

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
<b>Policies Map</b>					
Dr Jerzy Schmidt	259	Re Borough Wide Thematic Maps, Primary Green Infrastructure Map. The settlement of Queensway has been misnamed as Old Dalby and the name of the actual settlement of Old Dalby has been left out.	Name the settlements of Old Dalby and Queensway correctly.	Comments noted. This map extracted from the ' <i>A Green Infrastructure Strategy for Melton Borough, TEP, 2011</i> ' is incorrectly labelled in these two settlements.	To relabel Old Dalby and Queensway in the Primary Green Infrastructure map Borough Wide Map.
Sydney George Wood obo ME, AL & SG Wood	435	Re FRIS4. It has not been correctly mapped. The site is offered as a single entity whereas the Authority has been subdivided it into part 'a' and part 'b'. The Authority has also without consultant included part of a neighbour's property into part 'a' of the site. This is unsound as it gives influence to a private third party over consideration of our site and it makes wrongful any consideration of possible housing allocation.	Correct the fault in the mapping of site MBC/036/16.	As part of the consultation process this amendment was considered reasonable and it would be suggested as a modification. However, this site has been removed from the C1(b) policy as a Reserve Site so this change is not applicable.	None.
Terence Joyce	159	<p>I question Complies with Duty to Co-operate and SOUNDNESS.</p> <p>RE :- Amendments to the map - 29 November 2016 The "interactive policies map" was altered (Amendments to the map - 29 November 2016) due to alleged inaccuracies. Bearing in mind this amendment comes within the middle of the consultation period and some residents may well have submitted their comments before this amendment. One can forgive typing errors etc. but not any inaccuracies to detail. Remember the Melton Plan has a professional team behind it, the public response to it does not and can only respond to plan that is presented to them. Therefore I question Complies with Duty to Co-operate</p>	<p>To satisfy Complies with Duty to Co-operate and SOUNDNESS.</p> <p>I suggest an extension to cut off date 19th December 2016 whilst plan is scrutinised for any further potential amendments</p>	<p>The Interactive Policies Map is a reference tool and is not a formal policy document. The Policies Map hasn't been amended at this point as it shows the information as it should be interpreted and therefore no changes on the formal policy document have been done in the middle of the Consultation period. In addition to this, on the item 2 of the 'Proposed Submission Policies Map guide' it is mentioned the following: '[...] 4. (2) Where the adopted policies map consists of text and maps, the text prevails if the map and text conflict'. Additionally, further down in the same document it</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				can be found the item 8 'Borough Wide Thematic Maps' where an explanation on how the Primary Green Infrastructure layer and map (alongside other layers) should be interpreted. Finally, on the Primary Green Infrastructure bit on item 7 'layers' there is an additional explanation on why due the 'small-indicative scale of the layer' it is not included on the Inset Policies Map. Comments regarding the Soundness have been responded on the appropriate chapter (EN3).	
Trudy Toon - Clerk	311	The document refers to flood zones within the Parish Boundary [Gaddesby]; these are not indicated on the individual village maps. These should be shown.		Flood Zones 2, 3 and 3b have been included on the Inset Policies Map for Gaddesby, the Borough map (Policies Map) and the Interactive Policies Map. The Appendix 1 maps don't include any constraint, just the location of any potential housing allocation (and reserve site).	None.
Martin Lusty	176	Please refer to our comments in previous sections relating to development sites and environmental sites.		Comments noted.	None.
R H B Ranns	242	Note: the endorsement is subject to changes being made in accordance with representations made in this response.		Comments noted.	None.
Ben Hunt on behalf of Mr A Birley	374	Support to Long Clawson position and particularly LONG3. Confusion in how the plan is written (Appendix A, Chapter 5, etc...), Appendix A should be in Chapter 5.		Consideration will be given (in a more advanced stage) as to whether a presentational	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		For instance, Policy C1A includes a ranking of sites, but this ranking only comes out in Appendix 1, and it is not clear how this might affect the determination of applications under Policy C1A.		modification can be suggested to an Inspector to remove the duplication of plans.	