for SuDS features should be included within development sites. These features should look to introduce blue green corridors to improve the bio-diversity and amenity of new developments, and surrounding areas where possible. Often ordinary watercourses and land drainage features (including streams, culverts and ditches) form part of development sites. LCC recommend that existing watercourses and land drainage (including watercourses that form the site boundary) are retained as open features along their original flow path, and are retained in public open space to ensure that access for maintenance can be achieved'.o achieve these aims the LCC in our role as the Lead Local Flood Authority would recommend that communities consider the following principles when assessing site allocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locating development outside of River (Fluvial) Flood risk (Flood Zone 2 and 3)</li> <li>• Locating development outside of Surface water (Pluvial) Flood risk (updated Flood Map for Surface Water)</li> <li>• How potential SuDS features may be incorporated into the development to enhance the local amenity, water quality and biodiversity of the site as well as manage surface water runoff.</li> <li>• Watercourses and land drainage should be protected within</li> </ul>		Noted.	Modification to second para of policy.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	new developments to prevent an increase in flood risk.			
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	Supported, however the flood risk described above cannot wholly be avoided by simple forms of Sustainable Drainage Systems as the flood water arises externally to the villages and a more thorough approach is necessary 'through the creation of ponds and wetlands near the watercourses'. Modern drainage systems with swales and underground tanks should be preferred to the unattractive 'pit and pipe systems' which have no amenity value and are more suitable for industrial locations.		EN12 requires that SuDS techniques mimic natural drainage patterns and achieve net gains for nature through the creation of ponds and wetlands wherever practicable. In addition SuDS will be expected to achieve a net decrease in surface water run-off rates including through green infrastructure provision such as planting of native trees and bushes.	None.
Richard Simon	Supported, however the flood risk described above cannot wholly be avoided by simple forms of Sustainable Drainage Systems as the flood water arises externally to the villages and a more thorough approach is necessary 'through the creation of ponds and wetlands near the watercourses'. Modern drainage systems with swales and underground tanks should be preferred to the unattractive 'pit and pipe systems' which have no amenity value and are more suitable for industrial locations.		EN12 requires that SuDS techniques mimic natural drainage patterns and achieve net gains for nature through the creation of ponds and wetlands wherever practicable. In addition SuDS will be expected to achieve a net decrease in surface water run-off rates including through green infrastructure provision such as planting of native trees and bushes.	None.
Susan Love	Too many estates are being brought forward with ugly pit and pipe drainage solutions. Drainage solutions should have an amenity benefit.	Modern drainage systems using swales should be encouraged on housing development. Pit and pipe systems should be	EN12 requires that SuDS techniques mimic natural drainage patterns and achieve net gains for nature through the creation of ponds and wetlands wherever practicable. In addition SuDS will be expected to achieve a net decrease in surface water run-off	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		relegated to use on industrial sites	rates including through green infrastructure provision such as planting of native trees and bushes.	
Terence Joyce	Build on SOM2 (Someryby) will have maximum negative effect on this Policy , as the whole of this site is within “Priority Green Infrastructure” where rain dispersion is important.		EN3 does not prevent development within areas identified as Strategic Primary Green Infrastructure as long as proposals retain important elements identified in policy EN3 (10-17) or can provide mitigation.	None.
<b>EN13</b>				
Andrew Gore obo Mary A Donovan	These representations also seek to reiterate concerns raised in earlier Local Plan representations that the proposed reserved housing allocation at Land off Burrough Road, Someryby (SOM3 or MBC/048/13) will result in substantial harm to the significance of the Someryby Conservation Area. The Draft Plan overall does not give sufficient weight to the Heritage strategy compared to other strategies in the Environmental section. In the context of ambitious residential and employment growth and the number of important assets in the Borough, there is little detail and clear priorities don't emerge. In accordance with NPPF paragraph 126 it does not state 'a positive strategy for conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment'. For example, assets at risk are not identified with a priority for enhancement stated. Policy EN13 does not meet the intention of NPPF paragraph 132 which states 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.' Policy language such as 'seeking to' or 'where possible' is not in accordance with paragraph 132. Paragraph 7.23.2 states the Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans are completed. However, it is not clear from the appraisals on the website, if they have been updated, and those on the website appear decades old and not at the standard of Historic England:		At this stage MBC is not able to make changes - however minor modification to the wording will be considered. With regards to the development site SOM2 and Som3, all heritage assets likely to be affected any development have been taken into account in the site assessment process and in reference to Para 132 of the NPPF	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	<p>'Understanding Place: Historic Area Assessments in a Planning and Development Context.' In the context of ambitious growth, the Significance of heritage assets and their settings should be included, against which developers and planners can judge development proposals. Without this, the sustainability of the historic environment is at risk in the Plan.4.24 An update to the Somerby Conservation Appraisal was submitted in August 2015 and again to the 4 April 2016 consultation (Appendix 1 and 6) which does not appear to have been considered as part of the appraisal informing the Plan; it is considered that this should be considered if the appraisal is to be deemed sound at examination. 4.25 The development proposals SOM2 and SOM3, and indeed the planning applications at Southfield Farms, as described in point 4.12 will together affect a large number of the listed buildings at the south and west of Somerby as well as undesignated but related historic buildings and archaeology. In Appeal Decision APP/2430/A/14/221470, it was stated in reference to Section 5.66 that great weight should be given to conservation of the heritage assets. Those situated at the south and west of Somerby, and in particular the Grade I Church were included. In the balancing act undertaken by the Inspector, these assets were judged to experience as a result of the development 'Less than substantial harm to the setting of heritage assets, but the harm identified carries substantial importance and weight.' The Appeal noted that the STOP group had submitted a body of evidence to support this conclusion.4.26 The Draft Plan does not appear to have considered this appeal decision and the supporting evidence when favourably assessing the environmental sustainability of the concentration of development at the south and west of the village, for each individual SHLAA submission and planning application, or in the Local Green Space assessment for Somerby, in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 132.</p>			

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
Anthony Paphiti	This is an important policy, as we must protect out valuable heritage assets. It is important to recognise that we do not own these assets. Rather, we are custodians of them for future generations. This is why the siting of any development which may damage them or detract from an aesthetic appreciation of them in their historical setting is vitally important.		Comment Noted.	None.
Caroline Louise Stuart	Policy EN13A (p129) states that Melton Borough Council will seek 'to ensure the protection and enhancement of Heritage Assets including non-designated heritage assets when considering proposals for development affecting their significance and setting. Proposed development should avoid harm to the significance of historic sites, buildings or areas, including their setting. I believe the proposal for GADD2 is not consistent with this policy statement. St Luke's Church sits at the top of Church Lane, it is a Grade 1 listed building and felt by some to be the most important church in the County from an archaeological perspective. The church is a fine 12th Century Heritage Church, originally constructed by the Order of the Knights Templar. If the GADD2 site were to be developed this would interfere with the setting of this wonderful building. The GADD2 site would interfere with the only 'long view' to and from the Church. The impact of development upon the Church's setting has not been properly assessed in the context of the wider site. Without a robust heritage assessment, any public benefits balancing exercise cannot be undertaken, making the site of the proposed housing allocation unwarranted. In addition to St Luke's Church, the GADD2 site is 'ridge and furrow', this also constitutes a heritage asset but this also does not seem to have been taken into account and its potential loss assessed.		All heritage assets likely to be affected by any development have been taken into account in the site assessment process	None.
Diane Orson	Whilst I believe the policy is sound I don't believe that it is practised by the Council		The Council cannot operate this policy until it is nearing adoption, or is adopted.	None.



Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
Dr Anthony H. Cooper	This policy should be sound and effective, but it is not because it is contradicted by the land allocations and lack of notice taken of the comments from Heritage England with respect to Long Clawson, especially sites LONG2 and LONG4, neither of which should have been proposed in the first place if this policy was effective.	The Local Plan needs to better assess the heritage assets with respect to the land put forward for development. The Local Plan needs to take notice of Heritage England's comments and feed those into any assessment.	All heritage assets likely to be affected by any development have been taken into account in the site assessment process	None.
James Keith Hamilton	7.23 Although the Conservation Area Appraisals are completed, there is no evidence as many have not been reviewed since the early 1970`s. There is no reference to the important risk of archaeological finds during excavation, need for Geophysical surveys, trial holes, desk studies on likely sites. Section 69(2) and 70(1) place a continuing duty on LPAs to review and extend existing Conservation Areas. MBA have failed to do this in the case pf Somerby and many other areas.Policy EN13/B MBC are promoting sites for development which are clearly in breach of this policy. Positive contribution in villages is not encircling it with new housing and increasing traffic levels on already unsafe narrow winding roads.Policy EN13/C MBC needs to add the word “adjacent” to Conservation Areas and after the words new conservation areas add “ review boundaries of existing Conservation Areas”	Policy EN13 /A MBC need to add the word “adjacent” to historic sites	The Council acknowledges that the existing CAA's are due for revision.	Wording is added to the end of the first sentence of 7.23.2 to read ‘... But need to be updated, as and when resources permit.
K Lynne Camplejohn	The policy makes no reference to neighbourhood plans when referring to heritage assets in a settlement.	Include a statement on neighbourhood plans with reference to	It is not necessary to reference neighbourhood plans in every policy. Reflecting national policy, Section 1.9 of the local plan sets out how NPs relate to the local	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		heritage assets.	plan.	
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	We welcome the reference to historic features such as ridge and furrow. Policies EN1 Landscape, EN 3 Green Infrastructure, EN6 Settlement Character and EN13 Heritage Assets are all mutually supportive. It is important to recognise the inter-relatedness of the environment, and similarly the multiple opportunities and shared beneficial outcomes presented by working across the various environmental areas.		Noted	None.
Melanie Steadman	Seeking to ensure the protection and enhancement of Heritage Assets including non-designated heritage assets when considering proposals for development affecting their significance and setting. Proposed development should avoid harm to the significance of historic sites, buildings or areas, including their setting. In Long Clawson, there is a privately owned Grade II* listed Manor House, in its grounds is set an ancient fish pond, related to the Scheduled National Monument next door. Immediately to the south of this property is a development site for 55 houses. This site elevates 9 metres above the village and is currently an open view out of the village and across the escarpment and wider vale. This high density development threatens to dry up this ancient pond, ruin the setting of both the Grade II* listed Church and Manor House and crowd in the openness of the village. This has not been a consideration to date, and a "permit" has been advised by the Planning Officer. Again, it is alright to have these policies - someone needs to enforce them.	The Council needs to decide its parameters on this. "Substantial Harm" to a listed building, according to Heritage England, is akin to knocking it down. When Heritage England write to say it would be "less than substantial harm", it does not mean it's ok to go and do it. For my interpretation - it would be ruined - but still standing. Greater clarification on their interpretation on information from their Consultees on	All heritage assets likely to be affected by development have been taken into account in the site assessment process and in reference to Para 132 of the NPPF	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
		applications.		
Michael Maffei	See comments regarding Roman Road etc. above.		Noted	None.
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	Supported.		Noted and welcomed.	None.
Richard Simon	Supported		Noted and welcomed.	None.
Ros Freeman	The policy is great but the plan does not follow throughSom3 is the setting of a heritage asset, it should be included in the conservation area. Development on this site will harm the setting of a grade II listed building, it will ruin the character and distinctiveness of this area and even harm tourist opportunities by doing so.	Som3 should be removed from the site proposals	All heritage assets likely to be affected by development have been taken into account in the site assessment process and in reference to Para 132 of the NPPF	None.
Stephen Hemming, Lambert Smith Hampton	The Melton local Plan should be based upon a proportionate, adequate and up to date evidence base. In drawing up Policy EN13, the Council identifies that Melton Borough has a number of important historic assets including Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Schedule Monuments and non-designated heritage assets. With the exception of non-designated heritage assets, it is possible to identify all other historic assets from the register of Listed Buildings or Scheduled Monuments or list of Conservation Areas. There is no register or other adopted list of non-designated heritage assets available for either the Council to use or for members of the public or developers to make reference to. In order for Policy EN13 to be effective it is necessary for the Council to draw up a list of these non-designated heritage assets in order to be able to consider appropriate development proposals, rather than a general potential for old buildings to be considered in this way. This register should include reasoned justification for each entry. The Council have had a considerable amount of time within	Policy EN13 should be amended to include reference to a specific register of non-designated heritage assets.	A local list is a discretionary LPA activity and will be undertaken when resources permit	None.

Name	CH7: Response	CH7: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modification
	which to draw up a register, but have failed to do so. In the absence of this register, it is considered that the Policy must be found unsound due to the lack of reasoned justification for the destination on non-designated heritage assets.			
Tracey Watts		It is essential that such heritage assets are recognized and protected in their important heritage scene.	Noted	None.
Richard Crosthwaite Richard Crosthwaite (Gladman Development s)	Section 12 of the Framework provides the basis on which local planning authorities should plan for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. Gladman consider Draft Policy EN13 to be largely consistent with the approach of the Framework; however, whilst the Framework seeks to implement an policy of conservation (i.e. the process of managing change which is consistent with a national policy statement that anticipates development), Policy EN13 seeks the protection of heritage assets which could be interpreted as precluding development in certain circumstances. Since the introduction to the Policy states the approach of national guidance shall be adopted for the purposes of assessing harm, it should therefore also be consistent in the terminology it uses.		Policy EN13 seeks to preclude any development that is not considered sustainable in accordance with the NPPF, and/or negatively impacts on heritage assets in a way that cannot be balanced by enhanced public benefits. Therefore it is considered that the wording is appropriate and should not be amended.	None.