

## Chapter 4 Comments – SS6 Only

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Angela Smedley (on behalf of Burrough Court Estate Ltd)	371	<p>Policy SS6 indicates that the Council will support 'suitable' small sites within the rural area in the event of significant and persistent shortfalls in the delivery of housing. Considering that 65% of housing will be in the 'Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area' with a significant number coming forward from the strategic site allocations, it is considered that the previous comments in respect of housing distribution apply.</p> <p>It is further considered that development should be more evenly distributed through the Borough with a variety of settlements accommodating development to meet local housing needs and support the requirements of the Borough which would assist in delivering the housing requirement and potentially avoid a shortfall in housing delivery. Appropriate housing delivery can be achieved across all settlement categories</p>	Policy SS6 should be revised to set clear targets or thresholds which would trigger a review of the Local Plan, and there must be a requirement on the local planning authority to undertake this review if the criteria are met. The Framework already provides a means for addressing shorter term shortfalls in housing land, but the emergence of new evidence on housing need or issues within the wider housing market area must be taken into account if the plan is to be effective.	The policy sets out what the Council will do to ensure that any plan review is carried out quickly and the timescale is indicated in paragraph 4.7.8. The triggers for considering an early review are clearly set out in the policy as significant and persistent shortfalls in development or infrastructure delivery, or significant deviation from the plan strategy, or changes to the HMA OAN, or to the spatial distribution of growth across the HMA. In the case of the last two items, these may not necessarily give rise to a plan review if there is sufficient flexibility within the plan to accommodate the changes., so considering an early review, rather than definitively committing to one is appropriate. Paragraph 4.7.8 confirms this.	Suggested modification that amends paragraph 4.7.8 to clarify that the plan review referred to would be "commenced within 12 months of any adoption by the Council of the Strategic Growth Plan

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		<p>including 'Rural Settlements' where development is suitable and appropriate, which should not be restricted to such small scale delivery e.g 3 dwellings or less, when appropriate development, such as 10-15 units may be more appropriate in some settlements, whilst none is appropriate in others.</p> <p>Whilst it is recognised that Policy SS6 allows for an early Plan review to take place, the policy is not currently strong enough in identifying the triggers for a review, or providing a commitment that the review would in fact be undertaken. We are also concerned that the overall level of housing need (6,125 over the plan period; 245 per annum) is based on the 2014 SHMA, when the Leicester and Leicestershire wide Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) will be published for stakeholder consultation early in 2017 and is</p>			

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		<p>intended to supersede the SHMA. We support the desire to progress the Local Plan swiftly, but it is vital that it takes full account of the most up-to-date evidence on both housing and employment needs, which is not available at the time of this consultation.</p> <p>The identification within the policy of the alternative options is supported as it helps provide some certainty on how issues would be addressed, and it is important that options for both larger and smaller scale sites can be considered if additional land needs to be identified.</p>			

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Anthony Maher	185	It is disappointing that land to the west was not considered in the plan especially as this was raised by the inspector at the core strategy review. We also look to expand the Asfordby business park with 10 hectares of new business land which will warrant better access than it currently has possibly improving access for housing.	Review to improve access ( extend ring road / distributor road ) to service this area.	Land to the west of Melton Mowbray was considered as one of the plan alternatives at an early stage of plan making, and this is reflected in the sustainability appraisal. It is included in the plan under Policy SS6 as one of the options that will be explored when a local plan review is needed. The Jacobs 2016 options appraisal study for the Melton Mowbray Distributor Road clearly indicates that preference should be given to an eastern MMDR rather than a western one. This is far more up to date than any evidence that was in existence when the Core Strategy was being examined. The highway authority's view is that the Northern MMDR and the existing network beyond that, together with the existing road network, will be sufficient to meet the access needs of Asfordby Business Park.	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Carl Powell	231	It considers the possibility of 'shortfall' but no tthe possibility of excess.	<p>Keep:</p> <p>Where monitoring identifies significant and persistent shortfalls in the delivery of housing and employment, infrastructure or spatial distribution that deviates significantly from the plan strategy, or there are changes within the HMA to the objectively assessed need for development or the spatial distribution of growth across the HMA, the Council will consider an early review of the Local Plan to identify alternative development sites.</p> <p>But add:</p> <p>Where monitoring identifies no significant shortfalls in the delivery of housing and employment, infrastructure or spatial distribution the Council will not seek to identify alternative development sites.</p>	The change requested is implicit in the wording - the need for review is only triggered in the circumstances listed.	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Carole Brown	23	Six Hills development should be included in the plan as a key new development not as a back up plan for shortfall. Development of this site would alleviate the the pressure across the Borough and especially in rural areas for new housing where the infrastructure is aging and unsustainable in many cases - e.g. Where Village Primary schools are full, surely it is better to invest in one new school for the Six Hills development than several small uneconomic additions to already compromised schools.	Include Six Hills development in the plan from day one and reduce the minimum housing allocations in all the Rural settlements accordingly.	Development of a new village such as at Six Hills was one of the alternatives considered at an early stage of plan making. It did not perform as well against sustainability criteria and the achievement of the plan's vision and strategic objectives as did the selected spatial strategy contained in the draft local plan, because it did not enhance the vitality and sustainability of the Borough's villages. It is included in the plan under Policy SS6 as one of the options that will be explored when a local plan review is needed	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Charnwood Borough Council	376	<p>We also note that Policy SS6 – Alternative Development Strategies and Local Plan Review provides a “trigger policy” which will enable the Plan to respond positively to any changes which are subsequently required to the Local Plan. Alterations to objectively assessed need or the spatial distribution of growth may occur across the wider Housing Market Area (HMA) and under the Duty to Cooperate it may be necessary to undertake an early or partial review of the Plan to accommodate such changes. As you are aware, joint work is currently being undertaken on a Housing and Economic Needs Assessment (HEDNA) which will provide an up to date objectively assessed need for homes across the HMA, this may make such changes necessary.</p> <p>However, concern is raised that Policy SS6 – Alternative Development Strategies and Local Plan Review identifies some sites which do not reflect this</p>		<p>The long term options identified in Policy SS6 are not sites, and their identification does not preclude the consideration of any reasonable others. As with any local plan making, they and any others would have to be subject to sustainability appraisal and other assessments. The level of assessment that has been carried out is considered proportionate to their inclusion in the local plan as flexibility, should the chosen local plan strategy no longer be the most appropriate, given wider housing delivery considerations. Paragraphs 4.7.5 and 4.7.6 set out clearly the Council's intention to continue to work with its partners across the HMA to resolve meeting strategic housing needs.it is party to a published Statement of Co-operation to that effect.</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		<p>development strategy or the sustainability appraisal of the reasonable alternative options.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (Non-Technical Summary para 1.79) notes that “The relatively isolated site options at Six Hills and Normanton Airfield would have the least positive sustainability effects of the 12 sites considered - eight potentially significant negative effects were identified for both site options” yet these sites are identified in Policy SS6 as potential alternative or long term options.</p> <p>The site at Six Hills is of particular concern to Charnwood Borough being located adjacent to the authority’s boundary in a relatively remote rural location which lacks services, facilities and good public transport links. The overreliance on the private motor vehicle and the need to travel to reach higher level services and facilities could have impacts upon the A46 and the wider road</p>			



Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		network. No assessments of these transport impacts and the increased vehicle movements appear to have been undertaken prior to the inclusion of Six Hills as a potential alternative site.			

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Chris Sinton (GL Hearn) on behalf of Severn Trent Water	378	<p>Paragraph 4.7.5 and Policy SS6: STW strongly supports the identification of land to the west of Melton Mowbray, which includes its landholding at Sysonby Grange Lane, as an area which could meet future development needs. STW consider that a more formal mechanism is required to 'safeguard' the land for future development as part of the Plan. STW are keen to work collaboratively with MBC to deliver a 'sound' Local Plan which meets the identified housing needs in the Borough. We would welcome the opportunity to engage with the Council to discuss development options and opportunities at the site in greater detail. Refers to the Assessing Large Scale Development Site Options (2015) which previously identified</p>		<p>The draft Local Plan identifies sufficient land to meet the Borough's housing needs, taking into account the findings of HEDNA. The local plan also includes significant headroom to accommodate unmet needs from elsewhere in the HMA, but a plan review would be undertaken, as per Policy SS6, if this is insufficient to meet the amount that will be distributed to Melton through the Strategic Growth Plan. As we don't know this yet, it would be inappropriate to allocate/safeguard land at this time, as the amount of land needed is not known.</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		<p>land to the west of Melton Mowbray as one of two 'directions of growth' and assessed it because of its strategically advantageous location next to the main urban area of Melton Mowbray, even though there was no promoter. The representation outlines the advantages of growth to the west of Melton Mowbray, e.g. quantum of development , able to accomodate hosuing and employment, well related to existing employment, adjacent to the main urban area of Melton Mowbray , and could help to deliver the bypass, and explains that the environmental constraints can be overcome. it concludes that there is "significant potential in later years and beyond the plan period to explore options through this site in order to link the Melton south and north SUEs in the interests of achieving a more comprehensive scheme and securing a by-pass to the west of Melton Mowbray.</p>			

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		<p>Given the importance that the NPPF places on LPAs understanding the housing needs of their area</p> <p>STW considers that the Local Plan should be flexible in order that the findings of the HEDNA can be acted upon rather than proceed on the basis of an early review. To do so, land to the west of Melton Mowbray should be identified as an area which could accommodate future growth, either through a housing allocation or safeguarding designation.</p>			

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Colin Love	173	<p>The land to the west of Melton Mowbray should be prioritised as it is close to the core hub of employment in Melton.</p> <p>The 'suitable' small sites within the rural area should be confined to the currently designated 'Reserve sites'.</p>	The 'suitable' small sites within the rural area currently designated as 'Reserve sites'.	If a review is needed, the Council will need to consider all reasonable alternatives. It is premature to prioritise further. It would be inappropriate to limit consideration of suitable small sites only to 'reserve' sites as further more suitable site may become available by the time any plan review is undertaken.	None.
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Asfordby Parish Council)	380	<p>Policy SS6 of the Melton Local Plan (Publication version) identifies long-term development options at several locations, including Six Hills. The Policy pre-determines the outcome of a future review of the Melton Local Plan by highlighting future development locations that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have not been subject to the same level of scrutiny or Sustainability Appraisal as the sites allocated in the Melton Local Plan;</li> <li>2. Undermine the vision, objectives and strategy which underpin the Local Plan i.e. most development located within or</li> </ol>	Policy SS6 of the Melton Local Plan (Publication version) should be deleted.	The long term options identified in Policy SS6 do not preclude the consideration of any reasonable others. The reasoned justification (4.7.3) explains that these would only come into play if reserve sites could not deliver the necessary housing numbers or they are not envisaged to deliver within 5 years. The level and amount of evidence prepared for this policy is considered proportionate, considering that it is only to be operable if the local plan spatial strategy outlined is either not being delivered or is not longer the most appropriate. The review policy is needed to confirm the actions the Council will take in undertaking its Duty to Co-operate with other HMA partners to ensure delivery of enough housing to meet identified needs across the HMA, and to accord with national policy that	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		<p>adjoining Melton Mowbray;</p> <p>3. Undermines the delivery of strategic infrastructure e.g. the Melton Mowbray distributor road;</p> <p>4. Prejudices the preparation of the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan;</p> <p>5. Are unnecessary as the Plan already identifies 'reserve' sites;</p> <p>6. Are incapable of contributing to the five-year housing land supply.</p>		<p>indicates plans should be flexible enough to adapt to change.</p>	

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Belvoir Estate)	381	<p>Policy SS6 of the Melton Local Plan (Publication version) identifies long-term development options at several locations, including Six Hills. The Policy pre-determines the outcome of a future review of the Melton Local Plan by highlighting future development locations that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have not been subject to the same level of scrutiny or Sustainability Appraisal as the sites allocated in the Melton Local Plan;</li> <li>2. Undermine the vision, objectives and strategy which underpin the Local Plan i.e. most development located within or adjoining Melton Mowbray;</li> <li>3. Undermines the delivery of strategic infrastructure e.g. the Melton Mowbray distributor road;</li> <li>4. Prejudices the preparation of</li> </ol>	Policy SS6 of the Melton Local Plan (Publication version) should be deleted.	The long term options identified in Policy SS6 does not preclude the consideration of any reasonable others. The reasoned justification (4.7.3) explains that these would only come into play if reserve sites could not deliver the necessary housing numbers and they are not envisaged to deliver within 5 years. The level and amount of evidence prepared for this policy is considered proportionate, considering that it is only to be operable if the local plan spatial strategy outlined is either not being delivered or is not longer the most appropriate. The review policy is needed to confirm the actions the Council will take in undertaking its Duty to Co-operate with other HMA partners to ensure delivery of enough housing to meet identified needs across the HMA, and to accord with national policy that indicates plans should be flexible enough to adopt to change.	None

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		<p>the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan;</p> <p>5. Are unnecessary as the Plan already identifies 'reserve' sites;</p> <p>6. Are incapable of contributing to the five-year housing land supply.</p>			



Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Earl of Rutland and Dr Fleming's Hospital Trust)	382	<p>Policy SS6 of the Melton Local Plan (Publication version) identifies long-term development options at several locations, including Six Hills. The Policy pre-determines the outcome of a future review of the Melton Local Plan by highlighting future development locations that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have not been subject to the same level of scrutiny or Sustainability Appraisal as the sites allocated in the Melton Local Plan;</li> <li>2. Undermine the vision, objectives and strategy which underpin the Local Plan i.e. most development located within or adjoining Melton Mowbray;</li> <li>3. Undermines the delivery of strategic infrastructure e.g. the Melton Mowbray distributor road;</li> <li>4. Prejudices the preparation of</li> </ol>	Policy SS6 of the Melton Local Plan (Publication version) should be deleted.	The long term options identified in Policy SS6 does not preclude the consideration of any reasonable others. The reasoned justification (4.7.3) explains that these would only come into play if reserve sites could not deliver the necessary housing numbers and they are not envisaged to deliver within 5 years. The level and amount of evidence prepared for this policy is considered proportionate, considering that it is only to be operable if the local plan spatial strategy outlined is either not being delivered or is not longer the most appropriate. The review policy is needed to confirm the actions the Council will take in undertaking its Duty to Co-operate with other HMA partners to ensure delivery of enough housing to meet identified needs across the HMA, and to accord with national policy that indicates plans should be flexible enough to adopt to change.	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		<p>the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan;</p> <p>5. Are unnecessary as the Plan already identifies 'reserve' sites;</p> <p>6. Are incapable of contributing to the five-year housing land supply.</p>			
David Adams	1	<p>This gives MBC power to change things where events have happened even where those events are consistent with the events relating to the UK economy as a whole. This is to my mind unacceptable as there may be no consultation or other method of holding them to account.</p>		<p>Any review of the local plan would be subject to the same regulatory requirements regarding community engagement as preparation of this draft plan has been.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Dilys Shepherd	264	The Normanton airfield site would fail to meet your views on reducing the need to travel, reducing crime, provision of schools (unless the site would include a new school at the outset) and provision of health care.		it is envisaged that any large scale options would be more sustainable, by virtue of having enough development to support the provision of schools, shops, services, public transport, etc. However, this would be established through sustainability appraisal, which would apply a common methodology to the assesment of all potential alternatives, as and when a review is undertaken.	None.
Guy Longley, Pegasus Group (on behalf of Wilson Enterprises Ltd)	394	Policy SS6 advises that to ensure that any plan review is carried out quickly, The Council will prioritise the consideration of potential alternatives including the previously considered large scale site option at Dalby Airfield. The identification of Dalby Airfield as one of the potential alternative options to be considered as part of any necessary review of the plan, is supported. The site offers the opportunity for the provision of housing and employment to address any potential shortfalls in delivery from other sites as part of an early review of the plan.		Noted	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Helen Hartley, Nexus Planning (on behalf of Richborough Estates)	397	<p>Richborough Estates have concerns that as currently drafted, Policy SS6 is unsound in that it is not effective.</p> <p>Richborough Estates welcomes the inclusion of this contingency policy and consider it to be sound in that it will help ensure the plan is consistent with national planning policy which seeks to ensure Local Plans have sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change (paragraph 14).</p> <p>However, to ensure this policy is effective it is suggested a more quantifiable trigger for a review of the Local Plan is included in the wording of the Policy, for example to clarify what constitutes a 'significant and persistent shortfall' in delivery, or a spatial distribution that 'deviates significantly' from the plan strategy.</p>	4.4 The inclusion of clearer triggers within Policy SS6 will ensure a more robust, workable policy that provides more certainty for all parties and is more effective with regard to the tests of soundness set out in paragraph 182 of the Framework.	More detail on the amount of development expected by certain dates to deliver the overall housing numbers and their location is given on Pages 1 and 2 of Appendix 5 : Monitoring Framework. 'Significant', persistent shortfalls' and 'significant deviation' will be applied to consideration against this, in the authority monitoring report every year. It would be unduly inflexible to indicate precise triggers, as a change in best practice or case law could render the policy out of date.	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Howard Blakebrough	20	Given that some SHLAA sites are unwanted by the villages in which they are proposed (Somerby for sure) and that the position has been exacerbated by some identified villages not apparently having any sites thus forcing already reluctant villages to get an even bigger allocation, why not look now to develop one or more of these alternative sites?	Look to develop one or more of these alternative sites to counteract any shortfalls and take away unwanted development from villages.	Development of a new village such as at Six Hills was one of the alternatives considered at an early stage of plan making. It did not perform as well against sustainability criteria and the achievement of the plan's vision and strategic objectives as did the selected spatial strategy contained in the draft local plan. Development has been distributed based on the level of services within the villages which is addressed by development strategy policy SS2. Sites mentioned in Policy SS6 are for consideration if there is a shortfall identified through monitoring or joint HMA work	None.
James and Amanda Sparrow	279	The alternative development possibility on the Dalby airfield was deemed unsustainable in a previous enquiry and therefore should not still be under consideration.	The alternative development possibility on the Dalby airfield should be removed from the proposed plan.	If the operation of Policy SS6 is triggered, a new assessment of Dalby Airfield, including sustainability appraisal, would be carried out alongside that for all other reasonable alternatives, and would prevail over any more out of date evidence. Current SA scores for Dalby Airfield put it in advantage over some of the other alternatives at this point.	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
John Moore	203	<p>Reference in the policy to particular, named but untested alternative large-scale site options would prejudice a thorough review and consideration of development strategies. Should it be required, alternative site selection should be based on the most up-to-date Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), not rely on the Large Scale Development Site Options assessment which was completed in 2015 and which will become out of date over time.</p> <p>For example, whilst the Dalby Airfield site (MBC/126/13) may be available there is no confirmation of this in the Melton SHLAA 2016 and there have to be doubts over whether it is genuinely deliverable. There is a considerable history from the 1980s onwards of proposals for a “new village” on the former airfield site and it became a key strategic element of the 1999</p>	<p>I am not persuaded that any alternative options need to be identified at this stage but it should be sufficient to state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Previously considered and new large-scale site options;</li> <li>-Suitable small sites within the rural area; and</li> <li>-Land to the west of Melton Mowbray</li> </ul>	<p>The identification of Inclusion of Dalby Airfield with no corresponding mention in text. The options identified in Policy SS6 do not preclude the identification and consideration of further reasonable others. If the operation of Policy SS6 is triggered, a new assessment of Dalby Airfield including the SA would be carried out and taken into account, and would prevail over any more out of date evidence. Noted re paragraph 4.7.4 will be amended to include names of the sites. Also the latest SHLAA has sites that were submitted in 2016 which is why Dalby Airfield is not found in it, however it is included in previous SHLAAs. (MBC/126/13).</p>	<p>Minor modification: to include the Normanton and Dalby Airfield in the paragraph 4.7.4 as in the Policy.</p>

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		<p>Melton Local Plan. A subsequent planning application culminated in a call-in public inquiry in 2002 (APP/Y2430/V/02/1083524) at which point the application was withdrawn. It should be noted that none of the 1999 Melton Local Plan policies concerned with this proposed new village (NV1-NV15 inclusive) were saved under the provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004. The former airfield continues to perform poorly in the 2015 assessment of its potential sustainability. Further, in 2014 Historic England wrote to the Council and informed them that the former airfield site houses a surviving Cold War Thor nuclear intermediate range ballistic missile complex, the remains of which are of considerable significance.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the wording of policy SS6 is at variance with the supporting text</p>			

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		<p>(paragraph 4.7.4) which identifies:</p> <p>-Sustainable new village proposals such as that previously considered at Six Hills, or other suitable locations;</p> <p>-Other 'Suitable' sites within the rural area not allocated or identified as reserve sites; and</p> <p>-Land to the west of Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>There is no mention here of Normanton Airfield or Dalby Airfield.</p>			



Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
K Lynne Camplejohn	32	There is no reference to neighbourhood plans in this policy which will need to be considered under the circumstances where policy at SS6 alternative development strategies will come into play.	Amend policy SS6 to include a statement about neighbourhood plans.	Reference is made to neighbourhood plans in Section 1.9 of the draft local plan, and the relationship to local plans is set out in national policy and does not need repetition here.	None.
LCC (Highways, Education, Early Years, Waste, Property Assets, LLFA, Libraries & Culture, LRERC)	405	Policy SS6 - Alternative Development Strategies and Local Plan Review: . Through a flexible approach to master planning of the Melton Mowbray NSN it has the potential to offer the ability to meet shortfalls in housing delivery elsewhere.	5. 4.7 Long term Growth Strategy and review triggers:  • 4.7.4 3rd bullet – Description now needs to be updated.	Paragraphs 4.7.6 and 4.7.7 will be updated to reflect that the HEDNA has been published, the timetable for Strategic Growth Plan preparation, etc.	Proposed Modifications to paragraphs 4.7.6 and 4.7.7 to update and include references to HEDNA and SGP.
Leicester City Council	406	Policy SS6 – Alternative Development Strategies and Local Plan Review : The City Council also supports the flexibility in the plan provided by policy SS6 which sets out several alternative strategies should they be required in the future as a result of monitoring and review of the Plan ‘to accommodate any potential additional need which may arise.’ However any further consideration of sustainable		Support noted and welcomed.	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		village proposals such as at Six Hills will require close engagement and collaborative work with the City Council.			
Liberty Stones, Fisher German (on behalf of Mr David Cook)	410	<p>We are concerned that the overall level of housing need (6,125 over the plan period; 245 per annum) is based on the 2014 SHMA, when the Leicester and Leicestershire wide Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) will be published for stakeholder consultation early in 2017 and is intended to supersede the SHMA. We support the desire to progress the Local Plan swiftly, but it is vital that it takes full account of the most up-to-date evidence on both housing and employment needs, which is not available at the time of this consultation.</p> <p>We recognise that policy SS6</p>	Policy SS6 should be revised to set clear targets or thresholds which would trigger a review of the Local Plan, and there must be a requirement on the local planning authority to undertake this review if the criteria are met. The Framework already provides a means for addressing shorter term shortfalls in housing land, but the emergence of new evidence on housing need or issues within the wider housing market area must be taken into account if the plan is to be effective.	The Council is considering the implications for HEDNA on the draft local plan. Policy SS6 is considered appropriately worded, as the local plan's flexibility in reserve sites and in headroom between meeting its OAN and the amount of housing being planned for means that the need for a review may not be necessary. The Council is committed to playing its part in meeting unmet needs from elsewhere in the HMA under its Duty to Co-operate (see para 4.7.7 and 4.7.8) , and will need to respond through a plan review if the plan flexibility is not enough.	Suggested modification that amends paragraph 4.7.8 to clarify that the plan review referred to would be "commenced within 12 months of any adoption by the Council of the Strategic Growth Plan

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		<p>allows for an early Plan review to take place, but are concerned that it is not currently strong enough in identifying the triggers for a review, or providing a commitment that the review would in fact be undertaken.</p> <p>The identification within the policy of the alternative options which will be explored is supported, as it helps provide some certainty on how issues would be addressed, and it is important that options for both larger and smaller scale sites can be considered if additional land needs to be identified.</p>			

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Martin S Herbert (Brown & Co) on behalf of M Hill, P Hill, Mrs M Hyde & Mrs P Pickup	413	<p>Support the commitment of Melton Borough Council to the delivery of other development and infrastructure. Suggest deletion of the second paragraph because it is inappropriate to identify these locations at this stage, particularly with the increasing focus being placed on the delivery of the Melton bypass and the Report which has now been commissioned on the EDR. The County Council has identified the delivery of an eastern link road along with the proposed southern and northern links as the most effective way of addressing long standing traffic problems in Melton Mowbray, and the local plan makes several references to it.</p> <p>The delivery of an eastern link road as part of the Local Plan strategy will open up opportunities for housing and employment growth to the east of Melton Mowbray. Development to the east of the town therefore represents a</p>	<p>The following is taken from Representation Form Statement.</p> <p>Delete the second paragraph and the options identified. At this stage it is inappropriate and premature to identify specific options, but if it is to remain it should certainly include the allocation of land to the east of Melton Mowbray which means that it can be taken into consideration in helping provide the land needed for the EDR and also to assist with the funding, as should all development in Borough towards the EDR where the development does not already provide for part of the infrastructure proposed. If sites are to be identified Site MBC/049/13 should be added.</p> <p>The following is taken from a separate representation form.</p> <p>"Policy SS6 should be amended to include reference to land to the east of Melton Mowbray and also as one of the potential alternative for</p>	The locations identified in the policy are only options to be explored should a need for review arise. Also the policy does not preclude consideration of other reasonable sites at the time of consideration which will all be assessed in detail and subject to SA.	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		<p>potential future development opportunity that should be included in Policy SS6 or if not, immediately allocated. This site should be considered, as should parts of the land at Thorpe Arnold which offers opportunities for flood attenuation/alleviation, employment and housing land.</p> <p>Our clients have interests in land to the east of Melton Mowbray and around Thorpe Arnold which could offer future opportunities for growth as part of any necessary plan review once the eastern distributor road is in place. A plan was submitted showing the client's land that could potentially form part of a future review of development opportunities to the east of the town.</p>	consideration as part of any necessary plan review."		

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Maurice Fairhurst	73	Neither the Plan nor Policy SS6 explain how often will delivery rates be monitored and what will trigger a review of the Plan. If delivery on the other allocated sites in the Plan fails or is delayed the required housing numbers will continue to be deficient. Larger scale developments can deliver funding for infrastructure improvements more efficiently.	Delivery rates should be monitored at least annually and if significant shortfalls continue, urgent action should be taken to review the Plan.  Explain more clearly when the review will take place.	More detail on the amount of development expected by certain dates to deliver the overall housing numbers and their location is given on Pages 1 and 2 of Appendix 5 : Monitoring Framework. The annual authority monitoring report would identify performance and comment on whether it necessitated triggering a plan review. It would be unduly inflexible to indicate precise trigger amounts, as a change in best practice or case law could render the policy out of date.	None.
Melanie Steadman	284	Although legally compliant, they should have considered these options at an earlier date. Unfortunately for Bottesford, where development is at a high rate, it may well come too late.	Get on with it.	Comments noted.	None

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Melton North Action Group MNAG	414	<p>Generally this is quite disappointing since it seems to give the council the opportunity to adjust the Local Plan as they see fit and without further public consultation where certain circumstances prevail. Those circumstances could include a slow-down in the housing market without any specific reference to Melton borough. Of greater concern however is the list of alternative options to be explored by the council. These include sites that are specifically marked as being previously considered together with land to the west of Melton Mowbray. The clear indication is that the land to the west of Melton Mowbray was not considered as part of the Local Plan despite the Inspector dealing with the Core Strategy specifically stating in his letter that one of the multitudinous reasons as to why that Strategy was unsound was its failure to consider a western growth option. Similarly the Local Plan is unsound.</p>		<p>Any review of the local plan would be subject to the same regulatory requirements regarding community engagement as preparation of this draft plan has been, and would need to be in accord with the Concil's Statement of Community Engagement. If the reasons to undertake a review are triggered, a new assessment of the priority options listed in Policy SS6 would be undertaken, alongside any other reasonable alternatives, and this would supersede any older evidence that may have been collected during previous Core Strategy preparation.</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Melton North Land Consortium - GVA Consultants	415	The Consortium reaffirms its support for an early plan review mechanism to ensure that housing delivery can meet, without constraint, the Borough's objectively assessed housing need.		Support noted and welcomed.	None.



Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Michelle Colclough	45	Why is brownfield land not being chosen ahead of greenfield land?		As a rural Borough, the amount of brownfield land available falls well short of the amount of land needed for new housing. Dalby and Normanton Airfields are likely to include some brownfield land associated with their former and current uses. The 'suitable' small sites within the rural area could include brownfield sites, as may some of the land to the west of Melton Mowbray. There is also nothing in Policy SS6 to preclude the consideration of brownfield sites as other reasonable alternatives if the need for a plan review is triggered.	None.
Mr Gavin Simpson	267	<p>It is not sound as it identifies 2 areas that have not come forward, and are not suitable for development.</p> <p>Six Hills appears to have suitability, availability, infrastructure and deliverability, and complies with the Duty to Co-operate.</p>	<p>Six Hills is being promoted and supported as a new garden village. At this stage of the plan you should have a clear vision of a way forward.</p> <p>Previously considered large scale site option at Six Hills.</p>	Policy SS6 is about delivering the plan strategy if the policies of the plan as a whole are not delivering as intended, or if the strategy needs to 'flex' to accommodate more housing needs. All the options identified would need to be assessed alongside other reasonable alternatives at any plan review. There is no need to assess the relative credentials of the options at this stage.	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Mrs Sarah Grey	110	<p>Policy SS6 of the Melton Local Plan (Publication version) identifies long-term development options at several locations, including Six Hills. The Policy pre-determines the outcome of a future review of the Melton Local Plan by highlighting future development locations that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have not been subject to the same level of scrutiny or Sustainability Appraisal as the sites allocated in the Melton Local Plan;</li> <li>2. Undermine the vision, objectives and strategy which underpin the Local Plan i.e. most development located within or adjoining Melton Mowbray;</li> <li>3. Undermines the delivery of strategic infrastructure e.g. the Melton Mowbray distributor road;</li> <li>4. Prejudices the preparation of the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan;</li> </ol>	Policy SS6 of the Melton Local Plan (Publication version) should be deleted.	The long term options identified in Policy SS6 does not preclude the consideration of any reasonable others. The reasoned justification (4.7.3) explains that these would only come into play if reserve sites could not deliver the necessary housing numbers and they are not envisaged to deliver within 5 years. The level and amount of evidence prepared for this policy is considered proportionate, considering that it is only to be operable if the local plan spatial strategy outlined is either not being delivered or is not longer the most appropriate. The review policy is needed to confirm the actions the Council will take in undertaking its Duty to Cooperate with other HMA partners to ensure delivery of enough housing to meet identified needs across the HMA, and to accord with national policy that indicates plans should be flexible enough to adopt to change.	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		<p>5. Are unnecessary as the Plan already identifies 'reserve' sites;</p> <p>6. Are incapable of contributing to the five-year housing land supply.</p>			
Norman Hoskins	138	As already indicated Development in rural areas or the alternative brownfield sites such and the Normanton and Dalby Airfields , would serve Melton housing requirements long term without despoiling existing rural communities and creating massive commuting transportproblems	Revise the proportion of allocation from 65% Melton, 35% peripheral rural to 75% Melto, 25% rural	The option of developing large scale sites like Normanton and Dalby Airfield rather than new housing in villages was assessed as one of the alternative strategies at an early stage of plan preparation ,but it did not perform as well in the sustainability appraisal or in the assessment of ability to deliver the overall vision and objectives of the plan as the spatial strategy set out in the draft Local Plan does.	None.
Peter Bailey	8	NHS centralisation issues as identified in Chapter 2.	NHS centralisation issues as identified in Chapter 2.	Noted	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
R H B Ranns	242	<p>It is unsound to rule out large sites (particularly Six Hills) to the west of Melton Mowbray as the first strategy that would reduce car travel by being nearer the employment centres identified in the LLEP and would allow regular public transport commuting to Leicester and Nottingham.</p> <p>In particular the Six Hills proposed development fulfills this role and is close to the existing Borough employment sites identified at Policy EC3 (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vi), (vii), and (viii) and would enable the Plan to comply with Policy IN1.1</p>	The changes are suggested by including Six Hills in Policy SS2	Proximity to employment centres is only one of several aspects of sustainability that are taken into account in identifying where new housing should go. The sustainability appraisal of reasonable alternatives carried out at an early stage of plan preparation showed that the draft plan strategy was a more sustainable one to meet the overall housing needs of the Borough.	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	429	<p>Supported with comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Previously considered large scale site options at Normanton airfield, Dalby airfield and Six Hills;</li> </ul> <p>Consideration should be given to a longer term option of Six Hills to come on stream towards the end of the plan period and act as a potential safety net for failure to deliver adequate housing numbers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Suitable' small sites within the rural area;</li> </ul> <p>This includes a site to the south of Bottesford and we support its rejection by Melton Borough Council.</p> <p>This location is in an identified Area of Separation as well as an Area of High Sensitivity and the rejected scheme, if allowed to proceed, would have completely</p>		Support and comments noted.	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		<p>obliterated the Area of Separation. There is also a substantial flood risk to the area and to the village centre, as evidenced in the 2001 flood event. This risk is increased by the use of the Winterbeck as the outflow point from a SuDS scheme. The outflow is just upstream of a bridge that constricts high rates of flow in the Winterbeck and can cause water to flow down Belvoir Road and into the village centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land to the west of Melton Mowbray.</li> </ul> <p>We note and support (4.7.5) Land to west of Melton Mowbray may have potential for longer-term growth.</p>			
Richard Simon	266	Broadly supported subject to further definitive information		Support noted.	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Robert Galij BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI, Planning Director - Barratt David Wilson Homes North Midlands	430	It is unclear why land east of Belvoir Road, Bottesford (SHLAA Site Reference MBC/012/13) on the southern edge of the settlement has been excluded from the schedule of sites in Policy SS6.	Land east of Belvoir Road, Bottesford (SHLAA Site Ref. MBC/012/13) on the southern edge of the settlement should be included in the schedule of sites in Policy SS6.	The areas identified in Policy SS6 are not sites, but are priorities to explore in any review. That does not preclude the consideration of all other reasonable alternatives. Of all the options SA'd during the Issues and Options stage, Belvoir Road, Bottesford site scored the least and had 'negative' impact on the SA, and hence was not considered in the Emerging Options stage as one of the alternative large scale options. This can be viewed on our website <a href="http://www.meltonplan.co.uk">www.meltonplan.co.uk</a> for the commentary on the site.	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Robert Hughes (on behalf of Nigel Grifitths, First Provincial Properties Ltd)	431	<p>The representations are on behalf of First Provincial Properties Ltd, a landowner in Harby.</p> <p>They consider that reserve sites should be included within Policy SS6 alongside the other options listed above to enable the Council to react quickly to an undersupply of housing.</p> <p>Without doing so, the policy fails to achieve sustainable development through its spatial strategy. This approach is not consistent with the NPPF, and so is unsound on this basis.</p>	The spatial strategy should be amended to include Reserve Sites in the list of housing sites as set out above.	<p>Para 4.7.3 indicates that the initial action if the plan strategy is not delivering against the identified target would involve the considering the reserve sites. This is also referred to in para 5.4.7 and 5.4.8 and Policy C1(B). Policy SS6 is to accomodate change that is a scale of magnitude greater than the contribution reserve sites could make. A modification is suggested to clarify this.</p> <p>The Spatial Strategy is tested in the SA is a sound strategy with good layers of flexibility suggested within the Plan.</p> <p>Options in Policy SS6 would be considered in case of failing of reserve sites should under-supply or under-delivery be identified. The reserve sites have been assessed in detail for suitability including sustainability. The sites in Policy SS6 will go through a detailed assesement should the need arise for a review after the Plan is adopted. Policy SS6 and reserve site policy provide sufficient flexibility within the Plan through a considered 'stepped' approach.</p>	Suggested modification to amend 4.7.3 to read: '..... if these sites prove not to be suitable or deliverable, or do not amount to sufficient development capacity to address the shortfall, a partial review of the plan.....'.



Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Susan E Green	109	<p>If the triggers in this policy have occurred, then the Local Plan should be reviewed rather than the Council just considering a review. As currently worded the HBF is concerned that this proposed review policy contains no firm commitment to a review or a timescale for review. There is always the concern that a Council will not deliver in a timely manner on its commitment to an early review as set out in a Local Plan policy.</p> <p>Moreover an early review is not the optimum mechanism by which to resolve unmet housing need because of the slow response time of such reviews. The release of reserve sites provides flexibility to respond quickly to changing circumstances in order to meet identified housing needs. It is</p>		<p>Comments noted. Policy SS6 is considered appropriately worded, as the local plan's flexibility in reserve sites and in headroom between meeting its OAN and the amount of housing being planned for means that the need for a review may not be necessary. The Council is committed to playing its part in meeting unmet needs from elsewhere in the HMA under its Duty to Co-operate (see para 4.7.7 and 4.7.8) , and will need to respond through a plan review if the plan flexibility is not enough.</p>	<p>Suggested modification that amends paragraph 4.7.8 to clarify that the plan review referred to would be “commenced within 12 months of any adoption by the Council of the Strategic Growth Plan</p>

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		<p>noted that the Council is proposing to expedite the process via a reserved sites mechanism.</p> <p>This approach coincides with the recommendations of the Local Plans Expert Group (LPEG) Report which proposes that “the NPPF makes clear that local</p> <p>plans should be required not only to demonstrate a five year land supply but also focus on ensuring a more effective supply of developable land for the medium to long term (over the whole plan period), plus make provision for, and provide a mechanism for the release of, developable Reserve Sites equivalent to 20% of their housing requirement, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the NPPF” (para 11.4 of the LPEG Report).</p>			

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Susan Love	172	<p>It would be good to see MBC being bold enough to take the decision to use Dalby airfield or Six Hills to create a new village. This would prevent mass builders from destroying the character of existing villages and bring opportunities for innovative green design - e.g. ground source heating, and alignment of houses to make the most of solar power.</p> <p>At the Launch of the Melton Plan a slide was shown which was not consistent with the MLP doc., hard copy and online. The slide omitted Dalby airfield but included Bottesford as a site for a new village.</p>	Acknowledge and rectify the mistake made at the public Plan Launch.	Development of a new village such as at Six Hills or Dalby Airfield, were alternatives considered at an early stage of plan making. They did not perform as well against sustainability criteria and the achievement of the plan's vision and strategic objectives as did the selected spatial strategy contained in the draft local plan, including because they did not help to safeguard the vitality and viability of the Borough's existing villages, which are key local plan objectives.	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Tom Collins on behalf of Richborough Estates	439	<p>We are concerned that the overall level of housing need (6,125 over the plan period; 245 per annum) is based on the 2014 SHMA, when the Leicester and Leicestershire wide Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) will be published for stakeholder consultation early in 2017 and is intended to supersede the SHMA. We support the desire to progress the Local Plan swiftly, but it is vital that it takes full account of the most up-to-date evidence on both housing and employment needs, which is not available at the time of this consultation.</p> <p>We recognise that policy SS6 allows for an early Plan review to take place, but are concerned that it is not currently strong enough in identifying the triggers for a review, or providing a commitment that the review would in fact be undertaken.</p>	Policy SS6 should be revised to set clear targets or thresholds which would trigger a review of the Local Plan, and there must be a requirement on the local planning authority to undertake this review if the criteria are met. The Framework already provides a means for addressing shorter term shortfalls in housing land, but the emergence of new evidence on housing need or issues within the wider housing market area must be taken into account if the plan is to be effective.	Alongside other evidence, the HEDNA is being taken into account by the Council in finalising its local plan for submission, and a paper being prepared for the Council meeting considers it in detail. Policy SS6 is considered appropriately worded, as the local plan's flexibility in reserve sites and in headroom between meeting its OAN and the amount of housing being planned for means that the need for a review may not be necessary even if there are changes within the HMA to OAN or the spatial distribution of growth across the HMA. The Council is committed to playing its part in meeting unmet needs from elsewhere in the HMA under its Duty to Co-operate (see para 4.7.7 and 4.7.8) , and will need to respond through a plan review if the plan flexibility is not enough. Regarding triggers for review, more detail on the amount of development expected by certain dates to deliver the overall housing numbers and their location is given on Pages 1 and 2 of Appendix 5 : Monitoring Framework. The annual authority monitoring report would identify performance against those targets and comment on whether it necessitated	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		<p>The identification within the policy of the alternative options which will be explored is supported, as it helps provide some certainty on how issues would be addressed, and it is important that options for both larger and smaller scale sites can be considered if additional land needs to be identified.</p>		<p>triggering a plan review. It would be unduly inflexible to indicate precise trigger amounts, as a change in best practice or case law could render the policy out of date.</p>	

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Richard Crossthwaite (Gladman Developments)	443	<p>We consider a new policy and allocation to support the proposed Garden Village at Six Hills is justified. The fact that the Council has included an alternative development strategy policy highlights the importance of significant unresolved housing issues within the HMA, and we consider this magnifies the case for including this issue in the Strategic Issues and Objectives of the Plan. Mention the need for local plans to have sufficient flexibility to respond to rapid change and that appropriate mechanisms must provide certainty on how issues triggering a review will be identified, the course(s) of action that will be taken and how this will be triggered.</p> <p>Point to the fact that many plans do not deliver as envisaged. Point out that the likelihood of an early change of circumstances is extremely high in Melton</p>	<p>Propose a redraft of Policy SS6 and a new Policy SS7 to allocate the strategic site at Six Hills:</p> <p>Policy SS6 – Alternative Strategy and Local Plan Review :</p> <p>Melton Borough Council is committed to meeting its requirements for housing, employment, other development and infrastructure. The Council will monitor the delivery of housing against the requirements in this Plan on an annual basis through its Authority Monitoring Report (published in August each year) to ensure a sufficient supply of housing land will be maintained to ensure the delivery of the requirement set out in Policy SS2 over the Plan Period.</p> <p>In addition, the Council will continue to work positively with local planning authorities across the Leicester &amp; Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA) to</p>	<p>The Council has identified sufficient land elsewhere to meet its housing requirement, and that land performed better than Six Hills in sustainability appraisal and testing of alternatives against their ability to contribute to plan objectives. The Council is proposing a change to paras 4.7.6 - 4.7.8. to reflect the up to date position around HEDNA, the Strategic Growth Plan and other joint working across the HMA. Alongside other evidence, the HEDNA is to be read alongside 'Towards Housing Requirement for Melton' and its addendum. Policy SS6 is considered appropriately worded, as the local plan's flexibility in reserve sites and in headroom between meeting its OAN and the amount of housing being planned for means that the need for a review may not be necessary even if there are changes within the HMA to OAN or the spatial distribution of growth across the HMA. The Council is committed to playing its part in meeting unmet needs from elsewhere in the HMA under its Duty to Co-operate (see para 4.7.7 and 4.7.8) , and will need to respond through a plan review if the plan flexibility is not enough. Regarding</p>	<p>Amend paragraphs 4.7.6-4.7.8 to reflect the updated position on new evidence.</p>

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
		<p>Borough, as the new HEDNA will be published and through the timescale of this Plan, Leicester City Council will have unmet needs which will need redistributing across the wider HMA.</p> <p>6.6.6 If a new Garden Village policy is not supported, then in order to be effective, the proposed Policy SS6 requires a clearer framework against which the alternative development strategy will be triggered. Importantly, the supporting text to the Policy at 4.7.6 – 4.7.7 sets out the clear imperative for this policy and the need to respond to strategic issues. Accordingly, the commitment to review the plan must be made unambiguous.</p>	<p>identify up-to-date development needs and support them in delivering a proportion of any unmet development needs that arise within the wider HMA.</p> <p>Where monitoring identifies significant and persistent shortfalls in the delivery of housing and/or employment, infrastructure or spatial distribution that deviates significantly from the plan strategy, or there are changes within the HMA to the objectively assessed need for development or the spatial distribution of growth across the HMA, the Council will undertake an early review of the Local Plan or partial review. This will be submitted for examination within 12 months of new evidence being published and in order for this to be carried out quickly, the Council will prioritise consideration of the following potential alternative sites including, The Six Hills Garden Village; Previously considered large scale site options at Normanton Airfield</p>	<p>triggers for review, more detail on the amount of development expected by certain dates to deliver the overall housing numbers and their location is given on Pages 1 and 2 of Appendix 5 : Monitoring Framework. The annual authority monitoring report would identify performance against those targets and comment on whether it necessitated triggering a plan review. It would be unduly inflexible to indicate precise trigger amounts, as a change in best practice or case law could render the policy out of date.</p> <p>Allocations are a part of Policy C1(A) in Chapter 5, it would be inappropriate to include a new policy here after SS6 to include an allocation as suggested.</p>	

Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
			and Dalby Airfield; Sustainable sites within or adjacent to Service Centres, Rural Hubs and Rural Settlement, and Additional sites to the West of Melton Mowbray.		



Name	Representor Number	CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Representors Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modification or Proposed Change
Mrs Joyce Noon - CPRE Leicestershire	365	<p>Paragraph 4.7.3 : The conflict between Policy SS6 and Policy EN4 in respect of Land area to the West of Melton /Areas of Separation (Melton Mowbray and Asfordby Hill) does not accord with NPPF para 154, stating 'Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan'.</p> <p>Also NPPF para 157 says 'broad locations for strategic development on a key diagram and land-use designations on a proposals map'.</p>	Review identifying potential alternative sites	Locations like land West of Melton identified in Policy SS6, are priority areas to explore if a plan review is needed, and as such, not appropriate to show on the Policies Map. Para. 7.4.2 of the draft Local Plan is clear that some development may be acceptable in these areas, providing the separation and tranquillity is maintained. So the two policies are not necessarily in conflict.	None.