

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
SOMERBY				
SOM1				
Leigh Higgins	128	SOM1 - 3 including the reserve site. Are there allocations which were considered in the Southern Rural Area outside of Gaddesby and Somerby?	Great Dalby was assessed to be a 'Rural Hub' by policy SS2, therefore it was considered for allocation. At pre-submission there was no suitable available land, however, due to a submission of land through this consultation there is now a site in Great Dalby.	None.
James Keith Hamilton	116	SOM1 Outline application for 32 houses has been submitted for 10 months now with 90 valid objections and only one in support. This site on the edge of the village and is being used for grazing and is high quality agricultural land. The main objections are flooding, traffic, loss of trees, loss of night light, loss of amenity and inappropriate use. I therefore would add my strong objections to this application on this basis.	Objection noted.	None.
K Lynne Camplejohn	115	SOM1, SOM2 In terms of justification the provision of two sites SOM1 and SOM2 would provide more housing than is required in this service centre. In particular the size of the development and the timescale to completion. In terms of legality both these sites have issues which the NPPF may well rule them out such as flooding, heritage land site and infrastructure.	Site Allocations do not always fit neatly with individual settlement requirements, so should be viewed as a best fit on the best available land. Somerby 2 in particular is a large landholding; this allows the development to occur whilst providing suitable mitigation for the mentioned issues, including sensitive design around heritage assets.	None.
Dr R Leverton	169	Site SOM 1 MBC/146/14 This site is stated as being of Subgrade 3a quality agricultural land and as such should be afforded protection from development according to the NPPF guidance to protect best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land (paragraph 112). Additionally protected species have been identified within a pond	All of the available sites in Somerby are classified as 3a on the agricultural land classification. The protected species in question are reportedly in the adjoining field, but it is felt there is sufficient distance from the site and that on site mitigation measures will allow development to occur appropriately.	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		on the boundary of the land (Great Crested Newts) and the site is likely to be used as terrestrial habitat for these newts.		
SOM2				
James Keith Hamilton	116	<p>SOM2 Ref MBC/023/16 This site was registered very recently by a Registered Charity who have sold off land for housing in the MBC over the last few years. They also own the children`s play area and small football field adjacent. None of the site has been assessed yet but potentially has a high risk of archaeological work underneath and is a very important part of an overall historical landscape previously owned by Brasenose College, Oxford.</p> <p>I attach a recent appeal decision on an adjacent site which gives an excellent range of reasons to reject the inclusion the Melton Local Plan.</p> <p>The principal reasons to reject this site being included on this sensitive site can be précised as follows :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to (or on) a former Medieval settlement or possible Roman previously requiring both geophysical surveys and trial trenching to establish the archaeological importance • Far too large a scheme which would have a significant negative impact on the present small village and its sensitive rural environs • Too close to the Conservation Area, major listed buildings and a 16C Cruck Building (Former School and Infirmary) • Detrimental influence on other houses, public rights of way (Leicestershire Round) and horse trails 	<p>Objection noted. Many of the issues highlighted can be mitigated against, especially given the large site area, allowing buffers and mediation measures to be developed as part of a comprehensive scheme.</p> <p>Melton Borough Council have met with Historic England and have agreed the development can be brought forward subject to additional wording within the Local Plan Policy to ensure suitable protection of the historic environment.</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial harm to Heritage assets and using up valuable “green open space • Increase travel distance of village playground from local school and not easily supervised for children`s safety • Increased urbanisation of a very small village and equestrian community • Inadequate drainage provision (the current area floods the adjacent roads already due to poor porosity and inadequate road drainage) • Highway access is extremely dangerous due to speeding vehicles and inadequate visibility splays • Increased traffic to a village with already too narrow roads • Removal of important trees and landscape in the Conservation Area • Lack of infrastructure generally 		
K Lynne Camplejohn	115	SOM1, SOM2 In terms of justification the provision of two sites SOM1 and SOM2 would provide more housing than is required in this service centre. In particular the size of the development and the timescale to completion. In terms of legality both these sites have issues which the NPPF may well rule them out such as flooding, heritage land site and infrastructure.	Site Allocations do not always fit neatly with individual settlement requirements, so should be viewed as a best fit on the best available land. Somerby 2 in particular is a large landholding; this allows the development to occur whilst providing suitable mitigation for the mentioned issues, including sensitive design around heritage assets.	None.
Dr R Leverton	169	Site SOM 2 MBC/023/16. This site is also stated as being of Subgrade 3a quality agricultural land and again should be protected as BMV land (NPPF paragraph 112) The site also contains two areas which were previously designated as Protected Open Spaces and is designated as an Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside (APAC)	All of the land in Somerby falls under this particular designation of ALQ. The areas in question whilst previously protected, did not meet the criteria to be afforded Local Green Space protection under the NPPF. The NPPF does make allowances for the development of playing fields, however any subsequent planning	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		and therefore considered of higher landscape value than other areas (LSP SP4). The site contains the local play area, with associated play equipment, and the football pitch used by local children. The NPPF guidance is such that existing open space, sports facilities and playing fields should not be used for development (NPPF paragraph 74).	application, despite allocation should have due regard for those caveats in paragraph 74 of the NPPF and Local Plan Policy EN3(14) and Policy EN7 which protect playing pitches.	
Dr John Rawlings	243	SOM 2 is located in an area of outstanding countryside. The proposed development would eliminate the existing playground amenity that is used by local children and as an extended play space for the local primary school. There is no indication how this site would be accessed without adding significant congestion to the existing Main Street that is currently reduced to a single lane.	The land to rear of the High Street is not particularly visible, thus a well designed scheme should not be seen as overly intrusive. As part of any development proposal is the requirement for the play area to be replaced. Site access will be gained off Main Street to the west of the village, however it is likely some traffic may need to use Main Street to travel through the village to the east.	None.
Barbara Yandell	363	I have objections to the local plan, reference SOM2 MCB/023/16. I am a resident of Somerby, on Church Lane. Below are the reasons for my objection. The negative impact on the heritage assets of the Grade 1 listed church, Grade II listed buildings of Somerby House Farm and Manor Farm House and the Village School and other listed buildings on Church Lane all within the centre of the village.	Objection noted. There is national protection for conservation areas and policies in the plan, that ensure any development will have due regard for the historic environment. Melton Borough Council have met with Historic England and have agreed the development can be brought forward subject to additional wording within the Local Plan Policy to ensure suitable protection of the historic environment.	None.
Clare O'Callaghan	213	I wish to object to the inclusion of the above land [Som 2] in the draft plan for Melton. I understand this site is said to be able to accommodate 42 houses: It is hard to see how houses on the land could be accessed from existing roads which are of restricted width and all dead end roads If new roads are to be built within the site to give access to it this would mean at least one more road	Objections noted. The Highway Authority have confirmed the site is acceptable in principle. Access would be taken directly off Main Street; Policy Som2 specifically rejects using another road to enter the site.	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		feeding out into the narrow and congested High Street. In short the village road infrastructure cannot cope with the additional traffic a sizable development would bring. The whole character of the village will be ruined by a large number of new houses in one place. Such a large development cannot blend in and preserve the rural nature of the location. Somerby is located in an important area of recreational pursuits and tourism. It is not just Somerby which will suffer, it will bring more traffic through surrounding villages. I mention particularly Burrough (again 2 sharp bends and a considerable degree of on street parking) which is the route toward Leicester the nearest city.		
Jason Watts	337	<p>I object to the inclusion of Som2. The site has only recently been disclosed in the draft local plan, the local community has not had sufficient period of time to review the. The draft local plan (DLP) is set over a too long period. The reasons for my objection to SOM 2 are as follows:-</p> <p>Primary Green Infrastructure Area. The development of SOM 2 will disrupt the movement of wildlife. The site is adjacent to the Somerby conservation area. Ridge and Furrow. The loss of mature trees Somerby does not fulfill the criteria of Policy IN1 regarding Transport & Strategic Infrastructure. SOM 2 is not located where travel can be minimized. There are no realistic local employment opportunities. The village is a commuter village with the minimum distance travelled is 7 miles for those working in either Oakham or Melton. There is no direct bus service to Leicester or Loughborough or</p>	<p>The Pre-Submission Consultation ran for the full statutory period and it is contested that 6 weeks does not represent enough time for full reflection and comment. At Preferred Options the Borough Council ran the consultation for 12-weeks; however both consultations attracted similar numbers of responses. The plan period is 25 years; however 5 years have already passed. Moreover, the rest of the HMA is planning now up to 2036 and not planning over this period may lead to failings in the duty to cooperate. Whilst it is accepted that the development of this site will not 'assist this [route] being a visitor attraction', it is contested that it would damage its ability to attract visitors. In reality, most visitors are unlikely to note a small growth of housing next to an existing village. In respect of Leicestershire Round the MBC Green Infrastructure strategy document states on page 71</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>Nottingham from Somerby. The site will have a severe cumulative adverse impact on the local and wider highway network. The site SOM 2 is currently used as a paddock for an adjacent well renowned important equestrian business. My family will loose our privacy and amenity. Highway access. SOM 2 is connected to the walled open space on Manor Lane "a retained historic enclosure" . The site SOM 2 will exacerbate the existing drainage problems and other infrastructure issues. The village is not on the natural gas network and has an electricity supply which is subject to frequent outages. A number of properties in the direct vicinity of the site have long established and fully functional water wells. The water table in the field SOM 2 is very high, evident by the presence of natural small pond. The draft local plan acknowledges the increasing ageing population and the need for stock of housing to meet the need of an aging population. Sites such as SOM 2 in Somerby will not meet these needs as it is over 7 miles to the nearest hospital and over 17 miles to a hospital providing primary/geriatric care. Somerby is not capable of serving the basic day to day needs of the community.</p>	<p>"Planning policy should seek to refuse development deemed to compromise the network function and/or future function". The Leicestershire Round is the County's main long distance footpath. Furthermore the Green Infrastructure Strategy for Melton Borough Nov 2011 page 25 states "Promoted paths such as the Melton Way, Leicestershire Round and National Cycle Network Routes are also important elements of Melton's visitor infrastructure".</p> <p>It is again contested the development of this site will compromise the network function or future function. Whilst it is accepted the Leicestershire Round is an important asset to the area, it does not prevent development nearby, especially given the footpath already crosses through the village centre. As a right of way its status would be protected regardless of the proposed development.</p> <p>Again it is contested that development would stop people using these facilities. It could be argued however that the contrary would happen, and more people would use the facilities, given the growth in local population.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework Section 8 sets out "local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them." In addition local green space designation may be used "where the green are is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance for example because of its beauty,</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
			<p>historical significance, recreational value (including as a playing field) tranquillity or richness of wildlife and where the green area concerned is local in character” Areas of Separation, settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study (August 2016). I believe there is a very strong case for the land under SOM 2 to be designated local green space due to its heritage and tranquil setting.</p> <p>The site was assessed, albeit partially (just the recreation ground and field) for LGS, however it was assessed as being deficient in all three areas required to be given the status.</p> <p>Melton Borough Council has commissioned biodiversity work on all potential allocations and there is no evidence through this work that the development of this site will be overly damaging with regards to its effect on wildlife. There is no greenbelt within Melton Borough.</p> <p>Development can occur within and adjoining conservation areas and it is agreed that additional policy protection is required to ensure new development is appropriate with the listed historical features and conservation area. Melton Borough Council have met with Historic England and have agreed the development can be brought forward subject to additional wording within the Local Plan Policy to ensure suitable protection of the historic environment.</p> <p>It is accepted that in a rural borough such as Melton,</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
			<p>there will be greater impetus on the private car. All sites have been assessed by LCC, and their access in principle confirmed. Many other issues will form part of the Development management process, which will explore site solutions and design in more depth.</p> <p>For further commentary on suitability of settlement within the spatial hierarchy please view SS2 within Chapter 4.</p>	
Mr W J Watts	338	<p>I object to the inclusion of Som2. The site has only recently been disclosed in the draft local plan, the local community has not had sufficient period of time to review the. The draft local plan (DLP) is set over a too long period. The reasons for my objection to SOM 2 are as follows:- Primary Green Infrastructure Area. The development of SOM 2 will disrupt the movement of wildlife. The site is adjacent to the Somerby conservation area. Ridge and Furrow. The loss of mature trees Somerby does not fulfill the criteria of Policy IN1 regarding Transport & Strategic Infrastructure. SOM 2 is not located where travel can be minimized. There are no realistic local employment opportunities. The village is a commuter village with the minimum distance travelled is 7 miles for those working in either Oakham or Melton. There is no direct bus service to Leicester or Loughborough or Nottingham from Somerby. The site will have a severe cumulative adverse impact on the local and wider highway network. The site SOM 2 is currently used as a paddock for an adjacent well renowned important equestrian</p>	<p>The Pre-Submission Consultation ran for the full statutory period and it is contested that 6 weeks does not represent enough time for full reflection and comment. At Preferred Options the Borough Council ran the consultation for 12-weeks; however both consultations attracted similar numbers of responses. The plan period is 25 years; however 5 years have already passed. Moreover, the rest of the HMA is planning now up to 2036 and not planning over this period may lead to failings in the duty to cooperate. Whilst it is accepted that the development of this site will not 'assist this [route] being a visitor attraction', it is contested that it would damage its ability to attract visitors. In reality, most visitors are unlikely to note a small growth of housing next to an existing village. In respect of Leicestershire Round the MBC Green Infrastructure strategy document states on page 71 "Planning policy should seek to refuse development deemed to compromise the network function and/or future function". The Leicestershire Round is the County's main long distance footpath. Furthermore the</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>business. My family will loose our privacy and amenity. Highway access. SOM 2 is connected to the walled open space on Manor Lane “a retained historic enclosure” . The site SOM 2 will exacerbate the existing drainage problems and other infrastructure issues. The village is not on the natural gas network and has an electricity supply which is subject to frequent outages. A number of properties in the direct vicinity of the site have long established and fully functional water wells. The water table in the field SOM 2 is very high, evident by the presence of natural small pond. The draft local plan acknowledges the increasing ageing population and the need for stock of housing to meet the need of an aging population. Sites such as SOM 2 in Somerby will not meet these needs as it is over 7 miles to the nearest hospital and over 17 miles to a hospital providing primary/geriatric care. Somerby is not capable of serving the basic day to day needs of the community.</p>	<p>Green Infrastructure Strategy for Melton Borough Nov 2011 page 25 states “Promoted paths such as the Melton Way, Leicestershire Round and National Cycle Network Routes are also important elements of Melton’s visitor infrastructure”.</p> <p>It is again contested the development of this site will compromise the network function or future function. Whilst it is accepted the Leicestershire Round is an important asset to the area, it does not prevent development nearby, especially given the footpath already crosses through the village centre. As a right of way its status would be protected regardless of the proposed development.</p> <p>Again it is contested that development would stop people using these facilities. It could be argued however that the contrary would happen, and more people would use the facilities, given the existent local population.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework Section 8 sets out “local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them.” In addition local green space designation may be used “where the green are is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance for example because of its beauty, historical significance, recreational value (including as a playing field) tranquillity or richness of wildlife and where the green area concerned is local in character”</p> <p>Areas of Separation, settlement Fringe Sensitivity and</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
			<p>Local Green Space Study (August 2016). I believe there is a very strong case for the land under SOM 2 to be designated local green space due to its heritage and tranquil setting.</p> <p>The site was assessed, albeit partially (just the recreation ground and field) for LGS, however it was assessed as being deficient in all three areas required to be given the status.</p> <p>Melton Borough Council has commissioned biodiversity work on all potential allocations and there is no evidence through this work that the development of this site will be overly damaging with regards to its effect on wildlife. There is no greenbelt within Melton Borough.</p> <p>Development can occur within and adjoining conservation areas and it is agreed that additional policy protection is required to ensure new development is appropriate with the listed historical features and conservation area. Melton Borough Council have met with Historic England and have agreed the development can be brought forward subject to additional wording within the Local Plan Policy to ensure suitable protection of the historic environment. It is accepted that in a rural borough such as Melton, there will be greater impetus on the private car. All sites have been assessed by LCC, and their access in principle confirmed. Many other issues will form part of the Development management process, which will explore site solutions and design in more depth.</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
			For further commentary on suitability of settlement within the spatial hierarchy please view SS2 within Chapter 4.	
O Watts	339	<p>I object to the inclusion of Som2. The site has only recently been disclosed in the draft local plan, the local community has not had sufficient period of time to review the. The draft local plan (DLP) is set over a too long period. The reasons for my objection to SOM 2 are as follows:-</p> <p>Primary Green Infrastructure Area. The development of SOM 2 will disrupt the movement of wildlife. The site is adjacent to the Somerby conservation area. Ridge and Furrow. The loss of mature trees Somerby does not fulfill the criteria of Policy IN1 regarding Transport & Strategic Infrastructure. SOM 2 is not located where travel can be minimized. There are no realistic local employment opportunities. The village is a commuter village with the minimum distance travelled is 7 miles for those working in either Oakham or Melton. There is no direct bus service to Leicester or Loughborough or Nottingham from Somerby. The site will have a severe cumulative adverse impact on the local and wider highway network. The site SOM 2 is currently used as a paddock for an adjacent well renowned important equestrian business. My family will loose our privacy and amenity. Highway access. SOM 2 is connected to the walled open space on Manor Lane “a retained historic enclosure” . The site SOM 2 will exacerbate the existing drainage problems and other infrastructure issues. The village is not on the natural gas network and</p>	<p>The Pre-Submission Consultation ran for the full statutory period and it is contested that 6 weeks does not represent enough time for full reflection and comment. At Preferred Options the Borough Council ran the consultation for 12-weeks; however both consultations attracted similar numbers of responses. The plan period is 25 years; however 5 years have already passed. Moreover, the rest of the HMA is planning now up to 2036 and not planning over this period may lead to failings in the duty to cooperate. Whilst it is accepted that the development of this site will not ‘assist this [route] being a visitor attraction’, it is contested that it would damage its ability to attract visitors. In reality, most visitors are unlikely to note a small growth of housing next to an existing village. In respect of Leicestershire Round the MBC Green Infrastructure strategy document states on page 71 “Planning policy should seek to refuse development deemed to compromise the network function and/or future function”. The Leicestershire Round is the County’s main long distance footpath. Furthermore the Green Infrastructure Strategy for Melton Borough Nov 2011 page 25 states “Promoted paths such as the Melton Way, Leicestershire Round and National Cycle Network Routes are also important elements of Melton’s visitor infrastructure”. It is again contested the development of this site will compromise the network</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>has an electricity supply which is subject to frequent outages. A number of properties in the direct vicinity of the site have long established and fully functional water wells. The water table in the field SOM 2 is very high, evident by the presence of natural small pond. The draft local plan acknowledges the increasing ageing population and the need for stock of housing to meet the need of an aging population. Sites such as SOM 2 in Somerby will not meet these needs as it is over 7 miles to the nearest hospital and over 17 miles to a hospital providing primary/geriatric care. Somerby is not capable of serving the basic day to day needs of the community.</p>	<p>function or future function. Whilst it is accepted the Leicestershire Round is an important asset to the area, it does not prevent development nearby, especially given the footpath already crosses through the village centre. As a right of way its status would be protected regardless of the proposed development.</p> <p>Again it is contested that development would stop people using these facilities. It could be argued however that the contrary would happen, and more people would use the facilities, given the existent local population.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework Section 8 sets out “local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them.” In addition local green space designation may be used “where the green are is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance for example because of its beauty, historical significance, recreational value (including as a playing field) tranquillity or richness of wildlife and where the green area concerned is local in character”</p> <p>Areas of Separation, settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study (August 2016). I believe there is a very strong case for the land under SOM 2 to be designated local green space due to its heritage and tranquil setting.</p> <p>The site was assessed, albeit partially (just the recreation ground and field) for LGS, however it was assessed as being deficient in all three areas required to</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
			<p>be given the status.</p> <p>Melton Borough Council has commissioned biodiversity work on all potential allocations and there is no evidence through this work that the development of this site will be overly damaging with regards to its effect on wildlife. There is no greenbelt within Melton Borough.</p> <p>Development can occur within and adjoining conservation areas and it is agreed that additional policy protection is required to ensure new development is appropriate with the listed historical features and conservation area. Melton Borough Council have met with Historic England and have agreed the development can be brought forward subject to additional wording within the Local Plan Policy to ensure suitable protection of the historic environment.</p> <p>It is accepted that in a rural borough such as Melton, there will be greater impetus on the private car. All sites have been assessed by LCC, and their access in principle confirmed. Many other issues will form part of the Development management process, which will explore site solutions and design in more depth.</p> <p>For further commentary on suitability of settlement within the spatial hierarchy please view SS2 within Chapter 4.</p>	
Tracey Watts	340	I object to the inclusion of Som2. The site has only recently been disclosed in the draft local plan, the local community has not had sufficient period of time to	The Pre-Submission Consultation ran for the full statutory period and it is contested that 6 weeks does not represent enough time for full reflection and	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>review the. The draft local plan (DLP) is set over a too long period. The reasons for my objection to SOM 2 are as follows:-</p> <p>Primary Green Infrastructure Area. The development of SOM 2 will disrupt the movement of wildlife. The site is adjacent to the Somerby conservation area. Ridge and Furrow. The loss of mature trees Somerby does not fulfill the criteria of Policy IN1 regarding Transport & Strategic Infrastructure. SOM 2 is not located where travel can be minimized. There are no realistic local employment opportunities. The village is a commuter village with the minimum distance travelled is 7 miles for those working in either Oakham or Melton. There is no direct bus service to Leicester or Loughborough or Nottingham from Somerby. The site will have a severe cumulative adverse impact on the local and wider highway network. The site SOM 2 is currently used as a paddock for an adjacent well renowned important equestrian business. My family will loose our privacy and amenity. Highway access. SOM 2 is connected to the walled open space on Manor Lane “a retained historic enclosure” . The site SOM 2 will exacerbate the existing drainage problems and other infrastructure issues. The village is not on the natural gas network and has an electricity supply which is subject to frequent outages. A number of properties in the direct vicinity of the site have long established and fully functional water wells. The water table in the field SOM 2 is very high, evident by the presence of natural small pond.The draft local plan acknowledges the increasing ageing</p>	<p>comment. At Preferred Options the Borough Council ran the consultation for 12-weeks; however both consultations attracted similar numbers of responses. The plan period is 25 years; however 5 years have already passed. Moreover, the rest of the HMA is planning now up to 2036 and not planning over this period may lead to failings in the duty to cooperate. Whilst it is accepted that the development of this site will not ‘assist this [route] being a visitor attraction’, it is contested that it would damage its ability to attract visitors. In reality, most visitors are unlikely to note a small growth of housing next to an existing village. In respect of Leicestershire Round the MBC Green Infrastructure strategy document states on page 71 “Planning policy should seek to refuse development deemed to compromise the network function and/or future function”. The Leicestershire Round is the County’s main long distance footpath. Furthermore the Green Infrastructure Strategy for Melton Borough Nov 2011 page 25 states “Promoted paths such as the Melton Way, Leicestershire Round and National Cycle Network Routes are also important elements of Melton’s visitor infrastructure”. It is again contested the development of this site will compromise the network function or future function. Whilst it is accepted the Leicestershire Round is an important asset to the area, it does not prevent development nearby, especially given the footpath already crosses through the village centre. As a right of way its status would be protected regardless of the proposed development.</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>population and the need for stock of housing to meet the need of an aging population. Sites such as SOM 2 in Somerby will not meet these needs as it is over 7 miles to the nearest hospital and over 17 miles to a hospital providing primary/geriatric care. Somerby is not capable of serving the basic day to day needs of the community.</p>	<p>Again it is contested that development would stop people using these facilities. It could be argued however that the contrary would happen, and more people would use the facilities, given the existent local population.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework Section 8 sets out “local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them.” In addition local green space designation may be used “where the green are is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance for example because of its beauty, historical significance, recreational value (including as a playing field) tranquillity or richness of wildlife and where the green area concerned is local in character” Areas of Separation, settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study (August 2016). I believe there is a very strong case for the land under SOM 2 to be designated local green space due to its heritage and tranquil setting.</p> <p>The site was assessed, albeit partially (just the recreation ground and field) for LGS, however it was assessed as being deficient in all three areas required to be given the status.</p> <p>Melton Borough Council has commissioned biodiversity work on all potential allocations and there is no evidence through this work that the development of this site will be overly damaging with regards to its effect on wildlife. There is no greenbelt within Melton</p>	

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
			<p>Borough.</p> <p>Development can occur within and adjoining conservation areas and it is agreed that additional policy protection is required to ensure new development is appropriate with the listed historical features and conservation area. Melton Borough Council have met with Historic England and have agreed the development can be brought forward subject to additional wording within the Local Plan Policy to ensure suitable protection of the historic environment. It is accepted that in a rural borough such as Melton, there will be greater impetus on the private car. All sites have been assessed by LCC, and their access in principle confirmed. Many other issues will form part of the Development management process, which will explore site solutions and design in more depth. For further commentary on suitability of settlement within the spatial hierarchy please view SS2 within Chapter 4.</p>	
Nicola Morley	205	Our son Thomas is severely Autistic and is now nearing the end of education and will soon be 16, we looked at moving earlier this year as his needs will mean he is unable to live as most children growing up and still needs 24 hour supervision and has complex ongoing medical needs, the idea of moving was far too upsetting for him and we in the end decided to adapt our home to enable him to live independently in the future, whilst still under our supervision, we have indeed been in negotiations with Melton council regarding purchasing	Comments noted. As per the Windfarm application cited in this representation, issues such as those referenced form part of the planning balance of any eventual planning application submitted. Where possible, design and condition can lesson the impact on all households in the area, but due to the circumstances listed yours would need special consideration which cannot be fully explored at this stage. As previous, MBC will work with all parties to ensure a suitable outcome is reached.	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>the amenity land next to us so that we can extend our property to provide for his and our long term future. If you look back to the reports made to stop the windmill planning application submitted by Mr barnes , Thomas had a medical report detailing these effects and was one of the reasons it was stopped from going through, this was nothing compared to being forced to see a building site, to cope with noise and drilling and equipment vibrations that the normal person often isn't even aware of, he is facing 2 and a half more years in education, and is struggling as it is, this will completely ruin any chance he has of achieving anything because he will become more tired, more stressed and volatile.On a more global note, personally I feel this proposal will destroy the village, Somerby is a small village with small streets and is a small parish of mainly locals, a development as such as this will ruin the local feel bringing in commuters and larger families, further stretching the inadequate facilities we already have, the village school is not big enough to cope, the village drs is already at breaking point, the bus service is getting worse and is at such irregular times it's of no use for people seeking to use it for transport to employment. The local roads are treacherous, there is already too much traffic going through the village, there is daily flare ups and accidents with vehicles regularly damaged all along the high street, we are already beyond traffic capacity.</p>		
G F Hillard	129	<p>I am writing to objecto to the allocations in in Somerby. My reasons are:</p>	It will be a requirement of any new development to retain or replace the existing children's play area, as	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>This will have a negative impact on heritage. The proposed site location is likely to create bigger issues directly on the High Street, and an increase of traffic in the village which has also been limited to one lane and not capable of being easily integrated through improvements.</p> <p>This will also have an impact on the equestrain traffic on the High Street , Newbold Lane and the High Street.It will also overload the village infrastructure such as the already inadequate foul and surface water drainage system.</p> <p>Lastly, Melton Borough Council has erroneously classed Somerby as a service centre and capable of absorbing such new large development sites.</p>	<p>well as the creation of additional open space. This should be in a location which will be suitable not only for the new dwellings, but also to serve the existing community. It is therefore possible that your house will not overlook new dwellings but open space and a play area; much alike what is currently present, though it is accepted and appreciated that during the development of the site a level of disturbance will be evident.</p> <p>Melton Borough Council have met with Historic England and have agreed the development can be brought forward subject to additional wording within the Local Plan Policy to ensure suitable protection of the historic environment.</p>	
David Smith	274	<p>The allocation of large housing numbers to Somerby is illogical, inconsistent ,unfair and unsustainable. There is existing problems in Somerby and surrounding villages regarding traffic which will become worse with further housing. Somerby does not fulfill the criteria of Policy IN1.</p> <p>Employment opportunities at John O’Gaunt or Burrough Court are virtually zero.</p> <p>I do not consider it “fair” that many villages do not have allocations. I do not understand how villages such as Twford, a village far more sustainable community on the spectrum of the NPPF, is in the same category as Little Dalby or Leesthorpe. Somerby School does not have any off road car parking or its own green space and is totally unsuitable for further development.</p> <p>Somerby is not capable of serving the basic day to day</p>	<p>Comments noted. The methodology for allocating settlement roles in the spatial hierarchy was done through consultation and the Melton Local Plan reference group and working group. Many of the issues raised in this representation can be handled through appropriate mitigation and design through the development management stage. It is accepted that additional development will put some strain on issues such as transport, but not to unacceptable levels.</p> <p>Melton Borough Council have met with Historic England and have agreed the development can be brought forward subject to additional wording within the Local Plan Policy to ensure suitable protection of the historic environment.</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		needs of the community. It will diminish the significance and the setting to the whole of the Somerby Conservation area. The site will have an adverse effect on the Leicestershire Round. It will urbanise an important rural area. Traffic and transport. 'Victorian' foul and surface water drainage system currently in the village. there are currently over 700,000 homes empty in the UK.		
Rachel Jackson	150	<p>With reference to the above, I am writing to object that this area is suitable for housing, and my reasons are as follows:</p> <p>It will diminish the significance and the setting to the whole of the Somerby Conservation area.</p> <p>The site will have an adverse effect on the Leicestershire Round</p> <p>It will urbanise an important rural area.</p> <p>The proposed site is likely to create traffic access issues directly onto the 'ONE LANE' High Street and not capable of being easily mitigated through improvements. This will also overload the already inadequate 'Victorian' foul and surface water drainage system currently in the village. MBC has erroneously classed Somerby as a Service Centre and capable of absorbing large development sites. THIS IS A FLAWED ASSESSMENT! The majority of public services are at least 7 miles away.</p> <p>I believe the proposed area currently belongs to 'Ernest Cook Trust' - I have looked on their website and have copied their quote: In the 21st century, we take into account the principles of sustainability in its widest</p>	Comments noted. The methodology for allocating settlement roles in the spatial hierarchy was done through consultation and the Melton Local Plan reference group and working group. Many of the issues raised in this representation can be handled through appropriate mitigation and design through the development management stage. It is accepted that additional development will put some strain on issues such as transport, but not to unacceptable levels. Melton Borough Council have met with Historic England and have agreed the development can be brought forward subject to additional wording within the Local Plan Policy to ensure suitable protection of the historic environment.	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		sense as well as following the best practices of land management, including the protection of the landscape and heritage assets, and working closely with tenants and local communities. They appear to be going against all that they claim to be at the core of their belief system, so shame on them! My last comment is this – I believe the current Government is incorrectly applying pressure on local Councils to build more homes, as there are currently over 700,000 homes empty in the UK.		
Alan & Eileen Tomes	305	Ref. SOM2 MBC/023/16. We would like to object to this application, on the grounds that the infrastructure will not support these additional numbers. This is the fourth application in the past few months. We feel that they should be considered together, rather than as individual stand alone applications. We have problems already with the number of vehicle movements up and down the High Street, many existing properties have no parking facilities. Growth is important, however the village deserves to be allowed to grow in a manner that will be sympathetic.	The cumulative effect of development is a material consideration in determining a planning application; however every application must be decided on its own merits. This Local Plan allocates growth for a period of 20 years, though in the rural areas there is an expectation that some development will come forward to the beginning of the plan period.	None.
K Hamilton	115	<p>I write to object to allocation REF: SOM2 MBC/023/16</p> <p>While I have no objection to develop limited areas in Somerby, this additional proposal is neither practical nor sensible.</p> <p>The congestion in the village even now is ridiculous. The number of vehicles parked in the High Street increases week by the week and can get only worse. Neither the</p>	Comments noted. The Highways Authority have already stated access in principle should be acceptable, though the exact access arrangements will be established before planning approval is granted.	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>above proposal nor the existing proposals seem to have considered the access on to the already congested High Street from the developed sites. There does not seem to be any provision of infrastructure to cope with or improve this situation.</p> <p>Another concern is that with houses come families and children and consequently education needs. The village primary school is already full and children with secondary education needs will require transport which will mean more traffic and expense for parents or more likely the Borough.</p>		
Mr C M Crankshaw	59	<p>I object to site SOM 2. The access to this site is likely to cause problems, it would be close to a sharp bend and the junction to Newbold Lane. The proposed sites all have grade two agricultural. Any new build homes will be commuter households. Some properties on the High Street and Church Lane do not have parking, meaning they have to park on main street, restricting traffic to a single lane. Double yellow lines would be grossly unfair to these properties and possibly make them unsellable. At parts there is no pavement between road and pavement. There are many horses, agricultural vehicles and through traffic from Leicester which have to cross the village. When two large vehicles meet through the village, there is gridlock, with vehicles mounting the curb to pass. Somerby school does not have any parking or its own green space. It is a listed building and would not be easy to extend or adapt for modern teaching requirements. Why do so many other villages not have</p>	<p>Comments noted. Many of the issues raised in this representation can be handled through appropriate mitigation and design through the development management stage. It is accepted that additional development will put some strain on issues such as transport, but not to unacceptable levels. LCC are working to look at school capacities to ensure all children can receive appropriate education. For information on the settlement hierarchy, please look to policy SS2.</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		any allocated sites? Could other sites within the Parish help meet the demand whilst becoming more sustainable. What about the access to the Jubilee Way and the Leicestershire Round? No local employment. No protection of the environment and all the wildlife and nesting birds.		
Wendy Hanmer	118	<p>Their will be a negative impact on a number of key listed buildings. It will hugely diminish the significance and setting of the whole of the adjacent Somerby conversation area. The proposed location of the site is likely to create traffic access issues directly on to the High Street and further increase the traffic through the village which is already reduced to one lane and not capable of being easily mitigated through improvements. The site will have an adverse effect on the Leicestershire Round - Jubilee Way is intended to be a Melton Borough Green infrastructure flagship project. This development will harm land designated as Primary Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>A further 42 houses will have a detrimental impact on equestrian traffic on High Street, Newbold Lane and unintended negative consequences on an important source of employment and tourism in the area. It will also overload the village infrastructure such as the already inadequate foul and surface water drainage system</p> <p>It will urbanise an important rural area.</p>	Comments noted. Many of the issues raised in this representation can be handled through appropriate mitigation and design through the development management stage. It is accepted that additional development will put some strain on issues such as transport, but not to unacceptable levels. LCC are working to look at school capacities to ensure all children can receive appropriate education. For information on the settlement hierarchy, please look to policy SS2. Melton Borough Council have met with Historic England and have agreed the development can be brought forward subject to additional wording within the Local Plan Policy to ensure suitable protection of the historic environment.	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>The Somerby Fringe Sensitivity study states we should be having developments of no more than 5 homes - this is way in excess of this and will totally ruin forever the southern side of the village.</p> <p>There are currently applications for 12 dwellings, 32 dwellings and 31 dwellings, all of which is already too much for this village. No decisions have been made on any of these applications.</p>		
Simon Scrivens	260	<p>Their will be a negative impact on a number of key listed buildings. It will hugely diminish the significance and setting of the whole of the adjacent Somerby conversation area. The proposed location of the site is likely to create traffic access issues directly on to the High Street and further increase the traffic through the village which is already reduced to one lane and not capable of being easily mitigated through improvements. The site will have an adverse effect on the Leicestershire Round - Jubilee Way is intended to be a Melton Broough Green infrastructure flagship project. This development will harm land designated as Primary Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>A further 42 houses will have a detrimental impact on equestrian traffic on High Street, Newbold Lane and unintended negative consequences on an important source of employment and tourism in the area. It will also overload the village infrastructure such as the already inadequate foul and surface water drainage system</p>	<p>Comments noted. Many of the issues raised in this representation can be handled through appropriate mitigation and design through the development management stage. It is accepted that additional development will put some strain on issues such as transport, but not to unacceptable levels. LCC are working to look at school capacities to ensure all children can receive appropriate education. For information on the settlement hierarchy, please look to policy SS2. Melton Borough Council have met with Historic England and have agreed the development can be brought forward subject to additional wording within the Local Plan Policy to ensure suitable protection of the historic environment.</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		<p>It will urbanise an important rural area.</p> <p>The Somerby Fringe Sensitivity study states we should be having developments of no more than 5 homes - this is way in excess of this and will totally ruin forever the southern side of the village.</p> <p>There are currently applications for 12 dwellings, 32 dwellings and 31 dwellings, all of which is already too much for this village. No decisions have been made on any of these applications. There also seems to be the erroneous assumption that there is an economy to support these houses, which there is not.</p>		
Derek Cooper	49	<p>We object to SOM 2 MBC/023/16. The development would cause an increase in traffic in Somerby and surrounding villages. High Street is single lane due to the high volume of cars that park there due to lack of other parking. Large vehicles passing can cause chaos. Only a couple of weeks ago, we personally were held up for some five minutes in attempting to travel through. Over the past few years, we have been involved with the local Community Speed Watch programme (Burrough on the hill) and this has only served to emphasise that the 30mph speed limit in our village is widely ignored. Additional houses in Somerby will lead to more speeding traffic in other villages. The increase in traffic in Somerby itself will also adversely affect the safety of horses and their riders who regularly use the High Street, particularly those from the Riding School.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Many of the issues raised in this representation can be handled through appropriate mitigation and design through the development management stage. It is accepted that additional development will put some strain on issues such as transport, but not to unacceptable levels. With regard to localised speeding problems, as an existing problem, detached from the location of new development, it is not a major consideration for the determining of this scheme, nor can contributions from this scheme be reasonably expected with due regard for the CIL regulations.</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		The proposed development will also have the effect of urbanising a picturesque and scenic area which is enjoyed by many walkers and horse riders, particularly those using the Leicestershire Round path.		
Helen Cooper	50	We object to SOM 2 MBC/023/16 The development would cause an increase in traffic in Somerby and surrounding villages. High Street is single lane due to the high volume of cars that park there due to lack of other parking. Large vehicles passing can cause chaos. Only a couple of weeks ago, we personally were held up for some five minutes in attempting to travel through. Over the past few years, we have been involved with the local Community Speed Watch programme (Burrough on the hill) and this has only served to emphasise that the 30mph speed limit in our village is widely ignored. Additional houses in Somerby will lead to more speeding traffic in other villages. The increase in traffic in Somerby itself will also adversely affect the safety of horses and their riders who regularly use the High Street, particularly those from the Riding School. The proposed development will also have the effect of urbanising a picturesque and scenic area which is enjoyed by many walkers and horse riders, particularly those using the Leicestershire Round path.	Comments noted. Many of the issues raised in this representation can be handled through appropriate mitigation and design through the development management stage. It is accepted that additional development will put some strain on issues such as transport, but not to unacceptable levels. With regard to localised speeding problems, as an existing problem, detached from the location of new development, it is not a major consideration for the determining of this scheme, nor can contributions from this scheme be reasonably expected with due regard for the CIL regulations.	None.
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	Proposed allocations SOM2 and 3 are adjacent to the Conservation Area (together with other heritage assets) and impact upon these must be assessed to ensure a sound plan.	Comments noted. Both parties have met and agreed through a statement of common ground, that additional words are required to ensure suitable protection of the historic environment.	Major Modification. Addition of wording "particular attention should be paid to the design, layout, materials and siting of buildings, with

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
				particular attention to the relationship of the proposed development and the Somerby conservation area and its setting.”
Andrew Gore obo Mary A Donovan	367	Our client also objects to the proposed allocation SOM2. The site appears to have been incorporated as a late afterthought and does not appear to have been subjected to a proper Sustainability Appraisal. As acknowledged by the Council as part of its evidence base in respect of Spatial Strategy (SS5o: Somerby), proposed allocation SOM2 is ‘quite high for Somerby’. These developments would have a significant impact on the character of the village and the setting, character and appearance of the Somerby Conservation Area. Furthermore, it is noted that SS5O: Somerby refers to heritage constraints in its assessment of SOM2; it is not clear why an assessment ‘ + (positive)’ score towards the site. The sentence in the assessment is also considered to be incomplete. It is considered that development of both SOM3 and SOM2 will result in a clear over-concentration of development in Somerby West and South, and in Landscape Character Zones 1/4, an area evidence shows to be environmentally important. The Council is currently considering applications 16/00146/OUT and 16/00616/FUL in relation to Southfields Farm, Somerby (a total of 13 dwellings); the Council must deduct these windfall dwellings from the total allocation for the village of	Comments noted. The site has gone through appropriate SA along with the rest of the plan and allocations proposed in the Pre-Submission SA. Effect on character can be mitigated through appropriate good design as required through other policies in the plan and also by national protection due to its position adjoining the conservation area. It is countered that the Council must deduct windfall sites from village totals, as the Council has already estimated and deducted windfall development within its spatial hierarchy. Moreover, to do so may be add odds with the key aims of the NPPF	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		Somerby.		
Terence Joyce	159	This policy not SOUND with respect to Somerby SOM2 &3. The necessary infrastructure required to support development in accordance with Policy IN1; cannot be met in SOM (Somerby). there are very limited job opportunities in this very small rural area. Also Public transport is very limited. Also walking and biking out of question for obvious reasons. The only reason I can see SOM2 being put in allocation and SOM3 in reserve is that SOM2 has greater allocation i.e. 42 units. However SOM2 is a much more sensitive site for many reasons as set out in other policies, SOM3 has much better and safer access to main road whereas SOM2 has no direct access and any access created would have to be in the vicinity of dangerous bend in road and the problem of equestrian activity near same.	For comments based on IN1, please refer to IN1. Moreover for comments based on principle of allocation to a settlement refer to e SS2. The rationale for site selection, whilst partially weighted on number of units delivered, was primarily based on site suitability and site specific constraints. This is clearly evidenced in the Local Plan Supporting Evidence. Access in principle has been confirmed by LCC.	None.
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	409	SOM2. The centre and east of the development area lies within the historic settlement core of Somerby (MLE8617) and contains substantial and well preserved earthworks remains of the former medieval and post-medieval village (MLE22781). The western third of the development area includes a section of surviving former ridge and furrow earthworks providing clear evidence of the extent of the former village and the associate agricultural land use. The survival of earthwork remains indicates a high probability of significant associated buried archaeological remains. Loss of the earthworks will impact upon the setting and significance of the conservation area, which abuts the site along its northern and eastern boundaries.	Comments noted.	Minor Modification. Assessment of archaeological interest to be completed and agreed with LCC Archaeology before development of the site.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
SOM3				
Mike Sibthorp on Behalf of Tony Stimson	417	<p>Having regard to the assessment criteria used to consider the relative merits of sites, it is not considered that the two proposed housing allocations in Somerby represents the most suitable sites in the village for residential development. The proposed reserve site (SOM3) is of equivalent or greater merit to the preferred sites. The assessment matrix for the three sites, fails to take account on inherent flooding issues associated with Site SOM1 (as demonstrated through the current planning application on the site) or the open space and heritage issues associated with Site SOM2. Documentation submitted in connection with a current planning application on reserve site SOM3 demonstrates that there are no technical constraints to the development of the site. An ecological assessment undertaken as part of the application demonstrates that there would be no adverse ecological impacts. The significant negative effect flagged up in the Sustainability Appraisal is thus incorrect. Upward adjustment of this scoring within the Sustainability Appraisal matrix, combined with necessary downward adjustments to reflect the poor drainage and flooding characteristics of Site SOM1, and the open space and heritage issues associated with site SOM2, would result in a different prioritisation of the sites and would render site SOM3 more suitable as a housing allocation than the two other identified sites (Intro text only).</p>	Comments noted. The Borough Council has used a consistent methodology to assess sites across the Borough.	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	Proposed allocations SOM2 and 3 are adjacent to the Conservation Area (together with other heritage assets) and impact upon these must be assessed to ensure a sound plan.	Comments noted. Impact on heritage impacts was one of the criteria of which these sites were assessed. The plan adds additional policies (beyond that required nationally) to ensure that the development of these sites is appropriate and acceptable.	None.
Andrew Gore obo Mary A Donovan	367	Som 3 would give rise to a number of significant heritage and landscape/visual concerns to the extent that the proposals would a) fail to protect and enhance the natural, built and historic environment, as required by paragraph 7 of the NPPF; b) fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Somerby Conservation Area or the Grade II Listed Vinery and Plant House as required by Section 72 of the Listed Buildings Act 1990; and c) significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of granting consent within the context of paragraph 14 of the NPPF. The representations also identified that the proposed development would give rise to impacts relating to flood risk and ecology to the extent that the proposals would fail to 'mitigate and adapt to climate change' and to help 'improve biodiversity' respectively, again as required by paragraph 7 of the NPPF, and that such impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of granting consent.	Comments noted. It is noted that the current planning application has been deemed by LCC Archaeology to contain insufficient information, though if delivered by the appalment may offer a number of assurances on heritage grounds. It is noted that at this point no comments have been received from the LCC on flood risk, though the EA stated due to its being flood zone 1 they weren't going to comment on the application. It is unfortunate that these correspondences were not available at time of writing, though they should be available for the examination of the Local Plan.	None.
Terence Joyce	159	This policy not SOUND with respect to Somerby SOM2 &3. The necessary infrastructure required to support development in accordance with Policy IN1; cannot be met in SOM (Somerby). There are very limited job opportunities in this very small rural area. Also Public transport is very limited. Also walking and biking out of	For comments based on IN1, please refer to IN1. Moreover for comments based on principle of allocation to a settlement refer to e SS2. The rationale for site selection, whilst partially weighted on number of units delivered, was primarily based on site suitability and site specific constraints. This is clearly evidenced in	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed changes or suggested modifications (MBC)
		question for obvious reasons. The only reason I can see SOM2 being put in allocation and SOM3 in reserve is that SOM2 has greater allocation i.e. 42 units. However SOM2 is a much more sensitive site for many reasons as set out in other policies, SOM3 has much better and safer access to main road whereas SOM2 has no direct access and any access created would have to be in the vicinity of dangerous bend in road and the problem of equestrian activity near same.	the Local Plan Supporting Evidence. Access in principle has been confirmed by LCC.	
Howard Blakebrough	20	048/13, nomenclature SOM3 is preferable to 023/16 which would be built on the site of the Somerby play area	A replacement play area would be required as part of the development of Som2.	None.
Maurice Fairhurst	73	It is not clear when planning permissions will be granted on these sites. These sites have been chosen from a consideration of SHLAA submissions rather than an analysis of the capacity of each settlement. As a result, some sites have not been fully evaluated or even considered. Certain reserved sites are too large or are poorly related to the built structure of the settlement and will have serious damaging impacts on their character and rural setting. (E.g. in Old Dalby, Long Clawson, Frisby, Somerby, Harby and Waltham).	The Council has limited influence on when people wish to submit planning applications, however, as part of evidence gathered for the Local Plan, developers' intentions for individual sites were gathered and put into a trajectory which MBC have published. The SHLAA is the best resource the Council has to assess site availability; it would be neither effective nor efficient to spend time and resource assessing sites that may not be available for development. The Council has the ability to reduce SHLAA sites into allocations or reserve sites and has done across the Borough. Reserve sites can only be brought forward if other sites in the settlement cannot come forward for development. The size within Somerby3 helps to ensure the delivery of the Spatial Hierarchy and as such is	None.