

Agenda Item 4

Appendix 1 (a)

Chapter 4 Policy SS4

Melton South

Consultation responses

CH4Q3: Response	CH4Q4: Suggested Changes	MBC Response
<p>In the case of Melton Mowbray itself it's role as the primary urban centre is at least not in dispute, nor can it be questioned that it contains the majority of employment opportunity. Unlike the rural areas it is also compact and dense enough to realistically improve internal transport infrastructure and encourage 'green' behaviours such as using public transport, walking and cycling to work or school. This is simply because employment and other facilities are likely to be (or in the case of new development can be planned) relatively close to new housing.</p>		<p>Noted and supported.</p>

	<p>Policy SS4 – South Melton Mowbray Sustainable Neighbourhood Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Point C Perhaps could read ‘ Sustainable new and enhanced’• T2 A – We would suggest removing the reference 20 min frequency and replacing with suitable and regular. This will enable consideration to be given to providing appropriate services for shift workers, school and other commuter patterns as well as regular services to the town centre.• Master Planning and Delivery – should include route of the relevant section of the distributor road?	<p>Comment regarding Point C is unnecessary ;implicit assumption is that buses are sustainable. Accept comment regarding 20 minute frequency ,which would improve flexibility and usefulness of bus service. The status of the route of the new road is addressed in relation to revisions to policy IN1.</p>
--	--	---

<p>Policy SS4 – South Melton Mowbray Sustainable Neighbourhood (Strategic Development Location) and Policy SS5 - Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood : support the intention to allocate land for these, but it should be complemented by the allocation of a further strategic site, ‘Six Hills Garden Village’ , which has the ability to serve a wider market and in doing so support sustained housing delivery over the plan period (see sections 6.5 and 6.6 below). Rest of representation refers to potential shortcomings of the wording of Policy SS6 and sets out case for the allocation of land for Six Hills Garden Village under a new policy SS7, to deliver much needed homes in a strategic location within easy reach of Leicester, Melton, Loughborough and Nottingham, and cross references to associated representations to the Strategic Vision and Objectives of the Plan and also Draft Policy SS2. The representors are seeking the refinement of the parameters of Policy SS6. The case for the new garden village presented cites NPPF (paragraph 52), the need for additional land to meet objectively assessed needs and to maintain a rolling five year housing land supply, and the wider need to address the national housing crisis. A range of advantages of new settlements are set out, including how the new settlement could reinforce and strengthen existing networks of settlements and it is noted that transport sustainability could be addressed through the development management process, and a strategic rapid bus service that could be introduced between Six Hills and the Park and Ride facilities at Birstall, c.12km away is specifically mentioned. The lack of environmental constraints is cited, and the location, within a wider network of roads and near to established commercial and employment developments is cited. The site is being proposed as an allocation alongside the SUEs, made possible due to its location within the local market. An emerging</p>	<p>6.5.19 We therefore propose the following new policy:</p> <p>Proposed Policy SS6 - Six Hills Garden Village : Melton Borough Council will work in partnership with developers and delivery partners to deliver a new Garden Village at Six Hills. The Garden Village will provide:</p> <p>Housing</p> <p>H1: a minimum of 2526 dwellings, 37% of which should be affordable (subject to viability).</p> <p>Employment</p> <p>EM1: up to 11.4ha of employment land (comprising uses in the B1 and B8 Use Classes)</p> <p>enabling the delivery of a Village Enterprise Centre</p> <p>Community Facilities</p> <p>C1: New school provision to serve the Village</p> <p>C2: A centrally located local centre to serve the needs of residents of the development,</p> <p>including:</p> <p>A: A1 (retail), A2 and A5 uses</p>	<p>See response to Policy SS6 (This chapter)</p>
---	--	---

<p>framework masterplan was appended to the representation, and they mention working with MBC and stakeholders to refine it, including through pre-application discussions. They mention that a range of environmental assessments will be completed by the time of the local plan examination. It would include new employment opportunities in a 'Village Enterprise Centre' and the promotion of home working opportunities, and the mix of uses would minimising the need for travel further afield. The representor asserts that the site is suitable, viable and deliverable. Gladman are concerned that a number of the conclusions of the MBC 'Assessing Large Scale Development Site Options' report, particularly regarding Six Hills Garden Village and its potential to support the plan in fulfilling its issues and objectives, do not correctly reflect the positive potential of the site to support the strategic objectives of both Melton Borough and the wider HMA. An Alternative Assessment has been therefore prepared for consideration (see Appendix 2) through this plan-making process.</p>	<p>B: GP Practice and Pharmacy</p> <p>C: Community Park, including open space and formal sports provision</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>T1: A comprehensive package of transport improvements informed by an appropriate transport assessment including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Appropriate links to the strategic road network; B. Measures to mitigate the impact of development on the existing transport network where adverse impacts are identified; C. Public Transport provision to serve locations including Melton, Loughborough and Birstall Park and Ride / Leicester and associated travel plan for new residents. D. Provision for walking and cycling as part of the proposed development. E. Well-connected street patterns and walkable neighbourhoods providing high quality, safe and direct walking, cycling and public transport routes including links using the 	
--	--	--

	<p>green infrastructure network;</p> <p>Environment</p> <p>EN4: Provide a network of new high quality of multi-functional green spaces in accordance with the Council's open space standards set out in Policy EN7;</p> <p>EN5. Provision, or facilitation, of sports pitches in the immediate vicinity, and contribute towards indoor built leisure facilities within Melton Borough, in accordance with the Playing Pitch Strategy and emerging Indoor Facilities Assessment (see Policy EN7);</p> <p>EN6: A development that exceeds building regulations for energy efficiency and carbon emissions, where viable;</p> <p>EN7: Buildings and spaces which are adaptable to future climatic conditions including extremes of temperature, drought and flooding;</p> <p>EN8: Development that provides appropriate SuDS measures in accordance with the</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and;</p> <p>EN9: Protection and enhancement of water quality.</p> <p>Master Planning and Delivery</p> <p>A master plan, including a phasing and delivery plan, should be prepared and agreed in advance of, or as part of, submission of a planning application for Six Hills Garden Village. In order to achieve a comprehensive approach, the master plan should be prepared for the whole Garden Village. It will set out in detail the structure and development concepts of the Six Hills Garden Village, to include:</p> <p>M1: The distribution and location of proposed land uses;</p> <p>M2: Proposed key transport links, within and outside of the development, including those between the main housing and local centre, town centre and nearby employment uses, services & facilities;</p> <p>M3: Areas of green infrastructure and green space (including important strategic green gaps</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>to be protected);</p> <p>M4: Areas of new landscaping: and</p> <p>M5: Design that responds to the principles of garden cities</p> <p>The Six Hills Garden Village Master Plan will be prepared in consultation with key stakeholders. Planning permission will not normally be granted for the Six Hills Garden Village until a comprehensive master plan has been completed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority</p>	
<p>The Southern "sustainable" neighbourhood conflicts with the area of separation and uses too much greenfield agricultural land. The need for residents to use their cars for transport and for a bypass challenges the sustainability, particularly when it threatens to transform the landscape and have a negative impact on the Grade 2 listed heritage of Eye Kettleby Hall and other historic and archaeological features within the largely agricultural landscape surrounding the market town of Melton Mowbray. Ref: EN4 and EN1</p>	<p>Any proposed large development of this type should be sited where there is already a road/transport infrastructure and on a brownfield rather than greenfield site.</p>	<p>There is insufficient brownfield land in appropriate locations to deliver the spatial strategy. The impact upon landscape and heritage assets has been satisfactorily addressed.</p>

<p>The proposal ignores an earlier assessment and consultation relating to the construction of a ring road – the Options A,B,C and D - with commensurate in-fill housing, which was provided by an expert consulting company (this was about 10 years ago). Option C was a planned road through Melton South - this corresponds to "Option 1" on the Melton Mowbray Eastern Distributor Road (Current Status and Progression of the Scheme). The MLP appears to be rejecting that consultation which, I believe, was approved by the MMBC. If these facts are correct, what is the legal basis for doing so?</p> <p>Affordable Homes, "subject to viability", is vague and needs clearer definition. What is the vision for the Melton of the future - a satellite town for Leicester/Nottingham; an industrial hub for (undefined) industry; or an historic Market town with huge tourist potential, provided the character of our town centre and surrounding countryside are preserved?</p> <p>There is an inconsistency in allocation of areas of separation and no logical explanation why there is no such designation for the village of Great Dalby, to protect its character and amenity, bearing in mind the growing industrialisation of the Melton Airfield combined with the planned expansion of Melton Mowbray South to provide 2,000 homes.</p>	<p>Articulate a clear vision for what the future Melton Mowbray will look like: a satellite town for Leicester/Nottingham; an industrial hub for (undefined) industry; or an historic Market town with huge tourist potential, provided the character of our town centre and surrounding countryside are preserved.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the legal concern expressed over compliance/rejection of an earlier approved scheme, there should be a designation of an area of separation that lies from the northern boundary of the Melton airfield to the southern boundary with Melton Mowbray (Kirby Lane/Eye Kettleby Lane), so that everything south of that boundary comprises an area of separation for the village of Great Dalby, protecting in tandem the historical site of the Thor Missile site on the Melton Airfield.</p>	<p>The strategy and proposed strategic road link are based on the latest evidence. The vision is clear .</p>
---	---	--

<p>As previously mentioned. There will be 1197 houses + windfall sites, built north of Melton town. This refers to development south of Melton for 2000 homes. This site gets investment in infrastructure, bus services, facilities and road system. The villages north of Melton get none of this, are further away from the supermarkets and sports facilities and have no promise of improved services and yet they are taking a similar amount of housing.</p>	<p>Build a new village. Closer to Melton than Bottesford, Harby, Hose, Clawson etc with sufficient infrastructure.</p>	<p>All new development will have to be supported by contributions to ,or the provision of,infrastructure or services to mitigate the impact of those proposals. The scale of development in Melton Mowbay justifies significant new infrastructure. Note suggestion of a new village;Policy SS2 describes the development strategy and Policy SS6 sets out alternative development strategies.</p>
<p>Build new villages with new infrastructure at Six Hills &/or Great Dalby. This would answer the housing needs of the Borough for the next generation at least.</p>	<p>Build new villages with new infrastructure at Six Hills &/or Great Dalby. This would answer the housing needs of the Borough for the next generation at least.</p>	<p>Noted,has been considered and is addressed by Policy SS6.</p>

<p>Policy SS4 conflicts with Policy EN4 in this plan and therefore is NOT consistent with National Policy:</p> <p>NPPF Paragraph 154:</p> <p>"Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. They should address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change. Local Plans should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indications of how a decision maker should react to a developments proposal should be included in the plan."</p>	<p>Chapter 8: Figure 7 - The Southern Sustainable Neighbourhood Concept Map and other relevant policy maps should be re-drawn so that they indicate the intention to enforce the Environment section of Policy SS4;</p> <p>Notably points;</p> <p>"en1: Protection of the separate identities of Burton Lazars and Eye Kettleby in accordance with Policy EN4 and respond to settlement fringe sensitivity in accordance with Policy EN1 to create a locally distinctive development and an improved town edge;"</p> <p>"en3: Protection and enhancement of historic and archaeological features in accordance with Policy EN13; including the St Mary and St Lazarus hospital scheduled monument"</p> <p>"m3: Areas of green infrastructure and green space (including important strategic green gaps to be protected);"</p>	<p>No conflict between policies SS4 and EN4,plan should be read as a whole. Areas of separation do not have a defined boundary because their purpose s not to prevent development within the AOS,but prevent development which would result in coalescence and harm to individual settlement character.</p>
---	---	---

<p>Policy SS4 conflicts with Policy EN4 in this plan and is therefore NOT consistent with National Policy:</p> <p>NPPF Paragraph154. “Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. They should address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change. Local Plans should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.”</p>	<p>Chapter 8: Figure 7 - The Southern Sustainable Neighbourhood Concept Map and other relevant policy maps should be re-drawn to indicate the intention to enforce the Environment section of Policy SS4;</p> <p>Notably points:</p> <p>“en1: Protection of the separate identities of Burton Lazars and Eye Kettleby in accordance with Policy EN4 and respond to settlement fringe sensitivity in accordance with Policy EN1 to create a locally distinctive development and an improved town edge;”</p> <p>“en3: Protection and enhancement of historic and archaeological features in accordance with Policy EN13; including the St. Mary and St Lazarus hospital scheduled monument”</p> <p>“m3: Areas of green infrastructure and green space (including important strategic green gaps to be protected);”</p>	<p>No conflict between policies SS4 and EN4,plan should be read as a whole. Areas of separation do not have a defined boundary because their purpose is not to prevent development within the AOS,but prevent development which would result in coalescence and harm to individual settlement character.</p>
---	--	--

<p>Policy SS4 conflicts with policy EN4 in this plan and is therefore NOT consistent with National Policy:</p> <p>NPPF Paragraph 154. "Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. They should address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change. Local Plans should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan."</p>	<p>Chapter 8: Figure 7 - The Southern Sustainable Neighbourhood Concept Map should be re-drawn to indicate the intention to enforce the Environment section of Policy SS4;</p> <p>Notably points:</p> <p>"en1: Protection of the separate identities of Burton Lazars and Eye Kettleby in accordance with Policy EN4 and respond to settlement fringe sensitivity in accordance with Policy EN1 to create a locally distinctive development and an improved town edge;"</p> <p>"en3: Protection and enhancement of historic and archaeological features in accordance with Policy EN13; including the St. Mary and St Lazarus hospital scheduled monument"</p> <p>"M3: Areas of green infrastructure and green space (including important strategic green gaps to be protected);"</p>	<p>No conflict between policies SS4 and EN4, plan should be read as a whole. Areas of separation do not have a defined boundary because their purposes not to prevent development within the AOS, but prevent development which would result in coalescence and harm to individual settlement character.</p>
--	---	--

<p>Policy SS4 conflicts with policy EN4 in this plan and is therefore NOT consistent with national policy:</p> <p>NPPF Paragraph 154. "Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. They should address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change. Local Plans should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.</p>	<p>Chapter 8: Figure 7 - The Southern Sustainable Neighbourhood Concept Map should be re-drawn to indicate the intention to enforce the Environment section of Policy SS4;</p> <p>Notably points:</p> <p>"en1: protection of the separate identities of Burton Lazars and Eye Kettleby in accordance with Policy EN4 and respond to settlement fringe sensitivity in accordance with Policy EN1 to create a locally distinctive development and an improved town edge,"</p> <p>"en3: Protection and enhancement of historic and archaeological features in accordance with Policy EN13, including the St. Mary and St. Lazarus hospital and scheduled monument".</p> <p>"m3: Areas of green infrastructure and green space (including important strategic green gaps to be protected)".</p>	<p>No conflict between policies SS4 and EN4, plan should be read as a whole. Areas of separation do not have a defined boundary because their purposes not to prevent development within the AOS, but prevent development which would result in coalescence and harm to individual settlement character.</p>
---	---	--

<p>Policy SS4 conflicts with Policy EN4 in this plan and is therefore NOT consistent with National Policy:</p> <p>NPPF Paragraph154. “Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. They should address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change. Local Plans should set out the opportunities for</p> <p>development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.”</p>	<p>Chapter 8: Figure 7 - The Southern Sustainable Neighbourhood Concept Map should be re-drawn to indicate the intention to enforce the Environment section of Policy SS4;</p> <p>Notably points:</p> <p>“en1: Protection of the separate identities of Burton Lazars and Eye Kettleby in accordance with Policy EN4 and respond to settlement fringe sensitivity in accordance with Policy EN1 to create a locally distinctive development and an improved town edge;”</p> <p>“en3: Protection and enhancement of historic and archaeological features in accordance with Policy EN13; including the St. Mary and St Lazarus hospital scheduled monument”</p> <p>“m3: Areas of green infrastructure and green space (including important strategic green gaps to be protected);”</p>	<p>No conflict between policies SS4 and EN4,plan should be read as a whole. Areas of separation do not have a defined boundary because their purpose s not to prevent development within the AOS,but prevent development which would result in coalescence and harm to individual settlement character.</p>
--	---	---

<p>COMMENT ONLY This development does link 2 major roads. A606 and A607 which is a vast improvement on the Northern SUE but the time scale is important. It could take up to 2036 to deliver 1700 of the 2000 homes. When will the A606 and A607 be linked ?? after all development is complete ??? This could be more than 20 years away What is the plan to accelerate this.</p>	<p>Develop a plan to accelerate the completion of this link road.</p>	<p>The timescale for the delivery of this infrastructure depends upon when associated development and ,in some cases other funding, comes forward.</p>
--	---	--

<p>These two policies allocate large scale strategic development (Sustainable Neighbourhoods), which include a high level of large infrastructure development for the Borough. 65% of all planned residential development, totalling 3,500 dwellings, during the plan period will be directed towards the ‘Melton Mowbray Main Urban Area’. The principle of strategic growth in the Borough is supported, however this ‘putting your eggs in one basket’ approach is not supported as this will not deliver much needed homes in a timely fashion as directed by the NPPF. The Borough Council are already unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply, largely as a result of lack of strategic sites not delivering as anticipated, yet the Borough still wish to pursue this method of housing distribution.</p> <p>The trajectory for the delivery of the housing within these development sites are seriously questioned. An assumption has been made that each of the sites will deliver 100 dwellings per year, based on two developers operating concurrently on each site (50 dwellings each). However Policy SS4 requires delivery of 2,000 dwellings, some 20ha of employment land for a mix of use classes, as well as provision of a new primary school, local centre (including parade of shops, A2-A5 use classes, small scale employment opportunities, and non-retail and community facilities), as well as a strategic road link connecting the A606 to the A607 to form the outer western relief road to Melton Mowbray, a number of new and enhanced bus services as well as important environmental objectives. Policy SS5 is similar in its requirement to deliver 1,500 dwellings, employment land, community facilities, a strategic road link connecting the A606 to Nottingham Road form the outer western relief road to Melton Mowbray.</p>	<p>Development should be more evenly distributed through the Borough with a variety of settlements accommodating development to meet local housing needs and support the requirements of the Borough. Appropriate housing delivery can be achieved across all settlement categories including ‘Rural Settlements’ where development is suitable and appropriate, which should not be restricted to such small scale delivery e.g 3 dwellings or less, when appropriate development, such as 10-15 units may be more appropriate in some settlements, whilst none is appropriate in others.</p>	<p>The distribution of housing follows the spatial strategy, which takes account of the ability of different settlements to accommodate development .</p>
--	--	---

Both allocation requires comprehensive master plans preparing, as part of the requisite planning applications; incorporating all development elements into the masterplan i.e. employment, housing etc... It is likely that the preparation of such work is likely to take at least 12 months (including survey work), followed by the application itself, which, including the S106 legal agreement is likely to take a further 18 months. Upon receipt of outline planning permission, should it be granted, reserved matters applications will need to be prepared (a further 6-12 months) with determination a further 6 months minimum. This process therefore could take a minimum of 4 years (on each Sustainable Neighbourhood) before gaining detailed permission. That would led to at least 2021/22, when the Council have assumed delivery of 400 dwellings across the two Neighbourhoods. Neither site will have delivered any units by this stage. As set out above, large infrastructure will need to be in place as part of the allocations, relief roads, primary schools etc prior to residential development being delivered. Delivery of the required infrastructure takes a significant amount of time and money. It may even be that residential development is not delivered in the period 2021-2016 where the council assumes a further 1,000 units will be delivered.

In their 1999 Local Plan, the Council allocated a 'New Village' (Policy NV1) to deliver approximately 1,200 new homes, employment land, retail, community facilities including a village hall, public open space, landscaping , highway infrastructure including the provision of the Melton Mowbray southern and western bypasses and links to it; the 'New Village' was never delivered.

Unfortunately the Council have not learnt from the non-delivery of strategic sites, now seeking to allocate 65% of its requirements across just two large scale strategic sites. The need for large scale infrastructure to facilitate the planned strategic growth will cause delays, whilst small/medium scale sites in other settlements, including 'Rural Settlements', could come forward and deliver appropriate development with minimal delay since the level of infrastructure required will be far less.

In addition to the above, we are concerned that the overall level of housing need (6,125 over the plan period; 245 per annum) is based on the 2014 SHMA, when the Leicester and Leicestershire wide Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) will be published for stakeholder consultation early in 2017 and is intended to supersede the SHMA. We support the desire to progress the Local Plan swiftly, but it is vital that it takes full account of the most up-to-date evidence on both housing and employment needs, which is not available at the time of this consultation. Clearly this will have an impact on many of the Local Plan policies. In the event the SHMA identifies a greater housing need there will need to be alternative options for delivering the additional requirement. Smaller scale sites will assist in delivering this whilst maintaining vitality in villages.

The Council are currently unable to demonstrate a requisite five year supply of housing. By distributing residential development as proposed the delays of delivering the infrastructure required prior to delivering the much need new homes, will only seek to further exacerbate the housing delivery issue within the Borough.

<p>There is already a precedent set in that there is a Planning Inspectorate decision in respect of a similar planning application in Aylesbury (refusal). Pat Reid has already been made aware of this by email.</p>	<p>Developments cannot be planned without the infrastructure being in place. Link roads paid for by a developer are not a solution a by pass is the solution. Recent funding to scope out the proposed route means we must await the outcome before pressing ahead with developments that might be in the wrong places.</p>	<p>Noted,not clear how the Aylesbury case is relevant . Most infrastructure will come forward as part of the development of these neighbourhoods.</p>
<p>Construction of a section of the proposed future outer distributor road cannot be justified on traffic grounds and will do nothing to promote sustainable transport as set out in NPPF paragraph 182, 29 - 41.</p>	<p>Focus should be on removing traffic from the town centre by constructing a town centre relief road. See proposals outlined elsewhere.</p>	<p>The strategic link road is one part of a package of transport improvements, which together, studies show, will improve traffic and environmental conditions in and around Melton Mowbray town centre, and improve accessibility using a variety of travel modes across the town.</p>

<p>Objection on behalf of Messrs Lomas in relation to Policy SS4 South Melton Mowbray Sustainable Neighbourhood - Strategic Urban Extension; and matters related thereto.</p> <p>We represent the Lomas family who farm land across which the proposed link road crosses and includes proposals in the Local Plan for predominantly employment land with some residential as part of the emerging allocation for Melton South.</p> <p>In essence, their objection relates to the prospect of their land holdings and business interests being severely and adversely affected by the proposals for Melton South, and in particular the proposal for a new link road passing through and severing their farm holdings. Added to this, three family members have their homes in this area which will be most severely affect by the Melton South proposals, as will their successful business at Eye Kettleby Lakes.</p> <p>The emerging Local Plan proposes that the completion of the relief road be funded, either in whole or in part, by employment envelopment on out clients' land. Notwithstanding their objection to the relief road as proposed across their land, it is highly unlikely that that employment land will generate sufficient value to fund this. Employment development would have an even more adverse impact on clients' homes and livelihoods.</p> <p>Our clients object to this for the same reasons given above for loss of farm land and injurious impact on their livelihood. Notwithstanding this, the expectation for the delivery of the bypass is that funding will come primarily through development of land related thereto. In other words by the</p>	<p>In the absence of a workable comprehensive solution for Melton South which meets and reflects the client landowner needs and concerns, our clients formally object to the Local Plan and request that proposals for the relied road and associated developments in respect of our client' land be deleted from the Local Plan.</p>	<p>It is disappointing that at present these landowners are not able to support this development. The planning authority has been working with all interested parties to secure the delivery of the SUE and at the Issues and Options stage of the plan there was common support for the development which is acknowledged by these landowners. The current reasons for their objection are noted. The authority will continue to work with all parties to try and reach agreement to enable the development to proceed.</p>
---	---	--

landowners preparedness to sell their land for employment development to fund the bypass through monies received. This is a financially inequitable position for our clients notwithstanding the severely adverse impact development and the relief road will have on homes and livelihoods.

The proposed relief road, together with the increased volume of traffic and noise related thereto is, likely to have an adverse and detrimental impact of the enjoyment of our clients' very popular and successful business at Eye Kettleby Lakes, a business in which they have invested substantially over the last 20 years to create a very much valued leisure destination receiving a 5 star rating and certificate of excellence on TripAdvisor. Eye Kettleby Lakes is a major attractor to the Melton Area and makes a much valued contribution to the local economy. The proposed bypass will create even worse adverse noise impacts on the Lakes and detrimentally affect the peace and tranquility enjoyed by visitors. Indeed, figure 7 Melton Mowbray South SUE actually shows the bypass within meters of the Lakes an alignment our clients' could never support under the current circumstances.

Our clients have endeavored to work with the Borough Council and have been supportive of the principle of Melton South with the proviso this reflects and accommodates their personal and business interests. The proposal for the bypass and employment development on and across their land does not satisfy their needs and concerns for the reasons set out above.

<p>Our only concern is that this development is only contemplated if associated with a ring road/Melton by-pass. We appreciate that this development alone will not finance a complete ring road, but its scale is sufficient to finance a 90 degree segment. Conversely, if this is not done, traffic will become total chaotic</p>	<p>Include the absolute necessity of this development financing at least a 90 degree segment of the ring road/by-pass</p>	<p>Development should fund 100% of strategic road links through sustainable neighbourhoods. Funding for other sections to be confirmed.</p>
<p>Growing Melton Mowbray through Large Scale Development Sites : This notes that development required in Melton Mowbray will be focussed in two new large scale 'sustainable neighbourhoods' to the north and south of the town. Paragraph 4.3.4 states that 'these developments will deliver new residential and business communities in the form of attractive and high quality new neighbourhoods and places supported by the infrastructure necessary to mitigate the impacts of growth.'</p> <p>However modelling should include identification of impacts on the wider highway network outside the Borough.</p> <p>The City Council notes that a new strategic link road will be provided to help deliver both the Melton Mowbray Sustainability Neighbourhoods which is expected to improve Melton Mowbray's east/west connectivity through a link road. By providing this new infrastructure, traffic movements from the new housing stock could gravitate towards Leicester (subject to robust transport modelling) as this may facilitate easier access to Leicester's employment and other opportunities. Whilst this could reduce the traffic impacts in Melton Mowbray, there is the potential to create adverse impacts on the existing transport network in Leicester. These areas may include the A47, A607 and A46. Any adverse</p>	<p>Modelling should include identification of impacts on the wider highway network outside the Borough.</p>	

<p>impact in this area may be accelerated from proposed large scale housing growth in Charnwood and Harborough. Mitigation measures for Leicester's highway network may be required to support this new growth based on any strategic transport modelling findings.</p>		
<p>NHS centralisation issues as identified in Chapter 2.</p>	<p>NHS centralisation issues as identified in Chapter 2.</p>	<p>See response in Chapter 2</p>
<p>SS4 and EN4 conflict with each other.</p> <p>NPPF para 154 : "local plans should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where.</p>	<p>Not sure if a map is considered a policy.</p> <p>Ch 8 Fig7 : (policy) Map should be redrawn so areas of separation are clear between Burton Lazars and Melton and Eye Kettleby and Melton, green zigzags are not clear. This would help them retain their separate identities as policy EN4 . In accordance with policy EN1 create a locally distinctive development and an improved town edge. It would also protect St. Mary and St Lazarus Hospital scheduled monument in accordance with Policy EN13.</p>	<p>No conflict between policies SS4 and EN4, plan should be read as a whole. Areas of separation do not have a defined boundary because their purpose is not to prevent development within the AOS, but prevent development which would result in coalescence and harm to individual settlement character.</p>

<p>Policy SS4 of the Submission Draft Plan proposes the identification of the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood as a strategic development location. The policy indicates that the Sustainable Neighbourhood will deliver 2,000 homes with 1,700 homes being delivered in the plan period to 2036. The policy also requires the provision of 20 hectares of employment land and new community facilities including a new primary school and local centre. The policy also refers to the provision of a comprehensive package of transport improvements including a strategic link road connecting the A606 to the A607 to form part of a Melton Mowbray Distributor Road.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.4.2 advises that the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood is a key part of the delivery strategy for the Local Plan, constituting some 30% of the overall housing requirement and 60% of the outstanding employment requirements over the plan period.</p> <p>As indicated in our separate responses, Davidsons Developments has worked closely with officers and members as the local plan has been prepared following the withdrawal of the Core Strategy. Submissions were made in response to the Emerging Options Local Plan consultation outlining how Davidsons, through its land interests to the south of Melton could support the delivery of the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood. As part of the response to the Emerging Options Local Plan, an Indicative Framework Plan was submitted demonstrating how the required housing, employment, supporting community facilities and southern link road could be delivered.</p> <p>The Indicative Framework Plan was informed by detailed</p>	<p>Policy SS4 should be amended to refer to the identification of the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood as an allocation on the Policies Map.</p> <p>The following additional text should be inserted after para 4.4.7:</p> <p>“The redline boundary on Figure 7 shows the land allocated for the South Melton Mowbray Sustainable Neighbourhood on the Policies Map along with the preferred corridor for the southern link road. It also shows a concept masterplan for the site for illustrative purposes. We will work with our partners to refine the masterplan as more detailed evidence is prepared.”</p> <p>Figure 7 should be replaced with a plan reflecting the Indicative Framework Plan prepared by Davidsons Developments and submitted as part of these representations.</p> <p>The Policies Map should define Areas of Separation between the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood and Burton Lazars and Eye Kettleby.</p>	<p>The allocations plan includes the two sustainable neighbourhoods. The identical site areas are also included in the text of the document, where they are shown in figures 7 and 8, which are referred to as Concept Maps. As these plans duplicate the information in the allocations plan, including the areas of separation, their purpose could be confusing. For a variety of reasons planning applications submitted for the development of this, or any other allocation, would not always be expected to replicate the area or boundaries of the allocation.</p>
---	--	--

technical reports considering transport, flood risk and drainage, ecology, heritage and archaeology and noise and air quality. These technical reports formed part of the documentation submitted in support of an outline application for the development of 1,500 homes along with supporting infrastructure including a primary school and local centre. This application (ref 16/00515/OUT) was submitted to the Council in July 2016. Relevant documentation, including the Transport Assessment, Heritage Assessment and Design and Access Statement are

included as part of these representations for information. The complete documentation for the application, including the Environmental Statement, is included on the accompany CD by way of background information. The planning application relates to land in Davidsons control and shows how some 1,500 homes could be delivered on land west and east of Dalby Road, extending to Burton Road. The application would secure the delivery of key components of the proposed southern link road including a link from Burton Road to Dalby Road and from Kirby Lane to Leicester Road, along with improvements to Kirby Lane to allow this first component of the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood to come forward ahead of the completion of the link between Kirby Lane and Dalby Road.

The principle of a South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood as a key strategic site to deliver the Council's strategy is supported. With its land interests to the south Melton, Davidsons Developments has a key role to play in the delivery of the Sustainable Neighbourhood. The work Davidsons has undertaken in preparing detailed designs for the southern link road and for the outline application for the delivery of 1,500

homes demonstrates that the proposed South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood is a deliverable opportunity.

However, we are concerned that the approach the Council has taken in the Submission Draft Plan to the identification of the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood as a 'strategic development location', including the Concept Map included as Figure 7, means that the plan is fundamentally unsound in that it is not adequately justified or effective.

The Submission Draft Local Plan was considered by Council at an Extraordinary Meeting on the 20th October 2016. As originally drafted, Policy SS4 proposed that the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood (SSN) be identified as a strategic allocation on the Policies Map. An Erratum presented to the meeting proposed that the description of Sustainable Neighbourhoods to the north and south of the town be amended to 'strategic development location' in order to allow better opportunity for development of detailed composition following resolution of key issues. A copy of the Erratum is included as part of these submissions. It is noted however that the both the Melton South and Melton North Sustainable Neighbourhoods are still included in Policy C1 (A) Housing Allocations.

With this late amendment, it appears that the Council is not proposing the allocation of the Sustainable Neighbourhoods through the Local Plan, as was clearly the original intention. As set out in our separate representations, the Government's clear preference as confirmed in the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) is that Councils should prepare a single local plan for its area, with additional development plan documents only

being used where clearly justified. As the Submission Draft Plan is framed, it is not clear how the Council intends to progress the Sustainable Neighbourhoods through subsequent development plan documents if they are not shown as allocations in the Local Plan.

In our view, given the critical role the proposed Sustainable Neighbourhoods play in the delivery of the Local Plan strategy, they should be included as proposed allocations as was originally proposed by the Council. For the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood, the Council has sufficient information available from the work it has undertaken and supported by the technical studies undertaken by Davidsons Developments, to allow it to allocate land for the provision of the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood in the Local Plan.

The Indicative Framework Plan submitted by Davidsons in response to the Emerging Options Local Plan consultation, and included as part of these submissions, should form the basis for the allocation of land for the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood. The Indicative Framework Plan reflects detailed design work for the southern link road that provides a route that is technically deliverable. Within the land under its control, Davidsons Developments can deliver a new link road from Burton Road to Dalby Road along with a link connecting Kirby Lane with Leicester Road.

The Concept Plan at Figure 7 of the Submission Draft Plan does not provide an appropriate basis for the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood. It does not show a route for the Southern Link Road that is technically deliverable and supported by the evidence. The westernmost part of the link

road between Kirby Lane and Leicester Road falls outside the land under Davidsons control and is not therefore deliverable. The route indicated on Davidson's Indicative Framework Plan reflects detailed

design work on the road undertaken by ADC Infrastructure. In preparing the proposal for the link road, the Highway Authority was consulted and the design was amended to reflect comments received. The route for the southern link road as shown on Davidsons' Indicative Framework Plan should form the basis of the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood Allocation and the route should be identified as the preferred corridor for the link road on the Proposals Map.

For the easternmost part of the site towards Burton Road, the Council's Figure 7 Concept Plan shows the route of the link road following existing hedgerow boundaries. Whilst the plan is indicative, this suggested routeing is clearly impractical. Davidsons' Indicative Framework Plan shows the proposed link road running slightly to the south of existing field boundaries in this location in order to achieve appropriate alignment with the proposed roundabouts on Sandy Lane and Burton Road and to ensure a sufficient quantum of development to support the delivery of the necessary supporting transport infrastructure.

In preparing the Submission Draft Plan, the Borough Council has engaged with Historic England in relation to the potential impacts of the proposed South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood on the St Mary and St Lazarus Scheduled Monument (SAM) located to the north of Burton Lazars. A number of meetings have been held with Council officers and

representatives from Historic England and Davidsons Developments. Following these meetings, Historic England responded to the Council in May 2016, advising that Davidsons Indicative Framework Plan would result in substantial harm to the SAM due to the development and link road extending south of existing field boundaries to the east of Sandy Lane. This is despite the fact that, in responding to identical proposals that formed part of a planning application for the development of 175 dwellings submitted in February 2015, Historic England concluded that the harm would be less than substantial. There has been no material change to the proposals for this part of the site to justify Historic England's revised advice.

Following Historic England's response in May 2016, CgMs on behalf of Davidsons Developments reconsidered and revised the Heritage Assessment prepared to support the outline application for 1,500 dwellings. This provided additional information and an analysis of the historical context between the SAM and the development site. In addition, further landscape and visual assessment was undertaken and incorporated into the Design and Access Statement to further assess the potential impact of the proposals on the setting of the SAM. Copies of the Heritage Assessment and Design and Access Statement for the outline application are included as part of these submissions.

On the basis of this evidence, it is considered that there is no justification for Historic England's conclusion of substantial harm. The Heritage Assessment provides a detailed review of historical records which shows that there is no historical evidence of the association of the field to the north of the SAM with the SAM itself, and therefore no historical basis for

the contention that the development would constitute substantial harm to the SAM. In terms of the visual impact of the proposals, the further assessments and visualisations included in the Design and Access Statement for the outline application demonstrate that the proposed alignment of the link road and associated development, with associated landscaping proposed, would not result in a significant visual impact and would not constitute substantial harm to the setting of the SAM. For its part, Historic England has provided no clear evidence, historical or otherwise to justify its conclusions on substantial harm or to explain why its position has changed since its original advice provided in February 2015.

Davidsons remain firmly of the view that Historic England's contention of substantial harm associated with its development proposals is unsubstantiated and unjustified. The thorough assessment of this issue as set out in the supporting documentation confirms that any impacts to the setting of the SAM would be less than substantial. In accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF, the benefits associated with the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood, including the significant contribution to meeting housing needs and delivery of a key component of strategically important transport infrastructure in the form of the southern link road, clearly outweigh the less than substantial harm to heritage assets.

Melton Borough Council should continue its discussions with Historic England on this issue to reach agreement that the harm to heritage assets is less than substantial in this case and are outweighed by the clear strategic benefits associated with the delivery of the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood.

The inclusion of illustrative Areas of Separation on Figure 7 is also not considered appropriate. The Local Plan includes a policy, Policy EN4 on Areas of Separation which identifies a number of Areas of Separation. The Local Plan should identify these Areas of Separation more specifically on the Policies Map.

For the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood, the Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study identified broad Areas of Separation between Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars and Melton Mowbray and Eye Kettleby. Landscape assessments undertaken to inform the Indicative Framework Plan demonstrate that development to the south of Melton can be accommodated without threatening separate identities of Burton Lazars and Eye Kettleby. Areas of Separation should be identified more specifically on the Policies Map. This could include land south of the proposed southern link road and Burton Lazars and Eye Kettleby.

The South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood represents a sustainable development solution and is a key component of the Council's strategy to deliver growth over the plan period. It will play a key role in supporting the delivery of the southern link road as part of the Melton Distributor Road. As a key strategic site, the Local Plan should be clear in its allocation of the site rather than its proposed identification as a strategic development location.

The Indicative Framework Plan prepared by Davidsons Developments is based on supporting technical evidence, including design of the proposed southern link road. The Local

<p>Plan should be amended to show the site as an allocation on the Policies Map with route of the southern link road identified as the preferred corridor for the link road. The allocation of the strategic sites could follow the approach set out in the Charnwood Local Plan Core Strategy which allocated land for sustainable urban extensions west of Loughborough and east of Thurmaston. The approach in the plan was to show a redline boundary showing land allocated on the Policies Map with a concept masterplan included for the site for illustrative purposes.</p>		
	<p>Register of interest: Long Field Academy, a member of the Spencer Academies Trust, wishes to register its interest with Melton Borough Council to provide both the primary and secondary educational needs for the Melton South Development.</p> <p>Long Field is ideally situated adjacent to the proposed development and has the appropriate space for additional accommodation.</p> <p>In addition, The Spencer Academies Trust is experienced in managing 7 primary schools and is currently in the process of developing 2 new free schools in Derbyshire.</p> <p>The Trust is very interested in being involved with the educational provision for this development in Melton South and requests the opportunity to offer its expertise in the near future.</p>	<p>Consequently, it is proposed that figures 7 and 8 are deleted from the plan. It is not considered necessary to amend the boundary of the allocation, or re-draw the indicative line of the road. There is no conflict between the areas of separation (Policy EN4) and this allocation.</p>

<p>I would reiterate the protection of the separate identities of Burton Lazars and Eye Kettleby in accordance with Policy EN4 and respond to settlement fringe sensitivity in accordance with Policy EN1 to create a locally distinctive development and an improved town edge;</p> <p>This must be ensured to stop the coalescence of the 2 villages of Burton Lazars (east and west) and Eye Kettleby from the edge of Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>Application diagrammes currently show that this will happen !!</p>	<p>Reiterate the areas of separation with a solid definitive line which developers must not cross.</p>	<p>No conflict between policies SS4 and EN4,plan should be read as a whole. Areas of separation do not have a defined boundary because their purpose s not to prevent development within the AOS,but prevent development which would result in coalescence and harm to individual settlement character.</p>
<p>NPPF 154 : Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.</p> <p>Unsound – conflicts with another Policy (EN4 Areas of Local Separation)</p> <p>SS4 South Melton Mowbray Sustainable Neighbourhood Environment (en1)</p> <p>The area identified for development is within 2 Areas of Separation (Policy EN4) Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars/ Melton Mowbray and Eye Kettleby.</p> <p>However the Policy is unsound since 2 Policies conflict. This is inconsistent. Two Policies that conflict with each other (see our response to EN4) cannot be Sound.</p>	<p>Seek to make adjustments to the proposals map.</p>	<p>A response to this point is made in respect of the representation on EN4.</p>

<p>The policy document has not been positively prepared as it fails to make provision for the infrastructure, most noticeably a proper Melton bypass and increased town centre parking, to be built BEFORE houses are built. This failure means the plan will not be effective in making Melton a better or more attractive place to live. It will create an intolerable situation for southern residents around Burton Road, Kirby Lane, Sandy Lane and Dalby Road in particular with dramatically increased traffic flow on these roads. Section 4.4.4 states "The SSN will create improved connectivity to the town centre." How can this be possible when the three connecting roads are fully lined with houses and schools and there is no room for new roads? This statement is not positively prepared nor will it be effective. 1700 houses will generate a large volume of additional traffic trying to get into town along inadequate size roads. Additionally Sandy Lane feeds into the other two roads partially via Ankle Hill on which work is underway building houses very close to the road edge - so no chance to widen the road.</p> <p>Our property, located at the junction of Sandy Lane and Kirby Lane, will be subjected to very much increased noise and exhaust gas pollution from what is likely to be a dramatic increase in traffic.</p> <p>The plan is not properly prepared in respect to what happens to all the additional cars when they drive into town as no proper provision has been made to substantially increase the parking. [Please see Section EC5 for further comments and suggested changes to this issue]</p>	<p>The plans should clearly state that the north and south link roads and the connecting road - eastern relief road or whatever is, or may at some future date, be agreed - are built BEFORE the houses are built. At least this way the through traffic will be directed away from the town centre. If not, Melton will have the same volume of through traffic as now PLUS the additional traffic from residents driving into town from SSN and NSN.</p> <p>A much larger provision for shops needs to be included if this development is to be a sustainable development. If not then virtually all the residents will have to travel at least 1 1/4 miles to town to shop. The plans therefore need to recognise that house owners are also car owners and will, by choice, prefer to travel by car - and need places to park their cars in town. Even if ALL the houses allocated for "affordable housing", 63% or 1070 houses will be owned by more affluent people who, based on current experience, often have at least 2 cars per household.</p> <p>There is an alternative for the southern development - the old airfield. This is a brownfield site and many years ago a self sustaining community of at least 1000 houses was proposed. This was said to include all the necessary infrastructure including shops, schools, medical facilities etc. This would be a far better option than the current plan which will blight the homes of the many residents who look out on the fields at present - in our case a drop of 13% in value according to a Melton estate agent. The</p>	<p>The timescale for the delivery of this infrastructure depends upon when associated development and, in some cases, other funding comes forward.</p>
---	---	--

<p>Section C2 includes a parade of shops but only "up to 400 sq m" has been allocated. Even a small local convenience store in the UK has a typical size of over 250 sq m so this so called "parade of shops" will only be 3 or 4 small shops or a small convenience shop and one or two other small shops. The statements in 4.4.5 that "A new local centre will be provided which will provide local shops to serve the new residents and be a focal point for the new residential and business community" are clearly not true, certainly in terms of shops. Instead residents will need to travel to the town centre for most of their grocery and other shopping. To suggest as in T2D they will travel by bus is unrealistic. They do not now and they are unlikely to in future despite the claim in T2 "to achieve a modal shift away from private car use". Waiting 20 minutes for a bus then walking up to 400 metres to and from a bus stop is hardly likely to encourage those with bags of shopping to travel by bus.</p> <p>The plan, particularly when combined with that planned for north Melton, creates urban sprawl rather than, as stated in 4.4.4 "The SSN will create an improved urban edge that respects the town's heritage". It will detract from the town heritage by significantly altering the character of what is currently a very pleasant small market town. Moreover, building on good farmland will increase the flood risk. Chapter 2.7.5 identifies that there is a "significant flood risk" in parts of Melton. Building a very large number of houses (1700) will increase this risk.</p> <p>Section 4.4.3 also claims "The development will provide a mix of homes integrated with the major expansion of the successful Leicester Road Business Park providing an opportunity to live and work within the neighbourhood".</p>	<p>airfield also benefits from being located 110-120 metres above sea level, well above any potential risk from flooding.</p>	
---	---	--

<p>Where is the evidence that a large proportion of the working residents of 1700 new homes will choose or be able to work in the relatively small Leicester Road Business park development? Suggesting people largely work where they live is to hark back to an era we left behind many years ago and is a further example of how this plan has not been properly prepared and will not be effective.</p>		
<p>Historic England object to this allocation, in so far as it lies east of Dalby Road due to the setting impact upon the significance of the Scheduled Monument of St Mary and St Lazarus Hospital. It is noted that the Sustainability Appraisal site appraisal also raises concerns. The hospital was the principle establishment of the Knights of St Lazarus in England and is of exceptional archaeological and historic importance (even amongst monuments designated on the basis of national archaeological importance). Whilst noting the case for the utility of a southern bypass, Historic England do not accept the planned capacity for residential development to the east of Dalby Lane and south of Kirby Lane is sustainable with regard to the conservation of the Scheduled Monument in its agrarian landscape setting, consciously at a distance removed from the town, with strip fields between. If the planned option for development including housing and a relief road south of Kirby Lane is to be pursued, the bypass (Outer Western Relief Route) and associated landscaping should be sited as far north of the scheduled monument as possible, and without intrusion into areas of surviving ridge and furrow earthworks or breaking through key historic boundaries and breaks in topography. This view is reflected in Historic England's responses to 15/00127/OUT and previous local plan consultation responses. Historic England have provided detailed and constructive advice, meeting with the Local</p>	<p>To provide a sound allocation, being positively prepared, justified and consistent with national policy, protecting the setting of the Scheduled Monument of St Mary and St Lazarus Hospital, the site allocation should be realigned partially to the north, in accordance with our previous advice.</p> <p>South of the line E-D-C-B-A (on attached plan) lie earthworks of medieval / post medieval cultivation (ridge and furrow) which directly support the historic landscape context and hence the significance of the scheduled monument. The historic field boundary on line E-D-C-B-A forms a clear tipping point in itself in terms of level of harm to the monuments significance through setting impacts.</p> <p>Keeping the relief road to the northern side of line E-D-C-B-A would greatly reduce the prominence of the road when viewed from the scheduled area and it would avoid breaking the 115m contour.</p> <p>The next key tipping point (heading west) is where a revised relief road would break the existing east-</p>	<p>Question whether this is an objection .The southern boundary of the SUE follows the line recommended by and referred to by Historic England.</p>

<p>Planning Authority and the proposed developer on several occasions and have clearly set out in letter and plan form a relatively small amendment, which whilst still allowing for development to the east of Dalby Road, including the bypass, would prevent the most significant harm to the scheduled ancient monument. As indicated in our previous correspondence the introduction of housing as well a relief road in the area east of Dalby Road will be harmful to the significance of the scheduled monument, but there is a substantive increase in impact where the proposed road line breaks field boundaries as discussed below.</p> <p>We are aware that limiting housing development in the setting of the scheduled monument to the topographic break provided by the line of Dalby Lane may increase requirements to the west, however this underlines the need for nuanced decisions in which the relative importance and sensitivity of heritage assets is properly understood. It is evident that a funding model in which adjacent housing phases deliver the immediately adjacent stretch of road may be too inflexible and should not in our view justify this level of avoidable harm.</p> <p>Although welcomed, reference to the protection and enhancement of historic and archaeological features, including the St. Mary and St. Lazarus hospital scheduled monument and its setting within policy SS4 is not sufficient to address the issues set out above. As proposed, the allocation would be contrary to criteria en3 of policy SS4en3.</p>	<p>west oriented field boundary west of point E, in order to approach the proposed Sandy Lane junction north of the mature tree at G. If the point where the field boundary is crossed is constrained to a point west of point F this will work with the natural topography which falls away from that point, greatly reducing the visibility of the new road from the monument, hence the new road should not in our view break through the existing boundary between points F and E. Having examined the proposed junction on Sandy Lane, whilst our preferred location was north of that indicated, Historic England believe that as long as the junction is kept north of the mature tree at location G (hence on the north facing slope) harm will again be kept overall to a less than substantial degree.</p> <p>To summarise, Historic England consider that a relief road line north of G – F – C – B – A could avoid substantial harm.</p>	
---	--	--

<p>Any connection of the A606 with A607 can only take place using the west side of town as that is the only route that has been consulted on. Any plans to connect on the east side would need a full consultation before being put forward</p>		<p>The link is proposed to the south of the town, which was the subject of consultation in the pre-submission draft plan.</p>
<p>See comments made by James Hollyman (Harris Lamb) on behalf of Truframe and Garner Holdings on EC1.</p>		<p>See response to comments on Policy EC1 (Chapter 6)</p>
<p>4.3 Growing Melton Mowbray through Large Scale Development Sites</p> <p>We support the principle of the two new large scale ‘sustainable neighbourhoods’. In addition to their intrinsic capacity to support the growth of economically and socially sustainable communities. They offer the opportunity to integrate development into the landscape and, through recognition of and engagement with the historic environment, achieve sustainable and durable communities with a sense of place.</p> <p>Policy SS4 – South Melton Mowbray Sustainable Neighbourhood (Strategic Development Location): Environment en1 & en3; Master planning and delivery m2</p> <p>4.5 Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood</p> <p>Welcome reference to the setting of the town and respect for heritage (4.5.6-7), in Policy SS5 – en2 and m3</p>		<p>Support welcomed.</p>

<p>Generally we support the provision of the Melton South Sustainable Neighbourhood and the provision of the strategic road link referred to under the heading Transport (A).</p> <p>There is reference to the need to prevent coalescence between Melton and Burton Lazars. This can be achieved by the appropriate landscaping measures and with the development proposed on Site MBC/049/13 being on the land directly adjoining the edge of Melton. If needed a strategic landscaping wedge can be established to avoid any coalescence.</p>		<p>General support noted</p>
<p>1. River Wreake (RW) - when storm or heavy rainfall, it rises quickly in the past flooding homes in 'Thrush Close'. With houses built on the land, the run off will be higher resulting existing water level will rise more quickly. There is several watercourses linking to (RW) - Opey Road - where the river crosses the road either side dips water from this road has to go somewhere. It goes into (RW) road sometimes floods. This is the area you are planning schools, shops, park, etc. I suggest nearer to Sandy Lane.</p> <p>2. Shops - Kirby Lane footpath (eyesore @ moment) border Sandy Lane. This field could house all your needs shops, car park for parents to drop their kids off at school, etc.</p> <p>3. Field opp (see detail plan - only suggestions). These houses could be built in modular form and use to benefit for the Council (housing shortage) . Example (4 pers) see plans.</p> <p>Starting at 14) block built with doorway as a garage (I made some diagrams) ground floor front section will be able. Each plot will have concrete wall and insulation. Rear will opening</p>		<p>Drainage The allocations in the Plan have been subject to sustainability and environmental assessment, including flooding and drainage. As individual applications are submitted they will need to be supported by flood risk assessments. Policy EN11 seeks to minimise the risks of flooding. The details of the means of construction of dwellings is not a matter for this plan, although Policy D1 seeks to raise the standard of design and Policy 8 encourages innovative construction. The whole development will be subject to masterplanning which will set out in detail the distribution and location of land uses. Roads The existing policy addresses the</p>

<p>for patio dor. Car port will have 2 steel posts, 2 x steels, 1 steel for middle, 2 X small thin strip, to hold in. Concrete floor because it will be lower than main house floor, insutlationand wood floor. Joists have shoes fitted, I set will fit on top of mod frame they bolted together. Now with stair opening a large floor. Trusses cover all the area. Brick shin end beams, glued insulation and sawn.</p> <p>4. Road - Sandy lane roundabout will create a rat tun. I suggest road junction west side ,i.e. if they need to go east coming out of Sandy Lane onto Dalby Lane roundabout or vice versa, a ramp footbridge (cycle route before) crosses new road (save money). This section of the road could be built. Care needed 2 primary schools on Dalby Road, prefereed from Leicester Road A607. From A606 to A607 for time new road part of Melton Ring. 3 roundabouts - 3 junctions - 1 bridge - 1 footbridge - 1 ramp bridge - saving from your plan 2 roundabouts and 2 bridges (cost saved).</p> <p>5. Sharrard Street - with southern section in, we could close Sharrard Street to HGVs/through traffic. Limited access after 4pm until 10am. Buses and taxis still use it. I made detail plan for total pedestrianisation (plan in Melton office).</p> <p>6. Eastern Side - this section of the ring road is urgent - why - we have 3 large employers working 24/7 365/6 days. If A1 closes, relief to centre of melton ' cross field' or 'to complete link'. Land adjacent to storage yard, Saxby Road - crosfield dr a new cemetery with a crematorium as space runing out in existing cemetery. A crematorium will benefit the town - loughbough, grantham is now the place to go. Also land side of P.O. , HGV rest site.</p>		<p>transport requirements of Melton South.</p>
---	--	--

<p>7. Northern Section - Scalford Road to melton Spinney Road is needed. This will relief on Norman Way..</p> <p>8. Ring Road - (in detail Melton Office) - it is important this road is installed quickly as possible. Delay is not an option.</p> <p>(Submission included plans and diagrams for buildings and traffic)</p>		
<p>In addition, new developments will be supported where they:</p> <p>5. Do not adversely affect an area’s sense of place and local distinctiveness; and</p> <p>6. Do not adversely affect areas of tranquility, including those benefiting from dark skies, unless proposals can be adequately mitigated through the use of buffering.</p> <p>Contradiction on terms when almost 100% of the proposed new development is to be on the North and South side of Melton town where there are areas of tranquility and dark skies!</p>		<p>Comments are an extract from Policy EN1 ,which is not directly applicable to the North SSN.</p>
<p>Supported</p> <p>This clearly has all the advantages and is with the North scheme the most sustainable in the Borough. It ticks all the boxes, opportunity for living and working in the same area, public transport and walking and cycling routes. It also funds a great deal of the necessary infrastructure.</p>		<p>Support welcomed.</p>

<p>Supported</p> <p>This clearly has all the advantages and is with the North scheme the most sustainable in the Borough. It ticks all the boxes, opportunity for living and working in the same area, public transport and walking and cycling routes. It also funds a great deal of the necessary infrastructure.</p>		<p>Support welcomed.</p>
<p>We are particularly pleased to see references to the Playing Pitch Strategy and the emerging Built Sports Facilities Strategy. We support Policy SS4 part en5.</p>		<p>Support welcomed.</p>
<p>The Deregulation Act 2015 specifies that no additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings should be set in Local Plans other than the nationally described space standard, an optional requirement for water usage and optional requirements for adaptable / accessible dwellings. For energy performance the Council was only able to set and apply a Local Plan policy requiring an energy performance standard that exceeded the energy requirements of Building Regulations until commencement of amendments to the Planning and Energy Act 2008 in the Deregulation Act 2015 that date has now expired. So whilst the Council may still specify the proportion of energy generated from on-site renewables and / or low carbon energy sources it cannot set a local standard for energy efficiency above the current 2013 Building Regulations standard.</p> <p>Therefore references to policy requirements on energy efficiency and carbon emissions standards exceeding existing Building Regulation requirements in Policies SS4, SS5 and C1 should be deleted.</p>		<p>See response to comments on Policy D1 (Chapter 9) .</p>

<p>Policy MMS and MMN Sustainable Neighbourhoods needs to include reference to design review. Para. 62 states that</p> <p>'Local planning authorities should have local design review arrangements in place to provide assessment and support to ensure high standards of design.</p> <p>They should also when appropriate refer major projects for a national design review.¹³ In general, early engagement on design produces the greatest benefits. In assessing applications, local planning authorities should have regard to the recommendations from the design review panel.'</p> <p>Without this, the achievement of high design standards as set out in D1 will not be achieved.</p>	<p>SS4 m5: Design which performs well against Building for Life 12 and seeks to develop the principles of 'Active Design', in accordance with Policy D1. The quality of development will be reviewed by an independent panel of professionals through an Accredited Design Review process.</p> <p>SS4m6: Design which performs well against BfL12 and seeks to develop the principles of 'Active Design', in accordance with Policy D1. The quality of development will be reviewed by an independent panel of professionals through an Accredited Design Review process.</p>	<p>Support welcomed. Detailed comments can be addressed during the development management process.</p>
<p>The Pre Submission Draft Plan was considered by Council at a Special Meeting on the 20th October 2016. Late amendments to the plan were presented as an Erratum at the Council Meeting, and included changes to Policies SS4 and SS5 relating to the Melton North and Melton South Sustainable Neighbourhoods to describe them as strategic development locations, to allow better opportunity for development of detailed composition following resolution of key issues. It is not clear whether the Pre-Submission Plan is proposing the allocation of strategic sites to the north and south of Melton. The NPPF advises that any additional development plan documents should only be used where clearly justified (para 153) -PPG confirms the Government's preferred approach for each LPA to prepare a single Local Plan for its area (Paragraph 012, Reference ID: 12-012-20140306). It is considered that the appropriate approach for the Council is to prepare a single Local Plan including both strategic allocations and other allocations in the more sustainable</p>	<p>The Plan should be amended to make specific allocations of land to deliver the proposed southern and northern sustainable neighbourhoods to Melton Mowbray. The Council should work with the site promoters to agree the form and extent of the proposed allocations.</p>	

<p>settlements. To ensure soundness and enable adequate testing of impacts, the plan should include sufficient details to demonstrate the proposed sustainable neighbourhoods are capable of yielding the necessary development in accordance with Section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Given the key role the sustainable neighbourhoods play in delivering the strategy for the plan, it is important that these are included as specific allocations and shown on the Proposals Map. Before the plan is submitted to the Secretary of State, the Council should work with the promoters of the sustainable neighbourhood to agree the form and extent of the proposed allocations.</p>		
<p>page24 paragraph 4.2.3 : The distributor road provides no improved link to the south and will cause yet more congestion in the town centre so there is no joined up thinking here.</p> <p>page 35 paragraph 4.3.5 : The final sentence is nonsense since no development will depend on the Distributor Road per se since there will be alternative access. No real issue here but indicative of the sloppy way this is put together and creates a general concern about the accuracy of everything else.</p>		<p>Not clear what the first comment relates to as para 4.2.3 makes no such reference. However the last sentence of para 4.3.5 does make sense as development of both the Melton Mowbray South and Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhoods are dependent upon the distributor road to achieve safe and effective access.</p>

<p>The conclusion that the proposed Melton North and Melton South Urban Extensions offer the best opportunities to provide strategic scale growth delivering requirements for new housing and employment development is supported.</p> <p>The Submission Draft Plan notes that the full route of the distributor road will be delivered in a phased way and that development dependent on the road for access will provide or contribute towards the delivery of the distributor road.</p> <p>Davidsons Developments has worked proactively with officers and members at Melton Borough Council to develop proposals for the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood. The work undertaken on behalf of Davidsons Developments provides details of a suitable route for a southern link road that is technically deliverable. The Submission Draft Plan should show a preferred route for the southern link road reflecting the route identified in the Indicative Framework Plan prepared by Davidsons Developments. A copy of the Framework Plan is included as part of these submissions. The detailed design drawings prepared by ADC Infrastructure are included as Appendices to the Transport Assessment for Davidson’s outline application for 1,500 homes and included on the CD accompanying these representations.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.6 sets out expected delivery rates for the proposed sustainable neighbourhoods to the north and south of Melton Mowbray.</p> <p>The table indicates the delivery of 2,020 dwellings over the period to 2036 for the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood. This is at odds with Policy SS4 which assumes the delivery of 1,700 homes by 2036. It is also inconsistent</p>	<p>Paragraphs 4.3.1 to 4.3.7 -The Submission Draft Plan should include a preferred route for the southern link road reflecting the route alignment shown on the Indicative Framework Plan prepared by Davidsons Developments Limited.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.6 should be amended to ensure consistency between Policy SS4 and the Monitoring Framework at Appendix 5.</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan shows an indicative route for the southern Distributor Road, as at the time of preparation the route had not be agreed by all relevant parties. If the Davidnsons plan can be agreed by LCC and MBC as the best and most likely to be delivered route then it could be included in the final version of the Local Plan.</p>
---	---	---

<p>with the build assumptions set out at Appendix 5, Monitoring Framework.</p> <p>For that part of the South Melton Sustainable Neighbourhood which Davidsons Developments has an interest in, it is confirmed that 1,500 homes could be delivered within the plan period. Whilst the Council's assumptions are generally robust, it is expected that, at the peak of build, rates could be in the region of 150 dwellings with potentially 3 outlets on the site.</p>		
<p>Para 4.4.2 MMSSN - the reference to 30% of overall housing need in the Plan period appears to relate to the 2000 (total) dwellings not the 1700 (Plan period) dwellings. To be compatible with para 4.5.2 MMNSN - which correctly states that 1500 dwellings is c25% of Plan period housing requirements.</p>		<p>Agreed that the correct percentage for 1700 homes is 28% and not 30%</p>