

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
<u>Chapter 3</u>				
A.Thomas	Listen to local village residents who want to preserve the area where they live rather than having vast new housing imposed on them. Long Clawson for example will not be sustainable if the quantity of houses proposed in the draft plan is imposed upon the village.	Nothing specific stated.	Views of all stakeholders considered at several stages of the plan preparation process. See the Council's Consultation statement addendum.	None.
Anthony Paphiti	Legal compliance is a matter for an independent planning lawyer. Lay people are not competent to do so unless they work in planning and are conversant with planning law. it is difficult to perceive the vision - is it that Melton Mowbray is (1) a satellite town with little industry; (2) a satellite town with more industry; (3) an historic market town that preserves its innate character as melded to the surrounding countryside, like the German concept of Altstadt i.e. the old town, which is a way of preserving character and history, with development going on around it. MLP envisages "6,125 homes and some 51 hectares of employment land between 2011 and 2036 in Melton Borough. The population growth will place additional pressures on roads/transport, schools and medical services. This will not "Strengthens and enhances Melton Mowbray's role as a historic market town", but turn Melton into a satellite city for Leicester/Nottingham, totally stifling its uniqueness and character irreparably. Instead of focusing on how Melton can develop its current tourism, which has so much potential, it is majoring on a mix between industrial development and a dormitory town. One thing	Nothing specific stated.	Regulations require the LPA to ask the question in the form for making representations on the draft Local Plan at this stage. The vision sets out generally what Melton could be like in 2036, the spatial strategy gives a broad indication of where that will take place (see Figure 5 of the draft LP). The housing planned for reflects both natural growth and the growth required to sustain the Borough and to help ensure there are enough employees in the Borough to fill local jobs. The vision is that this this will be achieved so that '... the strong historic and landscape character will be as apparent and cherished as ever' and this will be effected by the plan policies as a whole, particularly EN13 and EN1 that deal with heritage and landscape specifically. The policies IN1 and IN2 are designed to ensure that service and infrastructure provision is improved in step with the provision of more housing.	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>is clear, the additional people will need local jobs. Road infrastructure will not be solved by a ring road and rail and bus links are not conducive to the expansion planned, and are reducing in frequency. Services, including St. Mary's Hospital, will become increasingly stretched at the same time as they are being scaled back as cost saving measures take hold. What is being done about increasing policing to cover the people moving above the rare sighting of a policeman on duty in the town. Building more houses does not Retain "the character of the countryside whilst supporting land-based industries and tourism opportunities". Houses need land. Around Melton that land is rural farming land which complements the countryside. The proposal for industrial scale expansion of Melton's housing will damage the character of the countryside. Providing the necessary infrastructure to support economic and population growth caters for a manufactured rather than natural growth, to meet a government target, not local demand.</p>			
Carl Powell	<p>A 'perpetual growth' strategy is set out - which many would say will eventually fail, when we run out of land and/or resources, and which does not equate to improvement. There is no local evidence to support the need for 'more of everything' , and the focus should be on improving lives, not just the number of them. Similarly, having more younger people to support/finance older (retired) people will fail</p>	<p>More emphasis on Increasing prosperity and improving quality of life before increasing population and mass housing, to achieve real sustainability.</p>	<p>The plan strategy has to accord with national planning policy which is explicit that the 'development' in sustainable development means growth, and that 'sustainable' means better lives for ourselves. Improving quality of life and achieving growth are not mutually exclusive.</p>	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	in the long run, because all young people grow, then we need even more young people ....			
Caroline Louise Stuart	3.3.4: Proposals for Gaddesby housing allocation are incompatible with the plan's strategic objectives. Few of the 25 objectives support the proposed housing allocation at Gaddesby - possibly only No. 1, and unclear for 16, 22, 23, 24 and 25. The housing allocation would achieve the opposite of objective No 9, as long as public transport is not improved, and the opposite of objectives 17 to 20. Therefore the Pre-Submission Draft Melton Local Plan as it relates to Gaddesby is not justified.	None suggested.	The strategic objectives of the plan are just that - they are to help us measure success of the plan as a whole, and are not meant for application on a settlement or site by site basis.	None.
Colin Love	3.2.1/Table 1: Strategic Issue 8. There is no need for a 'park' in the north of the Borough because the surrounding countryside is a natural park, with easy access to a substantial network of footpaths, the Grantham Canal walk and other riverside walks, along with a variety of children's playgrounds, adult gym and skate park. The concept of a 'park' in this Draft Plan is only appropriate to urban areas, not villages in rural settings . Also, 3.3.2 Bullet point 'Focus our work in the priority areas' - unclear what is meant by 'work'.		Strategic Issue 8 is a statement of fact. Country parks can be within the definition of a park. The features cited could be complementary to the provision of a park. The reference to focussing work refers to the work of the Council and its partners in addressing the sustainable community strategy objectives.	None.
Colin Wilkinson (on behalf of Asfordby Parish Council)	Para 3.1 : the vision seeks to improve connectivity with Loughborough yet there are no proposals within the Plan that sets out how this is to be achieved.	Para 3.1 vision reference to improving connectivity with Loughborough should be deleted, or proposals included to demonstrate how it will be delivered.	Implementing the Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy, including the proposed distributor road (Policies IN1 and IN2 refer) will help deliver better connectivity at the end of journey from Loughborough to Melton.	None.
David Adams	Page17 Vision : Amazed that the plan will reverse the ageing population, and buck the	None suggested.	Views noted.	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	national trend. Indicates an incompetent plan			
David Middleton	<p>3.1 Vision: improving connectivity - there is no evidence to substantiate the aim of improving connectivity and ease of movement to and from large centres from Bottesford Parish. 3.1 Vision: historic and landscape character - there is no evidence to demonstrate that the historic character of Bottesford has been taken into consideration in the proposed sites and number of dwellings for Bottesford, the key community in the Vale of Belvoir. Many recent developments have failed to reflect the character of the local heritage, or been integrated into the existing visual landscape. Furthermore, there is no evidence to suggest that the Melton Local Plan will provide a framework that will secure the quality of the existing heritage aesthetic of the locality. The selection of development sites within the Parish is the result of the willingness of landowners to sell for development purposes rather than maintaining and enhancing their agricultural use and support of a strong rural economy. The character of Bottesford is a product having agricultural corridors of land that breaks up post war urbanisation. No evidence is presented that this has been taken into account nor how the serendipitous access to development sites based on willing sellers creates a sustainable pattern of development in regard to the rural economy. Delivering the Vision : heritage - the 'unique reputation, heritage, character and rural nature' of Bottesford is not secured by the numbers of</p>		<p>The vision is a high level statement of what is envisaged the Borough could be like if the plan is successfully delivered. It does not set out detail for specific villages. The specific issues relating to Bottesford are covered elsewhere in responses to representations on specific sites/policies. The Duty to Co-operate does not encompass the parties alluded to here, i.e. the public. The terms of engagement with the public are set out in Regulations and in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement. The consultation carried out during local plan preparation is set out in the Council's consultation statement (2016) and update (2017).</p>	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>dwellings proposed in the Melton Local Plan nor is it demonstrated how the numbers will benefit the economy and maintain or improve the quality of the local environment. <b>Conclusion</b> : The plan as currently drafted in regard to Bottesford is unsound and has failed to take into account a large body of local views and information that has been accessible to Melton Borough Council. On that basis it has not complied with duty to co-operate.</p>			
Debbie Caroline Adams	<p>Page 17 : To suggest that the national trend for an ageing population should be reversed in Melton is not justifiable, as it does not attempt to address the need for homes for retired people to 'downsize' into in either the town or borough, or address the lack of employment opportunities in Melton to sustain a 30% growth in the town's population. The lack of transport infrastructure and its traffic congestion consequences in the town is probably having a detrimental effect on encouraging new business to the area.</p>	Nothing specific stated.	<p>Attracting more younger people to the Borough is vital to its long term economic and wider sustainability. Evidence such as the housing and economic development needs assessment (HEDNA) and employment and housing land supply and deliverability evidence indicate this is not an unrealistic ambition over the 25 year plan period. Policy C2 should aims to ensure that housing suitable for older people to downsize to is included in new provision, and new transport infrastructure to help address traffic issues in Melton Mowbray will be secured alongside new housing.</p>	None.
Diane Orson	<p>Vision - reducing traffic movements, Large numbers of houses in villages without employment and where schools are full works against this. The plan seeks to fundamentally change the Borough, but it but existing role is</p>	Nothing specific stated.	<p>The vision and overall plan strategy has been chosen from a range of options, including allowing existing trends to continue. The approach chosen takes account of up to date</p>	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	unlikely to be changed.		evidence. More homes in Melton for people who work here would reduce traffic movements associated with in commuting. Housing in the villages is required to sustain their shops and services over the longer term.	
Dilys Shepherd	Proposals being promoted now, e.g. at Clay Pits, are for larger homes, not the smaller homes you want to plan for. Fewer large homes would allow more homes to be built more quickly on less space. Re: Objectives to 'reduce the need to travel by car' 'reduce pollution'. Has consideration been given to improving public transport in Bottesford to Grantham and Nottingham? Re; Objectives: 'reduce crime', 'schools' 'health' - polices schools and GP surgery in Bottesford will struggle to cope with the increase in residents from so many new homes.The plan may work for Melton but much is irrelevant for Bottesford, some distance away.		The policies in the draft plan will not take full effect until it is adopted. Policy C2 is to help shift the balance to more smaller homes. Ensuring local services have the capacity to support new population will be achieved through developer contributions (Policy IN2). Policy IN1 supports enhancements to the public transport interchange at Bottesford, and transport assessments setting out sustainable transport measures will be required through the development management process of new housing schemes.	None.
Dr James Philip Clifford Harding	Historic and landscape character: the disproportionate number of unnecessary new houses in Bottesford is totally at odds with this aim.	Publish sound evidence of the needs and impact of new housing on Bottesford relating to flood risk, traffic, parking, sewerage, schools, health facilities, shopping and leisure. Provide feedback to residents who have heard nothing from MBC in response to their comments on the earlier emerging options and draft plan. Provide clear reasons why a totally disproportionate number of new houses has been proposed for Bottesford rather than other more suitable brownfield sites	The plan objectives are to be read as a whole and are not mutually exclusive. Policies D1, EN1 and EN13 are designed to ensure that any development achieves the historical and landscape character aim as well. Evidence on housing needs for the Borough has been published and site assessments have been undertaken for all proposed sites, setting out flood risk, sewerage capacity, access to local services, schools etc. The	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
		closer to employment and facilities in the borough.	reasons for the apportionment of housing have also been published in the Settlement Roles and Relationships Report 2016, which can be found on <a href="http://www.meltonplan.co.uk">www.meltonplan.co.uk</a>	
Gareth Evans	<p>Nowhere in the Jobs and Prosperity, and Accessibility and Transport objectives is there the recognition that (1) the Tuesday Traffic congestion in the town centre due to the Cattle Market will remain a problem, (2) there is insufficient provision of town centre parking, (3) there is no plan to provide additional central space for larger non grocery retail outlets which would increase trade, and (4) the effects of home deliveries for all goods which will affect the sustainability of village services and with environmental impacts. Unless town land is made available for development, then larger retail units will not move into the town. Small food supply business are disappearing as more of the larger food supermarkets appear to destroy these shops: do you really want to be a town full of charity shops and cafes.</p> <p>Figure 5. Growing Melton Borough - The Spatial Arrangement : This figure does not shows some of the larger settlements such as Buckminster, Burton Lazars, some other Villages listed as a rural hubs, the central industrial areas on Saxby Rd and MARS (See later comments on definition for Rural Hubs) .</p> <p>Objective 25, Ensuring the reuse and recycling of waste is maximised will not be helped by the current reduction of opening days for the LCC.</p>		The strategic issue and objectives are meant to be high level statements only. The issues mentioned would be addressed in the appropriate sections of the local plan where the Council has evidence to support the need for a policy intervention. All the rural hubs identified in 4.2.7 do appear in Figure 5. Comment regarding opening times of waste recycling facilities noted, but not a matter for the local plan.	None

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	Waste Tips, which is leading to increased "fly tipping" in rural areas.			
Guy Longley, Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Development	Figure 5 presents a Key Diagram setting out the overall strategy of the Submission Draft Plan. It is useful, but would more appropriately follow Policy SS2 which sets out the proposed development strategy. Paragraph 3.3: the strategic objectives to provide a stock of accommodation to meet the needs of the community and reducing the need to travel by car and improve access to public transport and reducing traffic congestion in Melton Mowbray are supported. The South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood will play a key role in helping to deliver these strategic objectives. The proposals for South Melton will make a significant contribution to delivering the housing requirement for the Borough over the period to 2028. Development of the Sustainable Neighbourhood will also deliver a new strategic link road connecting the A606 to the A607, forming a key component of the Melton Mowbray Distributor Road.		Support for plan objectives noted and welcomed. There is little reason to move Figure 5, though the text in 3.3.5 should be amended to clarify what it is. Support for the objectives cited and related comments noted.	Minor mod: Add sentence to end of para 3.3.5 to say 'The reasoned justification for and detail on this is developed in subsequent plan chapters'.
Howard Blakebrough	3.2.1: Strategic Issues 4 & 5 do not emphasize traffic issues enough.3.3.5 Spatial Strategy: Figure 5 shows clearly that with only one service centre, which does not meet all criteria, the south of the Borough cannot be thought of as the same as the north of the Borough, where there are several substantial villages. Villages in the south are more dispersed and cluster to different centres for different functions. The effect of the housing criteria policies on the south is that some settlements	Omit Somerby from the "map" and address the whole issue of settlements/housing allocation etc. in the south of the borough as a separate issue with a different solution to that which might apply in the north.	Road traffic, congestion and connectivity are two out of 10 strategic objectives identified, which is considered sufficient emphasis. The issue of whether the criteria for Somerby are met, and the effect of the spatial distribution of service centres (Figure 5) is dealt with in responses made to representations to Policy SS2.	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	may fossilise regardless of the needs of the inhabitants.			
James Keith Hamilton	<p>3.2.1 “safeguarding valued heritage and local landscapes” should include “Conservation Areas” and “Archaeology” 3.3.2 “Enable and support the provision of affordable housing” needs clarifying re location as there is no point in locating to remote sites with no facilities and high transport cost Objective 17 : Needs to include “protection of existing archaeology, historic landscapes and settings” including “small villages” 2.3.5 states there are 5 service centres not the 12 referred to in 4.2.7 . I would argue that certain smaller villages such as Somerby are Rural Hubs as there are other villages in the Parish of Somerby such as Burrough on the Hill, Pickwell, Leesthorpe and part of John O Gaunt. A more certain measure is required such as population. 4.2.12 Windfall sites is not compared with the actual “Housing Needs” survey recently undertaken. There is no rationale behind the 5% or 15% percentage without discussing land costs, geology, transport and access. It does need a statement that windfall means integration within the villages and not the periphery sites which are not viable. The criteria of the site selection is more complex than a mathematical formula. It should take into account for example, infill sites or existing buildings that will be demolished because they are not sustainable.</p>		<p>Strategic issues in Table 1 and sustainable community strategy objectives in 3.3.2 are high level statements that are not meant to give detail of the issues. Archaeology and conservation areas would be understood to be encompassed within the former. More detail on affordable housing provision is given in Chapter 5. Accept a need to change wording of para. 2.3.5. Comments made about windfall sites are dealt with in response to representations on Chapter 4.</p>	<p>For consistency and clarification, amend 2.3.5 to add in the other service centres from the table at para 4.2.7.</p>
JOHN RUST	See comments in chapter 1&2	See comments in chapter 1&2	Noted.	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
K Lynne Camplejohn	Although the plan is sound for the service centre identification in the North of the borough the criteria used fail in the south of the borough as it has identified only one service centre. This results in major development being proposed in one village whilst villages of a similar size are and able to develop sustainably.	Reviewing the criteria used to identify villages for sustainable development, that is developments of more than three or four houses. Just because a village does not have a school does not render it unsustainable especially if there are other services such as public transport to towns and cities.	The matter raised in relation to service centre identification and the criteria for new housing is dealt with in response to representations on Policy SS2.	None.
LCC (Highways, Education, Early Years, Waste, Property Assets, LLFA, Libraries & Culture, LRERC)	Vision and Strategic Objectives - Vision and the means of Delivery are broadly supported, in particular the aspiration to meet the needs of business, the housing needs of the whole community and the infrastructure required to meet the needs of the community and a growing economy. These elements of the Vision are underlined in the Strategic Objectives. The Housing and Jobs and Prosperity objectives are strongly supported being seen as the key to the delivery of all those contained in the wider plan.	3.3 Strategic Objective 9 - suggest it reads 'Improve access to jobs and services'	Support noted. Objective 9 is about more than just access to jobs and services, but would encompass it.	None.
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	3.1 Vision: welcome the recognition of the strong historic and landscape character of the Borough, and the aspiration for development to reflect the particularities of place and setting. Delivering the Vision: welcome recognition of the significance of heritage, character and tranquillity of the environment, all of which contribute to sustainable development, whilst addressing the distinctiveness of the Borough, the historic market town and villages. 3.3 Strategic Objectives 17 and 18: Support the clear recognition of the importance of the historic		Support noted and welcomed. None	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	environment at a strategic level, given that the Borough encompasses heritages asset of local, regional, national and even international significance.			
Martin S Herbert (Brown & Co) on behalf of M Hill, P Hill, Mrs M Hyde & Mrs P Pickup	Paragraph 3.1 , delivering the Vision: references to the necessary infrastructure to support economic and population growth do not give sufficient regard to the need to provide the Eastern Distributor Road as part of the Plan and the development growth that will help pay for the bypass which is needed. Refers to a statement made by the Council about the EDR that they append. They further point to paragraph 3.2, issues 4 & 5 as reinforce the need for the EDR, and comment that there are insufficient enabling Plan policies to help deliver the infrastructure referred to, that reducing traffic congestion in Melton Mowbray will not be materially achieved by Melton North, and the focus for attention should be on delivering Melton South, the EDR and the allocation of land to facilitate the infrastructure, etc. This is underlined by the strategic objectives and in particular No 10.	Paragraph 3.3.2 : Provide policies to facilitate growth supporting the provision of land to help accommodate the construction of the EDR and also development in a more sustainable location to help facilitate the much needed infrastructure. then changes are required to the Plan to make sure that it does accommodate the EDR and the necessary housing and other development growth that will help to deliver this much needed infrastructure project	The proposed change sought is not appropriate in this high level overarching chapter of the Plan. The issues raised are dealt with in responses to representations to Policies IN1 and IN2.	None
Melanie Steadman	Strategic issues 4 to 6: Are concerned that connectivity, high volumes of road traffic and flood risk cited for Melton Mowbray have not been adequately assessed for Long Clawson. Concerned that flood risk within the village is not mentioned in the SFRA, only appearing in Appendix 1 and given scant mention, and wrongly attributed to surface water only.	Melton Borough Council should re-visit their SA and base it on more than amenities and facilities. As the villages are to take 35% of development then I think they are entitled to have a traffic report, and flood risk assessments etc. The Council should have listened to the concerns of residents which have been	The SA evidence and the site assessment work that underpinned the draft site allocations is considered appropriate and proportionate for local plan preparation. The Settlement Roles and Relationships Study 2016 considered settlements as a whole.	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>Mention 10 year old surveys indicating undersized culverted watercourses running through the village, and raw sewerage coming up through the main road and the surface water drainage system, and BT broadband conduits. They cite information provided in submission from Clawson in Action. Regarding transport, the poor public transport to access jobs is mentioned, and the representor is concerned that heavy congestion in villages is overlooked. The remainder of the representation questions how a 55 house development in the middle of the village and the identification of 4 greenfield sites in the SHLAA accords with the environmental objectives of the plan, and note that given the lack of investment in village infrastructure for decades, new development will only compound existing, documented problems.</p>	<p>raised over the past two years instead of sticking their heads in the sand and hoping that these problems will disappear. The villages are now beyond the stage where a "sticking plaster" approach will cure the problems of unsustainability. They seem to have just done a tick box survey across the rural areas without any real consideration or assessment of the viability of these villages. They should have looked at the wider village instead of just assessing the viability of each site within it. They have the opportunity at Six Hills to build a whole new village, green, sufficient infrastructure, excellent transport links - but will not consider it as they feel they do not have the time to consult on it before filing the plan. I would suggest that they delay filing the plan, consider this application and take the pressure off the unsustainable villages.</p>	<p>The Council has considered accommodating development at Six Hills but this would have been far less effective at delivering the plan objectives, such as promoting sustainable communities. The Council needs to get an up to date local plan in place as soon as possible, so that it can ensure infrastructure and development takes place in a co-ordinated way, rather than giving rise to the circumstances the representor suggests currently exist.</p>	
Michelle Colclough	<p>Where are the proposed new local employers going to come from? Manufacturing is a declining industry in the UK. Retailers will not be attracted to the outskirts of a market town when cities such as Nottingham and Leicester are in close proximity. Business rates are often unsustainable in the town centre, leading to the installation of more charity shops. A large proportion of social housing, with no employment prospects does not make for a prosperous town.</p>	<p>You need to be realistic when defining a vision for the borough. Melton is determining how to meet the Government targets for new housing. Without a clear plan on how this will be sustained by employment, it is very "woolly".</p>	<p>Evidence of potential employment growth is set out in the Leicester and Leicestershire HEDNA, the Council's 'Towards a Housing Requirement for Melton' Report and in other evidence such as the employment land study and economic strategy. The comment about social housing and jobs is unsubstantiated. Planned employment and housing growth are linked in all assessments of growth</p>	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
			needs of the Borough. A vision is meant to be high level: there is more detail on how the plan will foster growth in specific policies elsewhere in the plan.	
MRS NICOLA MORLEY	Para 3.1, bullet point 8 - queries how retaining the character of the countryside will be achieved if a housing estate is suggested that will ruin all the local walks and create adverse effects such as destroying original ridge and furrow, ruin local aesthetics and affect the use of land by adjacent local riding stables.	refers to a proposed change cited elsewhere	Planning is a balance between sometimes competing objectives. The bullet point cited is one of 10, and the plan's purpose is to achieve the best outcome overall against all these.	None.
Mrs Trudy Elizabeth Lower	I thought that wind turbines should only go ahead where local people want them and have identified where. Land identified as 'suitable' for wind turbines should therefore not be identified in the local plan.	Chapter 3 : strategic objective 24. Agree with rest of plan but do not feel that sites should be identified for wind farms.	This is dealt with in response to representations made in respect of Policy EN9.	None.
Norman Hoskins	Allocating even more new housing outside the perimeter of Melton can only result in even more commuting to places of employ, notably Melton itself		It is envisaged that some of the houses that are planned for Melton will be occupied by people who currently commute in (see Towards a Housing Requirement for Melton Borough), so this could reduce the impact of more housing, as more people will be able to walk cycle or use local public transport to get to work. The Towards a Housing Requirement for Melton records this.	None.
Opun, Architecture East Midlands Ltd	Policy D1 should be added to this section and it made clear that high standards of design and other place making principles are required in order to achieve the Vision (page 17) of seeking high quality development. As read, D1 is hidden at the back of the plan.	To add at end of chapter	Agree with the importance of design. However, the plan is to be read as a whole, and where a policy appears within it does not affect the weight that is given to it in decision making.	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
Peter Bailey	NHS centralisation issues as identified in Chapter 2.	NHS centralisation issues as identified in Chapter 2.	Not clear what point is being made here.	None.
R H B Ranns	<p>3.1 A Vision for Melton Borough includes references to ease of movement to nearby centres of Leicester, Loughborough in Leicestershire and Nottingham and Grantham outside the Borough. This does not adequately address the LLEP and Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth statement which envisages the majority of growth in the West of the County astride the M1 and A46. (Duty to co-operate) . Delivering the Vision, should include recognition that a significant proportion of the new housing development will be for people who work in the expanding industries in the West of the County. The Plan assumes that the greater part of the employment growth to be catered for is in Melton Mowbray and the rest equally spread around the Borough. Whereas LLEP state the majority of the employment growth is in the West. Large sites (particularly Six Hills) to the west of Melton Mowbray that would reduce car travel by being nearer the employment centres identified in the LLEP and would allow regular public transport commuting to Leicester and Nottingham existing employment centres. Six Hills fulfils this role and is also close to the existing Borough employment sites identified at Policy EC3 (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vi), (vii), and (viii) and would enable the Plan to comply with Policy IN1.1</p>	<p>Delete penultimate bullet on page 17  Replace with "Meets the current and future housing needs of the whole community recognising that a significant amount of future employment will be in the west of the County in areas identified in the LLEP". This will then permit other policies to recognise this fact in terms of both infrastructure and housing location and meet the strategic objectives 9 and 10 on page 20 of reducing travel by car and congestion in Melton Mowbray.</p>	<p>The Strategic Growth Plan will be a high level plan. So far, only a Strategic Growth Statement, setting out a draft vision and objectives has been published. It is not the intention of the emerging SGP to preclude growth in Melton. The Leicester and Leicestershire HEDNA and the Towards a Housing Requirement for Melton provide analysis of where the planned for people and jobs in Melton are going to come from. Some people living in Melton may well work elsewhere in the sub-region, but it is not an explicit local plan objective. Whilst development at Six Hills may have some potential benefits, through the assessment of alternatives in the sustainability appraisal, it has been established that the spatial strategy proposed would achieve better sustainability outcomes overall.</p>	None.
Richard Simon, Clerk	3.1.2 : As the Reference Groups met in Melton Mowbray, there is no guarantee that rural		Re: reference group operation, it was made very clear that developers	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
to BPNP Steering Group	<p>areas of the Borough were adequately represented. At later meetings, representatives of commercial concerns did not identify themselves and/or declare any financial interest, which is unacceptable. The influence of builder and developer interests was unclear and possibly excessive.</p> <p>3.3.4 - strategic objective housing 1: priority for this should be where there is adequate and appropriate employment. Objective 2: there is significant scope for detached houses in the Borough to be released through downsizing if suitable well-designed and well located freehold housing was provided. The existing balance of housing types suggests that affordable housing should be a priority in the early years of the Plan along with supplying the identified need for higher paid work in the Borough</p> <p>3.3.4 - strategic objective 3: Prioritise development in and around Melton Mowbray to successfully compete with larger neighbouring towns. 3.3.4- strategic objective 4. - looks likely to be achieved. 3.3.4- strategic objective 5. - The distribution of houses will not permit most of the settlements in the Borough to become more sustainable. 3.3.4- strategic objective 7. - as for objective 1. 3.3.4- strategic objective 9 - Poor rural public transport means that many journeys are made by car. Example cited of the bus from Bingham (which provides a connection to Nottingham) which terminates in Orston, the adjacent village to Bottesford. 3.3.4- strategic objective 10 - more than 65% of development should be</p>		<p>were present and the planning officers facilitating the discussions of each group knew who developers were. A mix of participants was regarded as a benefit of the Reference Groups. The rural parts of the Borough, especially Bottesford, were always very well represented. Re: settlement hierarchy and the proportion of development that should go to Melton Mowbray, the Reference Group input was considered alongside other sustainability evidence, including proximity to jobs and public transport, all reflected in the Settlement Roles and Relationships Study 2016 . For rural areas, the demand generated by more development can help to support and improve local services, such as public transport. Comments regarding the ability of the spatial strategy to foster sustainable communities is addressed in responses to representations made on Policy SS2. Regarding flood risk, a strategic flood risk assessment and sequential and exceptions testing has informed the allocation of land at Bottesford and Easthorpe.</p>	

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>in Melton Mowbray, to fund road infrastructure improvements, without relying on Government funds. 3.3.4- strategic objective 12 - may only be achieved in Melton Mowbray; pattern of housing allocation in the rural areas will not support this aim. 3.3.4- strategic objective 13 - The pattern of housing allocation in the rural areas will not support this objective. 3.3.4- strategic objective 14. -as for 12. above. 3.3.4- strategic objectives 6, 8, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 50 - all supported. 3.3.4- strategic objective 19 - There is a significant flood risk in some areas of the Borough, arising from fluvial flooding, run-off from hillsides, groundwater flooding, flooding of sewers and drains and blockages to artificial drainage systems. Unless this can be mitigated viably, this will act as a significant constraint on new development. Bottesford has been identified as the most low-lying area in Leicestershire and thus a High Risk area having already experienced serious flooding in 2001 which affected Bottesford, Muston and Easthorpe. Belvoir Rd and the retail and service centre of Bottesford was particularly affected. There was a further Environment Agency Flood Warning in 2012. 3.3.4- strategic objective 24 -Supported in Principle.</p>			
Richard Simon	<p>3.1.2 : As the Reference Groups met in Melton Mowbray, there is no guarantee that rural areas of the Borough were adequately represented. At later meetings, representatives of commercial concerns did not identify themselves and/or declare any</p>		<p>Re: reference group operation, it was made very clear that developers were present and the planning officers facilitating the discussions of each group knew who developers were. A mix of participants was</p>	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>financial interest, which is unacceptable. The influence of builder and developer interests was unclear and possibly excessive. 3.3.4 - strategic objective housing 1: priority for this should be where there is adequate and appropriate employment. Objective 2: there is significant scope for detached houses in the Borough to be released through downsizing if suitable well-designed and well located freehold housing was provided. The existing balance of housing types suggests that affordable housing should be a priority in the early years of the Plan along with supplying the identified need for higher paid work in the Borough 3.3.4 - strategic objective 3: Prioritise development in and around Melton Mowbray to successfully compete with larger neighbouring towns. 3.3.4- strategic objective 4. - looks likely to be achieved. 3.3.4- strategic objective 5. - The distribution of houses will not permit most of the settlements in the Borough to become more sustainable. 3.3.4- strategic objective 7. - as for objective 1. 3.3.4- strategic objective 9 - Poor rural public transport means that many journeys are made by car. Example cited of the bus from Bingham (which provides a connection to Nottingham) which terminates in Orston, the adjacent village to Bottesford. 3.3.4- strategic objective 10 - more than 65% of development should be in Melton Mowbray, to fund road infrastructure improvements, without relying on Government funds. 3.3.4- strategic objective 12 - may only be achieved in Melton</p>		<p>regarded as a benefit of the Reference Groups. The rural parts of the Borough, especially Bottesford, were always very well represented. Re: settlement hierarchy and the proportion of development that should go to Melton Mowbray, the Reference Group input was considered alongside other sustainability evidence, including proximity to jobs and public transport, all reflected in the Settlement Roles and Relationships Study 2016 . For rural areas, the demand generated by more development can help to support and improve local services, such as public transport. Comments regarding the ability of the spatial strategy to foster sustainable communities is addressed in responses to representations made on Policy SS2. Regarding flood risk, a strategic flood risk assessment and sequential and exceptions testing has informed the allocation of land at Bottesford and Easthorpe.</p>	

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>Mowbray; pattern of housing allocation in the rural areas will not support this aim. 3.3.4- strategic objective 13 - The pattern of housing allocation in the rural areas will not support this objective. 3.3.4- strategic objective 14. -as for 12. above. 3.3.4- strategic objectives 6, 8, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 50 - all supported. 3.3.4- strategic objective 19 - There is a significant flood risk in some areas of the Borough, arising from fluvial flooding, run-off from hillsides, groundwater flooding, flooding of sewers and drains and blockages to artificial drainage systems. Unless this can be mitigated viably, this will act as a significant constraint on new development. Bottesford has been identified as the most low-lying area in Leicestershire and thus a High Risk area having already experienced serious flooding in 2001 which affected Bottesford, Muston and Easthorpe. Belvoir Rd and the retail and service centre of Bottesford was particularly affected. There was a further Environment Agency Flood Warning in 2012 3.3.4- strategic objective 24 -Supported in Principle.</p>			
<p>Robert Galij BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI, Planning Director - Barratt David Wilson Homes North Midlands</p>	<p>The Local Plan fails to state the need to boost significantly the supply of housing - in the context of the NPPF (Paragraph 47) - and to have this as part of its Vision and reflected in its Strategic/Housing Objectives.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 should all be amended by incorporating the need to boost significantly the supply of housing and meeting future housing requirements.</p>	<p>The vision is a local high level statement of what is envisaged for the Borough, so to refer to this and other Government objectives would be inappropriate. The need to boost significantly the supply of housing would be necessary to achieve the strategic objectives of the plan and to address the strategic issues identified.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
Robert Hughes (on behalf of Nigel Griffiths, First Provincial Properties Ltd)	Vision: The representations are related to a land interest in Harby. The vision fails to encourage the effective use of land by reusing previously developed land (provided that it is not of high environmental value), one of the core land-use planning principles that should underpin plan-making and decision-taking. (Bullet point 8 of paragraph 17 of the NPPF) . As such, the local plan fails to achieve sustainable development through a strategy of encouraging the reuse of previously developed (brownfield) land as a priority over greenfield land, and so is unsound.	The vision should be amended to include giving priority to the reuse of previously developed land before the development of greenfield land.	Re-use of previously developed land is implicit in the reference in the vision to 'the efficient use of land'. Brownfield land, which is commonly understood to mean previously developed land, was a criteria used in the site assessment that underpinned the selection of housing sites for allocation, and was taken into account in the Sustainability Appraisal.	None.
Robert Ian Lockey	The objectives in this section are, in many cases outside the remit of the Council and beyond its competence. For example the Council cannot by itself "create a mixed economy with increased knowledge-based jobs and wages".	The plan should be restricted to those things which only the Council, such as alleviate road congestion, provide education facilities, ensure an appropriate mix of housing types etc. Effort and expense devoted to peripheral issues such as climate change can only cause the Council to lose focus on its key responsibilities and objectives	Good local planning can support all the objectives listed after para 3.3.4 of the local plan, so they are appropriately included. Matters cited by the representor, such as climate change are fundamental to the purpose of good local planning.	None.
Ros Freeman	Wrongly classifying Somerby as a service centre goes against the strategic objectives 6, 9, 12, 17 and 18. Large scale development may harm rural tourism there, buses are not frequent enough to reduce the need to travel by car, local jobs and facilities are limited, the proposed developments, especially SOM3 will harm the historic environment and heritage assets. The rural character of the area could be threatened if Somerby becomes so urbanised and indistinct from Oakham and Barleythorpe.	Change Somerby categorisation to Rural hub	The issue of Somerby's place in the rural hierarchy is dealt with responses to representations to SS2.	None.
Russell Collins	The plan will not improve connectivity within	Provide safe cycling routes to schools,	The Melton Mowbray Transport	None

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	and across the town as stated in 3.1. There are little or no specific proposals to achieve this. The plan is not sound because it fails to address NPPF paragraph 182, 29 - 41 Promoting sustainable transport.	employment and to the town centre from all major residential areas of the town.	Strategy, of which the Melton Mowbray Distributor roads are part, will include complementary walking, cycling and public transport measures. Policy IN1, point 2 allows safe walking, cycling and public transport improvements to be sought with new development.	
Sport England	We support the community objectives 12 and 15.		Support noted and welcomed.	None
Susan Love	3.1.2 - The Reference Group meetings were very imaginatively designed to enable small groups to explore policies and principles, and members of the MBC planning team were very helpful in explaining and exploring the issues both with the whole group and with small groups on separate tables. However, in Rounds 5, 6, 7, and 8 meetings the different Reference Groups were amalgamated and so residents' and landowners' and developers' views were taken together. No formal declaration of financial interest was required at these meetings, so people who had hundreds of thousands of pounds to gain were making their points alongside ordinary residents who might not know their special position. Attendance at the earlier Rounds 1,2,3, and 4 is revealing - 20-24 landowners and developers attended Rounds 1-3, but the attendance fell to only 12 when the topic was 'Design'. This I think is a major problem for existing residents in relation to new development. Sometimes it is not development, in itself, that is the problem, but	Change 3.1.2 to - Reference Group Round 7 on average recommended only 350 houses for Bottesford. (See Evidence Base)Delete 3.2.1. (8) For the reasons set out above.	Re: reference group operation, it was clear that developers were present and the planning officers facilitating the discussions of each group knew who developers the were. A mix of participants was regarded as a benefit of the Reference Groups. Re: settlement hierarchy and the proportion of development that should go to Melton Mowbray, the Reference Group input was considered alongside other sustainability evidence, including proximity to jobs and public transport, all reflected in the Settlement Roles and Relationships Study 2016 . Regarding design, draft policy D1 is worded to ensure that developers take the need for good design seriously.	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>the lack of sensitivity to neighbouring properties and poor design . Interestingly in Round 7 on Housing Distribution, despite the presence of developers, and the skewing of one of the small groups by the presence of the Barratt's representative (550 houses for Bottesford) with a special interest in Bottesford, an average of only 350 houses was recommended as the Bottesford allocation. This is a figure well below what emerged from the EO consultation as the allocation for Bottesford. 3.2.1 1 Ageing population in villages - will not affect the provision of public transport. Public transport workers are likely to be living in the town centres from which the services set out. 8. Absence of a large park in the n.e. of the Borough. Why is this perceived as a problem? This is a very urban view appropriate to an urban setting. Bottesford, e.g. has many green areas and children's play areas as well as easy access to countryside walks via a good network of footpaths, easy access to the Grantham canal towpath, and a skate park Why would we want a park? Parks are for towns. I fully support the 'Environment Objectives'. 3.3.2 Revitalising Melton town centre - development of Bottesford will contribute nothing to this objective. Newark, Grantham and Nottingham are the main retail centres for the Bottesford population 6. BOTTESFORD FLOODS. I fully support the constraints on growth in the Borough because of Flood Risk. Bottesford has a serious flood problem. IT IS VERY LOW LYING AND HAS 2</p>			

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>FORDS. My house at the southern end of Belvoir Rd was flooded in the 2001 flood which affected many parts of the village (Belvoir Rd and the centre of the village, and Easthorpe particularly). I am now on an automated telephone Flood Warning from the EA and received a Flood Warning as recently as 2012. The development of the Barratt's estate on Belvoir Rd has increased my flood risk because:</p> <p>a. On this very flat landscape the direction of low of the water in the fields opposite my house has been altered. The water flow used to divide almost opposite my house with water flowing south to the Winterbeck and north to the centre of the village. Barratts have raised the land they have developed by over 1.5 metres thus disrupting the natural flow from these fields. Water from the north of the original divide is now being brought south through their new dyke system to flow into the Winterbeck to the south of the site. The Winterbeck is a minor waterway which has to travel under a small bridge on Belvoir Rd. In 2012, even before the Barratt's developed their Belvoir Rd site the water reached the height of the bridge arch (photographic evidence can be supplied). Barratt's dyke provides a good opportunity for this water flow back down Belvoir Rd if it can't get under the bridge. The dyke exits into the Winterbeck just before the bridge. b. To make the situation worse their dyke enters a culvert opposite my house creating an opportunity for flooding. c. Houses on the west side of Belvoir Rd are</p>			

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	lower than the newly developed fields opposite on the east.			
Terence Joyce	Soundness: Building on SOM2/3 will have maximum negative effect on environment objective. Whilst it is important to consider the requirements for affordable/social housing, consideration should also be given to people who work hard to achieve their ambition of owning that cottage in the countryside, to get away from the rat race and are quite prepared to trade off facilities in favour of a rural way of life.	To address SOUNDNESS: Re-consider building on sites such as SOM2/3. Ensure our villages do not lose their rural charm and thus distract those people who are prepared to buy and maintain that listed building etc.	The environment objective cited is one of 25 in the draft plan, which has to be considered as a whole. The change proposed relates to another section of the plan and will be dealt with there.	None.
Vic Allsop - Clerk to Parish Council	The Parish Council considers that the Local Plan is legally compliant.	The Parish Council does not seek any specific changes to this Plan as the points raised at earlier consultations have now been reflected. The Parish Council is in the midst of preparing its Neighbourhood Development Plan which will amplify and extend policy areas covered in the Melton Local Plan.	Comments noted and welcomed.	None.
Wayne Hickling	Concerned that development will encroach on neighbouring villages like Burton Lazars and be detrimental to their futures - refers to other comments made on Policy SS4 and EN4.	Please refer to my responses for Policy SS4 and EN4.	Issues dealt with in response to representations made on SS4 and EN4.	None.
Gladman Developments	3.1 Vision: considered sound. Note that it highlights the relationship of Melton and neighbouring towns and cities in Leicestershire and the desire to improve connections with those places. If this vision comes to fruition, it would enhance the intricate working relationships between the Leicestershire authorities and the people who live and work in the County. 3.2.1 : it is surprising that cross-boundary housing issues	The strategic Issues should be updated, so that the plan is internally consistent.	The strategic issues were locally identified. The requirement to meet unmet needs from elsewhere comes from national planning policy. As national planning policy and the local plan need to be read together, there is no need to repeat all its objectives in a local plan.	None.

Name	Q3: Response	Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response	Suggested Modifications
	<p>in the HMA and un-met needs from other authorities, such as Leicester are not identified as strategic issues, despite the Draft Plan making specific contingency for this (in Policy SS6). 3.3.2: It is a requirement of local plans to address the housing needs of the HMA. It should be made clear that the “community” expressed in the first objective applies not only to residents arising within Melton, but those which may arise and otherwise go unmet within the HMA. This would be consistent with later sections of the plan. 3.3.3: If the second objective of the Plan is to be effective and the local economy is to prosper through links to neighbouring centres, the commitment to addressing housing needs of other authorities if required must be made clear in the Plan.</p>			