

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
<u>Chapter 2</u>				
A.Thomas	I am not a lawyer therefore do not know whether it is legally compliant or not. There may be a 'Duty to Cooperate' but the powers that be do not appear to be listening to opinions of local residents, (at least not in Long Clawson anyway)		Regulations require the Council to ask the question in the form for making representations on the draft Local Plan at this stage. The Duty to Co-operate does not apply to engagement with the public. There are different regulatory requirements for this and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement sets out what the Council committed to undertake on this. All the public engagement undertaken has been documented in the Consultation Statement (2106) and its update (2017).	None.
Anthony Maher	The Portrait anticipates significant government funding for infrastructure. It should have been sought years ago. Now many thousands of homes could be built and no road or other infrastructure delivered.	Stop further development now until government funding is forthcoming.	This issue is addressed in responses to representations on Policy IN1 and IN2.	None.
Anthony Paphiti	The question in each section of this Consultation asking for agreement whether a policy is "legally sound" is not one a layman can answer - that is for a planning lawyer to assess. Laymen are not competent to do so. It would be disingenuous to rely on answers to this question by ordinary consultees as any form of endorsement of the legality of the policy in question.	Obtain independent advice from a planning lawyer, rather than request agreement from lay consultees who are not in a position to assess legal compliance.	Regulations require the Council to ask the question in the form for making representations on the draft Local Plan at this stage.	None.
Carl Powell	compliant	compliant	Comment noted.	None.
Clawson in	MBC have not SA'd Long Clawson nor		All of the sites in Long Clawson have	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
Action	<p>considered the sustainability of its infrastructure. Growth in LC has not been supported by necessary infrastructure, so that now the school and surgery are over capacity. 6/7 dwellings per annum is deemed acceptable; the rate of development proposed would cause major harm to cohesiveness and historic rural character. MBC has not adequately gave weight to historic, environmental, traffic and flood risk in assessing Long Clawson. MBC assessment of Long Clawson is based on historic perception and not up to date information. Clawson in Action have pointed out a number of discrepancies (Appendix 1). Due to this, any development in Long Clawson will be unsustainable. Residents object to the Spatial Strategy in respect of Long Clawson, as it is based on out of date evidence and is disproportionate. It fails to consider sufficiently needed infrastructure investment. Evidence presented to MBC has been ignored, including (view rep for full info). -Flooding -Education - Traffic, Congestion and Pedestrian Safety - Transport Links -Environmental -Historic We object to development being frontloaded in the plan period. This is unsound due to forced rapid expansion of villages. And MBC has ignored previous feedback in this regard.</p>		<p>been through the SA process. The group indicate that the village would accept around 7 dwellings per annum, this would be 175 over the plan period. However, to deliver them in smaller developments as the group state, would mean no affordable housing provision and less money for 106 contributions to highlight some of the deficiencies created by the extra development (i.e. Schooling.). The flood risk evidence referred to is the SFRA (2016), not the 2004 study cited. The infrastructure list is a 'live document' meaning it can be updated to reflect what is happening in the Borough. If additional infrastructure is needed to support growth in the settlement, it can be added to the list. The policies in place mean that no large development will come forward until a satisfactory answer to the education problem has been agreed. Many of the villages in the Borough have historic street patterns that are not always optimal for modern transit, however that does not mean they are unsuitable for development. All planning applications will need to go through the Development Management process wherein safe access will have to be demonstrated. Further development may be able to</p>	

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
			<p>rectify speed problems with the introduction of traffic calming measures. Regarding bus timings, planning policy actively looks to minimise the use of the private car, but in rural locations there is an appreciation that this is not always practicable, though addition development can sometimes create enough demand to prompt the provision of more or enhanced public transport services. The Local Plan contains policies relative to design and the historic environment, which should mitigate damage to listed building. It is not the Councils choice to demonstrate a five year land supply, but a requirement of Central Government. Due to the lead in times of the larger strategic sites, there is an expectation will need to come forward in the villages first, to maintain the Boroughs housing supply.</p>	
Colin Love	<p>The important intention of 2.3.2 is clear - to demonstrate the 'problems' of the low skill base of many of the Melton workforce. However, the wording of the paragraph, to my reading and understanding, does not constitute logical, deductive reasoning - especially the last three lines. Section 2.4 refers to the Bottesford railway line as having 'a good connection to Grantham'. Clearly what constitutes 'good' is a subjective judgement.</p>	<p>2.3.2 Could be expressed with greater detail and more clarity and deductive reasoning. The objective within the Plan is to raise the skill level of new employment opportunities within the Borough, not remain embedded in the present predominantly low skill manufacturing base. This is not apparent in the present text. 2.4 Should be reworded that Bottesford has a regular,</p>	<p>Comments noted. The section is only meant to provide an overview and not the level of detail suggested. Such villages (Rural hubs) do receive housing allocations on a proportionate approach as do the Rural Service Centres.</p>	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>Nonetheless, it can be argued with evidence from the published timetable that it is not the case that the connection is 'good'. It may be regular - but at not necessarily convenient.</p> <p>2.3.3 Should start there IS a growing number - not there are - 2.3.5 It is unclear why four villages are identified by name as Rural Service Centres when the text continues to say that 'other larger villages particularly to the south of the Borough perform a similar role' - but these are not identified.</p> <p>2.6.6 Unlike Melton, the library in Bottesford is only a Community supported library with annually diminishing financial support from LC C and its future has to be considered uncertain.</p> <p>2.6.7 Of course, in the north of the Borough, i.e. Bottesford, there is no requirement for a 'park' because the surrounding countryside is a natural park.</p>	<p>but not necessarily convenient, rail connection to Grantham.</p> <p>2.6.6 Change to Community Library</p> <p>2.6,7 Re-think the purpose of making reference to 'parks' in the northern part of the Borough.</p> <p>Imposing a 'park' in a village context only contributes to the urbanisation of the village character.</p>		
David Adams	<p>page 11 paragraph 2.2: Most residents commute to other employment centres thus emphasis on affordable housing is misplaced, as the benefits of cheaper housing will be countered by transportation costs. The Leader of the Council and the Chief Exec have stated there is sufficient affordable housing in the town, thus contradictory to promote so much in the plan. If levels of affordable housing can be changed for other purposes (distributor road), why have a plan?</p> <p>page 12 paragraph 2.3.2: Given the main employment profile it is obvious and no attempts at any type of social engineering will cause any change</p> <p>page 13 paragraph 2.4.2: This is true and the plan does</p>		<p>There seems to be a misunderstanding of the socio-economic profile of the Borough in these representations. Melton Mowbray has many jobs that are low paid and hence the employees in such jobs may need assistance through affordable housing. The Councils evidence shows Melton Borough as having demonstrable issues with housing affordability and low levels of unemployment. It is however appreciated, that sometimes the affordable housing provision has been reduced in lieu of</p>	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>nothing to improve the situation but will certainly make it worse. Given that there is acceptance of this issue why is there no attempt to mitigate page 13 paragraph 2.6.2: Not surprising since this is expected given the comments in 2.2 and nothing in the plan focuses on reducing the outflow or indeed encouraging the inward movement by providing housing to suit those particular needs of retirement page 14 paragraph 2.6.5: There is one surgery in Melton with inadequate parking. It is oversubscribed with patients and scope for achieving an early appointment never mind one on the same day non-existent. The result of adopting the plan policies will only make this worse and there will be additional traffic delays when appointments have been secured. Bus services are not available for many town residents and such services are declining.</p>		<p>other infrastructure. This is especially true of the relief road, however, the relief road is needed to deliver the Borough's housing and economic growth. The plan has, as one of its key foundations, the delivery of strategic infrastructure, which is an attempt to mitigate the issues of traffic congestion in Melton Mowbray. Where this is no capacity in a service, new development will pay to create capacity through section 106 agreements.</p>	
<p>Debbie Caroline Adams</p>	<p>Melton Borough is a rural area between other larger urban centres. 4,000 houses, including 37% affordable is unjustifiable as who would want to live in MM if they work in another area and are on a low income. It would instead be sensible to build the housing in those locales rather than increase MM's population by 30%. Young people move out due to better job opportunities. People come to MM to retire, however there is a lack of suitable housing. The plan is unsound as it does not promote an appropriate mix of housing in the Town and Borough. 2-3 bedroom starter homes may not be suitable for older people. There needs to be</p>		<p>Whilst there are currently low levels of unemployment, there are a number of factors that mean to ensure economic growth, additional housing is required. Firstly the demographics of the Borough means that there is a large proportion of the population who will retire during the plan period and likely stay in their property, thus leaving jobs with no local housing for new employees. Secondly, many of the Borough's employers are actively looking to grow their business, but are</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>more bungalows. On page 14 in 2.6.5 it says that 10 GP surgeries serve the borough. However only ONE serves the whole of the town (Latham House). It is on too small a site to allow for expansion particularly as the car park is woefully inadequate. According to page 56 of the MBC Infrastructure Delivery Plan - October 2016 Latham House and Asfordby surgery between them have 35,600 registered patients with 20 doctors. According to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Latham House will be submitting an application for S106 funding for an extension. There needs to be a new surgery in Melton preferably at the Melton hospital site rather than trying to cram another extension on to the Sage Cross Street site to relieve the burden on Latham House of another circa 8,000 residents from the 4,000 homes planned for the next 20 years. Such inadequate provision of healthcare facilities for a town population due to grow by 30% makes any large scale development unsustainable and therefore unsound.</p>		<p>struggling to employ additional staff in the locality, again this means that additional local housing stock is required to fuel this demand and to contribute to economic growth. detailed evidence of housing need is set out in the 2017 HEDNA and the local link between housing and employment growth and other factors is set out in the Towards a Housing Requirement for Melton report. The Local Plan does look to create an appropriate housing mix, however, it has to be a deliverable one. Bungalows are disliked by developers as they are less viable than other forms of housing, especially in Melton Mowbray where house prices are lower. Melton Borough Council are working with healthcare providers to ensure appropriate cover is provided across the Borough. As part of this, there may be scope to deliver a new facility as part of the southern SUE. The advantage of amalgamating services into one location, i.e. Latham House, is they can provide a far wider range of services and specialisms that actually provide a better local service, instead of making people travel to larger conurbations.</p>	
Dilys	There is hardly any mention of Bottesford. Not		The issues mentioned do not fall	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
Shepherd	surprising - Melton hardly comes into our lives at all - Hardly any public transport, no Police station, and very little police presence at all, 'a library' run by volunteers, and double yellow lined areas but nobody to do anything about parking. Etc.		under the remit of planning policy.	
Howard Blakebrough	Two issues: - 2.3.5 Re Service Centres - refers to "other larger villages, particularly to the south of the Borough, also perform a similar role". There is only one service centre in the south, Somerby, which is of very different size, has less facilities and does not have all the necessary attributes to qualify. Specifically the Access to Employment criterion is patently not of a scale to be relevant to the proposed housing developments. 2.4.2 Peak Hour Traffic - without a bypass Melton will simply grind to a halt as a result of all the new proposed housing. The issue of congestion and the need to take traffic out of the town centre needs to be elevated to the top of the priority list.	Service Centres - take out the reference to service centres, real or imagined, in the south of the Borough. There is a real problem with the geographical spread of Service Centres, which are all concentrated in the north, east and west. Emphasise more the need for a long term traffic solution	For villages to be designated as a Service Centre or Rural Hub, they require access to employment opportunities, not necessarily contain employment themselves. Moreover, in a rural borough with declining public transport, there is an acceptance on a higher reliance of the private car. Additional development in the rural areas may ensure surviving bus routes continue to operate. This plan contains throughout reference to the Melton Mowbray Distributor Road, and the Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy of which it will be part.	None.
James Keith Hamilton	2.3.5 Under jobs and prosperity heading, which villages perform the same role as the service centres mentioned? This is very vague. Without a full definition some of the smaller villages provide little job opportunity I'm afraid. Please supply any data in support.2.7.3 Many of the Conservations areas were designated in the 1970s and need reviewing.2.7.5 Flood risks are increasing due to ill considered developments and infrastructure in wrong locations. The evidence is increasing in County Council Flood Figures		The list of service centres is at 4.2.7 of the draft plan, and at Appendix 1. Conservation Area appraisals will be updated as and when resources permit. Melton Borough Council have completed a SFRA of the Borough, which in many cases is more detailed then information held by County Council and even the Environment Agency, and applied a sequential test in identifying draft allocations in the plan.	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	(FRA) which should be in the “key evidence” at the end.			
K Lynne Camplejohn	I am happy with most of the data used to describe the Melton context, however some data is derived from 2001 census which is now inaccurate leading to poor conclusions.	Revise the plan in accordance with more recent data, if necessary conduct surveys to collect the missing data.	2001 census was used to demonstrate change in circumstances to 2011 and beyond, not as direct evidence itself. It would not be proportionate to conduct surveys to bring all data up to date - national planning practice guidance indicates that Census data can be used where it is the most up to date available.	None.
Leicester City Council	Accessibility and Transport : Paragraph 2.4.1. should also note that the A46 also provides access between Melton and Leicester, and north towards Nottingham and Lincoln. It also notes that Melton Mowbray station is on the Birmingham to Stanstead Airport railway line and is described as providing ‘quick and regular access to Leicester’. It should be noted that this is only an hourly service.	Accessibility and Transport : Paragraph 2.4.1. should also note that the A46 also provides access between Melton and Leicester, and north towards Nottingham and Lincoln. It also notes that Melton Mowbray station is on the Birmingham to Stanstead Airport railway line and is described as providing ‘quick and regular access to Leicester’. It should be noted that this is only an hourly service.	This chapter is only meant to provide an overview and the level of detail suggested in the comments is not necessary.	None.
Martin S Herbert (Brown & Co) on behalf of M Hill, P Hill, Mrs M Hyde & Mrs P Pickup	Paragraph 2.4.2 : Does not identified sufficiently the connectivity of the major employment areas within the Plan. The eastern bypass to link the A607 Melton to Grantham Road at Thorpe Arnold round to Melton South and the A607 Leicester Road, will take significant volumes of HGV traffic away from the town centre. The main employment areas in Melton Mowbray are to the west, south east and east and it is essential this full link is provided to reduce traffic in the		Please view the Jacobs report for full information on the traffic modelling used.	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	town centre.			
Melanie Steadman	<p>2.3.5 Mentions "other large villages, particularly south of Melton". If this is the case, out of their 1800 rural allocation of houses why are 1197 of these to be built in villages north of Melton. The industry base of the town is also to the south. The only villages to the south are Great Dalby 72 houses, Gaddesby 55 houses and Sommerby 72 houses. To the North of Melton there is Bottesford 400, Easthorpe 36, Stathern 91, Harby 109, Hose 72, Long Clawson 127, Scalford 36, Thorpe Arnold 18, Waltham 109, Croxton Kerrial 72, Asfordby Hill 72, Ab Kettleby 18 and Old Dalby 36. This is a very disproportionate split. There is not one Primary Rural Service Centre south of Melton. Long Clawson is not situated on or even near a main road. Again, these villages cannot sustain the level of development they have been allocated.</p>	<p>They should have considered more custom built sites. Great Dalby Airfield or Six Hills development sites. The villages are already unsustainable. Most of these villages have residents who commute to Nottingham, Newark, Leicester and beyond and do not associate with Melton.</p>	<p>The response to comments about spatial distribution of housing are dealt with in responses to Policy SS2. Custom build responses are at Policy C8.</p>	None.
Melton North Action Group MNAG	<p>Chapter 2 Melton Borough Today - A Portrait, 2.4.2: Given the statements here, can a proposed population increase in the town of about 30% over the next 20 years, be justified when there is no guarantee of any funding to improve the road infrastructure of the town to a level where any large scale development could be considered sustainable. Similarly it will not improve the prospects of the town becoming a larger business centre. Given the contradictory nature of current traffic congestion and the plan to build even more homes in the town, the Melton Local Plan</p>		<p>Comments noted. Most of the proposed housing cannot be delivered without the delivery of the strategic infrastructure and as such form crucial aspects of the development proposals. Further response to issues to do with traffic in Melton Mowbray appear in response to Policies IN1 and IN2.</p>	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	cannot be considered effective.			
MRS NICOLA MORLEY	for example states Melton has a maternity hospital, yet it's closure has been announced	for example states Melton has a maternity hospital, yet it's closure has been announced	The closure of the maternity unit has not yet been confirmed.	None.
Peter Bailey	There is no mention of the threat to local NHS services. If the maternity & St. Mary's hospital are centralised what will be the impact on residents now and in the future after agreed housing developments are completed.	Full contingency measures need to be identified to ensure the community not only fully understands the implications but what factors will be installed to minimise related inconvenience, stress and expenditure.	Comment noted. The NHS have been involved with the preparation of the Local Plan and aware of the pressures the planned growth may cause.	None.
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	This factual chapter and is broadly supported. 2.2.1: indicates a substantial shortage of properties available for those that cannot afford to buy and the need for good quality dwellings available for rent. 2.2.2 : suggests that affordable housing should be a priority in early years of the plan if this Strategic Objective (Housing Objective 1) is to be addressed effectively. 2.2.3: The remoteness of Bottesford Parish to Melton Mowbray means that the contribution that can be made in assisting the achievement of the Strategic Objectives will be limited. 2.3.1 : Notes that smaller villages should be encouraged to grow and be more 'sustainable' so that residents would not require daily transport or retail facilities. Home working, internet shopping and communication can alter the idea of sustainable locations particularly in relation to smaller villages, housing choice is relevant here, people would not choose to live where access to facilities might be a problem. 2.3.2there is a need for development at Melton		Comments noted. It is not considered sustainable to locate housing where these facilities are not present, though it is accepted that modest growth in all settlements is necessary and the spatial hierarchy allows for this. Comment regarding subjective use of term good – in relation to rail links - is noted. Melton Borough Council is happy to assist the Parish in achieving better rail services and the increased growth may support any bid. A strategic flood risk assessment has been carried out for the whole Borough and a sequential test applied in undertaking work to identify site allocations.	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>Mowbray to attract a wider range of businesses as in Chapter 6 2.3.5: the Service Centres are predominant in the North of the Borough so 'particularly to the south' is not accurate. The map shows the number of other Service Centres that are closer to Melton Mowbray, these settlements are smaller than Bottesford and should be considered for expansion to improve their facilities. 2.4 Accessibility and Transport: 2.4.1 Bottesford station: the view that the service to Grantham is not supported by the Parish population. want more action to get a better service. 2.4.2 : This is clearly a need for sufficient development in Melton Mowbray to fund the complete ring road and suitable connections. This is identified as a Strategic Issue and a Strategic Objective yet the number of new houses planned for Melton Mowbray may be insufficient to support this objective and Government funding will be required to complete the scheme. 2.6.1 ... suggests the need for good quality, rented housing as well as suitable employment in and around Melton Mowbray. 2.6.2 ...This para. is further evidence for enlarging Melton Mowbray and improving the quality and quantity of employment in and around the town. Only by improving the quality of the employment offer will entice graduates and other qualified and skilled people back to Melton Mowbray for appropriate jobs and attractive salaries. 2.6.5 Part of the strategy should be to work with Leicestershire C.C. Education Department to</p>			

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>improve the capacity of existing and consider new school locations to support sustainability (Objectives 5,12 and 13) 2.6.6 : Most services are at Melton Mowbray and are remote from Bottesford. Maternity services at Melton are under threat as is the A and E Dept at Grantham. The 'Community' library here is only there through voluntary help and on a reducing budget. 2.6.10 : facilities mentioned are remote from Bottesford and the attractions to the west, east and north are more convenient. 2.7.3 .The Grantham Canal is a major flood risk to Bottesford Parish. The associated reservoirs also present a flood risk. Bottesford was seriously flooded in 2001 and received a further Environment Agency Flood Warning in 2012.</p>			
Richard Simon	<p>This factual chapter and is broadly supported. 2.2.1: indicates a substantial shortage of properties available for those that cannot afford to buy and the need for good quality dwellings available for rent. 2.2.2 : suggests that affordable housing should be a priority in early years of the plan if this Strategic Objective (Housing Objective 1) is to be addressed effectively. 2.2.3: The remoteness of Bottesford Parish to Melton Mowbray means that the contribution that can be made in assisting the achievement of the Strategic Objectives will be limited. 2.3.1 : Notes that smaller villages should be encouraged to grow and be more 'sustainable' so that residents would not require daily transport or retail facilities. Home working, internet shopping and</p>		<p>Comments noted. It is not considered sustainable to locate housing where these facilities are not present, though it is accepted that modest growth in all settlements is necessary and the spatial hierarchy allows for this. Comment regarding subjective use of term good – in relation to rail links - is noted. Melton Borough Council is happy to assist the Parish in achieving better rail services and the increased growth may support any bid. A strategic flood risk assessment has been carried out for the whole Borough and a sequential test applied in undertaking work to</p>	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>communication can alter the idea of sustainable locations particularly in relation to smaller villages, housing choice is relevant here, people would not choose to live where access to facilities might be a problem. 2.3.2there is a need for development at Melton Mowbray to attract a wider range of businesses as in Chapter 6 2.3.5: the Service Centres are predominant in the North of the Borough so 'particularly to the south' is not accurate. The map shows the number of other Service Centres that are closer to Melton Mowbray, these settlements are smaller than Bottesford and should be considered for expansion to improve their facilities. 2.4 Accessibility and Transport: 2.4.1 Bottesford station: the view that the service to Grantham is not supported by the Parish population. want more action to get a better service. 2.4.2 : This is clearly a need for sufficient development in Melton Mowbray to fund the complete ring road and suitable connections. This is identified as a Strategic Issue and a Strategic Objective yet the number of new houses planned for Melton Mowbray may be insufficient to support this objective and Government funding will be required to complete the scheme. 2.6.1 ... suggests the need for good quality, rented housing as well as suitable employment in and around Melton Mowbray. 2.6.2 ...This para. is further evidence for enlarging Melton Mowbray and improving the quality and quantity of employment in and around the town. Only by</p>		<p>identify site allocations.</p>	

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>improving the quality of the employment offer will entice graduates and other qualified and skilled people back to Melton Mowbray for appropriate jobs and attractive salaries. 2.6.5 Part of the strategy should be to work with Leicestershire C.C. Education Department to improve the capacity of existing and consider new school locations to support sustainability (Objectives 5,12 and 13) 2.6.6 : Most services are at Melton Mowbray and are remote from Bottesford. Maternity services at Melton are under threat as is the A and E Dept at Grantham. The 'Community' library here is only there through voluntary help and on a reducing budget. 2.6.10 : facilities mentioned are remote from Bottesford and the attractions to the west, east and north are more convenient. 2.7.3 .The Grantham Canal is a major flood risk to Bottesford Parish. The associated reservoirs also present a flood risk. Bottesford was seriously flooded in 2001 and received a further Environment Agency Flood Warning in 2012.</p>			
<p>Robert Galij BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI, Planning Director - Barratt David Wilson Homes North Midlands</p>	<p>Insufficient weight and recognition given to the role of Bottesford as the second largest settlement in the Borough.</p>	<p>Greater recognition should be given to Bottesford in paragraph 2.3.5 'as the principal local service centre' outside Melton Mowbray. This should be reflected through housing provision during the plan period.</p>	<p>The purpose of this chapter is to paint a general portrait only. Bottesford's role as the second biggest settlement has been reflected in its receiving the second highest amount of growth behind Melton Mowbray, some 7% of the housing requirement for the Borough. The analysis of Bottesford is included in the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report 2016.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
Susan Love	2.6.6 The library in Bottesford is only a Community Library. 2.1.3 There should be specific mention of Belvoir Castle as a tourist location.	2.6.6 Bottesford has only a Community Library. 2.1.3 Belvoir Castle is a significant tourist location.	Comments noted. The type of library is not relevant to painting this overall portrait Belvoir Castle is referenced in the tourism policy.	None.