

EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF FULL COUNCIL

4TH JULY 2017

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF REGULATORY SERVICES

DRAFT MELTON LOCAL PLAN: 'HOUSING ALLOCATIONS AND RESERVE SITES' (POLICIES C1A AND C1B OF CHAPTER 5) AND POLICIES SS4 AND SS5 OF CHAPTER 4 (SUSTAINABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS) OF THE PRE SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is report is to highlight the issues raised in the representations received to Chapter 5 Policies C1(A) and C1(B) and Policies SS5 and SS6 of Chapter 4, and to recommend responses to the representations. The report also includes the update to the site assessment work and proposes amendments as a result.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 It is recommended that Council :

- (i) Agrees that the responses to representations outlined in the Schedule of responses for individual settlements (Appendix 1 and 1a, available in the Members Room)**
- (ii) Agrees that amendments proposed to Policies C1(A) and C1(B) based on updated site assessment work and suggested changes and its associated 'reasoned justification' as a 'Focussed Change' for consultation (full details are contained within Item 3I of this agenda);**
- (iii) Agrees the responses outlined in the schedule of responses for Policies SS4 and SS5 (Appendix 2a, 2b and 3);**
- (iv) Agrees amendments proposed to the policies be agreed as outlined in paragraph 7.23 of this report and its associated 'reasoned justification' as a 'Focussed Change' for consultation (full details are contained within Item 3I of this agenda);**
- (v) Agrees to the modifications identified elsewhere in this report.**

3.0 KEY ISSUES – C1(A) and C1(B)

- 3.1 Developers, landowners and agents took the opportunity of the draft plan consultation to promote their sites for development. Representations were received seeking to extend the area and/or capacity of sites and/or seeking the ‘promotion’ of a site from the ‘reserve sites’ list to the ‘site allocations’ list. A number of new sites were promoted for inclusion in the Local Plan. Where these were within or adjoining Melton Mowbray, the service centres or rural hubs, they have been assessed and ranked against the existing sites. The same applied to requests to extend sites. Alongside this, updated and enhanced information on the availability, deliverability and viability of sites has been collated from landowners, housebuilders, planning agents and developers on each of the specific sites. This updated information, including new information provided in representations from landowners and developers, statutory agencies (e.g. Heritage England, Environment Agency) and residents and community groups has influenced the suggested responses to the representations, so that the issues raised and technical information can be dealt with an integrated and comprehensive way.
- 3.2 A significant number of responses were received in respect of Policy C1(A) and C1(B) generally. Many of those from local residents and community groups took the form of representations that argued that the total amount of new housing land being identified for a particular village was not reasonably apportioned and for often environmental or infrastructure capacity reasons, the overall requirement should be reduced and met elsewhere, e.g. on brownfield sites, in a new village or at Melton Mowbray. The issue at the heart of these comments is the spatial strategy, which is being included in a separate report (**Item 3C of this Agenda**).
- 3.3 Other general representations to C1(A) included comments about the potential confusion that could arise from multiple site references and the inclusion of site specific policies in an Appendix rather than the main body of the document. Reference was also made to the fact that the numbers of new homes cited are minimums and not maximums, and that the overwhelming majority of sites identified are greenfield.
- 3.4 The site references issue can be resolved out through the proposed change to Policy C1(A), but appendices can form part of a Local Plan, so there is no harm in them being presented in the current way. The site capacities are not meant to be prescriptive, and do not preclude schemes coming forward for more or fewer dwellings on the site, provided a high standard of design and other normal planning considerations are addressed, and an appropriate mix of dwellings (Policy C2 is achieved). The preponderance of greenfield sites is a reflection of the nature of the Borough, and the amount of brownfield land available is very limited in comparison to the amount of new housing land that needed to be identified.
- 3.5 Rest of the paragraphs in this report set out the responses received, issues raised and changes proposed on a **settlement by settlement basis**.

3.6 Melton Mowbray

- 3.6.1 The sites within Melton Mowbray were largely uncontroversial, however there are a number of changes required. An agreement has been reached with Historic England regarding the capacity of land at MEL4 which would be limited by the inclusion of a site

specific criterion being added that no development would take place within 100m of the eastern boundary of the Scheduled Monument, which lies immediately to the west. Additional information has been requested from the MOD regarding capacity of one site Mel 5. The MoD welcome the inclusion of MEL 5 and the owners of the site currently occupied by Jeld-wen at Snow Hill (MEL13) sought the inclusion of their site as an allocation rather than a reserve site to avoid uncertainty when it is vacated. The agents acting for the owners of MEL3 (Thorpe Road – former hospital) used the consultation to challenge the basis for the requirement to retain historic buildings on the site.

- 3.6.2 MEL 4: Recommend amendment to the policy to say no development to take place within 100m of the eastern boundary of the Scheduled Monument
MEL 5 : Recommend a change of estimated site capacity, increased from 62 to 70.**

Service Centres

3.7 Asfordby

- 3.7.1 Main issues raised included suggesting changes to the site boundary for ASF1, and this change is set out in the updated site assessment work to align with the planning permission granted.
- 3.7.2 Jelson asked that land adjacent to ASF1 on Hoby Road be considered for inclusion as well, arguing that there was insufficient land overall for a 5 year housing land supply. The reason for the Councils approach to the five year housing land supply and the sites that contribute to this is set out in a separate item on this agenda (**Item 3H**) . The conclusion of that report is that the Council can demonstrate the 5YHLS, so no further land needs to be identified for this purpose.
- 3.7.3 The NDP Group are concerned that no reference to the Neighbourhood Plan Policy has been made with respect to ASF1. However, this matter is now resolved through the determination of the reserved matters application, which took account of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 3.7.4 Issues were raised regarding ASF2's availability. The updated site assessment work has established that the site is available and there are no identified issues with viability. Therefore, it is proposed that the site remains allocated as set out in the Pre Submission draft plan.
- 3.7.5 Issues were raised with respect to ASF3's availability. The updated site assessment work has not been able to identify the owner to confirm its availability. Therefore, it is proposed to remove this site from Policy C1(a).
- 3.7.6 Further to representations made on the local plan by Heritage England and a subsequent meeting, it is recommended that a modification be suggested to amend Policy ASF1 to refer to the setting of Kirby Bellars Scheduled Monument.

3.7.7 Recommend:

ASF3: remove as an allocated site;

ASF1: amend to refer to the setting of Kirby Bellars Scheduled Monument.

3.8 Bottesford

- 3.8.1 Seven local residents have objected to all of the five proposed allocations in Bottesford . In addition, a further representations have been received in respect of each of the individual sites, notably BOT4 which received a total of eleven representations.
- 3.8.2 Agents promoting the sites have made representations in respect of BOT3, BOT4 and BOT5. LCC Archaeology has highlighted that there are heritage implications for BOT1 and BOT4, which could be addressed at the development control stage.
- 3.8.3 The representations which have been received from local residents for all of the sites are summarised as follows:
- a) the change in character of the village and adverse impact upon services. The rapid increase in the size of the village over a short period will result in the development of a town. Consider that Bottesford has insufficient services and facilities to accommodate the increase in population. Emphasise that growth should be spread over the whole plan period.
 - b) Transport and highways: residents consider that the local highway network can not accommodate the proposed new development and that it would exacerbate existing capacity, congestion and highway safety problems. They note that public transport is minimal. Some detailed comments about the adequacy and safety of the proposed access to individual sites.
 - c) Bottesford is an area of high flood risk and consider that other locations with lower risk should be developed. Flood risk of some sites inadequately addressed in the plan.
 - d) Impact upon heritage and landscape is a general concern and is referred in some detail in respect of BOT4.
 - e) In respect of individual sites, there are concerns that some of them are too remote from the main part of the village with inadequate links and that the site which is being developed (BOT1) is poorly designed and laid out.
- 3.8.4 In summary, the promoters of the various sites consider that they could deliver more dwellings to meet unmet identified need and make the following representations relating to individual sites:
- a) BOT3 Consider that the site is well related to the village, outside flood risk area and could provide high quality development;
 - b) BOT4 The allocation only includes part of the site which is being promoted and consider that there proposals adequately address heritage concerns;
 - c) BOT5 The proposed boundary disregards local topography and their no technical constraints to development
- 3.8.5 As a result of the updated site assessment work, it is proposed that all of the sites

allocated are altered, but not as a result of representations. BOT1 should be removed from the plan because development is completed, with a consequent re-numbering of the remaining sites. A refinement of site area calculations and developable areas has resulted in recommended changes to the capacities of BOT2, BOT4 and BOT5 have all altered slightly. The area of BOT3 is proposed to be reduced to take account of flood risk, and the estimated capacity reduced from 102 to 65.

3.8.6 Recommendation:

BOT 1 : delete;

Bot 2, 3, 4 and 5: Amend estimated capacities.

3.9 Croxton Kerrial

3.9.1 Representations made mainly related to differences between allocations and SHLAA submissions and some heritage concerns. As a result of the updated site assessment, it is proposed that the capacity of CROX1 is proposed to be reduced to take account of the proximity of a heritage asset, but that the boundary should not be altered. The site boundary of CROX2 should be increased to reflect the original SHLAA site submitted. No changes are proposed to the boundary of CROX3, but the capacity is proposed to be reduced, to take account of the surgery car park which occupies part of the site.

3.9.2 Recommendation:

CROX 1: Reduce estimated capacity;

CROX 2: increase site boundary;

CROX 3: amend boundary and reduce estimated capacity.

3.10 Harby

3.10.1 The main concerns raised by the Parish Council were related to the number of units proposed for HAR4, HAR5 and HAR6. The response to this is that the number of units specified in the C1 policies is an estimate only of what an efficient use of the land will provide, and the response at paragraph at 1.6 above also applies. Also, HAR6 already has planning permission (granted on appeal).

3.10.2 Concerns were also raised about HAR3. As a result of the site assessment update, it is proposed to remove this from Policy C1, to make way for HAR6. Heritage concerns (LCC Archaeology comments) on HAR1 have already been resolved through an approved planning application. HAR2 didn't generate any objections.

3.10.3 Recommendation:

HAR 3: delete as an allocation;

HAR 6: re-designate as an allocated site

3.11 Hose

3.11.1 Concerns focused on HOS2 and HOS3, because of heritage issues (adjacent to conservation area), traffic and access. However, as a result of the site assessment update, it is proposed that these sites be deallocated, and replaced with an extension of HOS1 and land off Harby Lane. There was a general concern regarding the access/road impacts that will be caused by having all the allocations in the same part of the village. However, the new suggested distribution within the village will reduce the number of houses proposed in this area by 15 as the new proposed allocation would be at the North of the village with access off Harby Lane.

3.11.2 Recommendation:

HOS 2 and 3: delete from allocations;

HOS1 : extend the boundary

3.12 Long Clawson

3.12.1 Several concerns were raised about the heritage importance of LONG2, by Historic England, County Archaeology and the Parish Council). It is now proposed to remove this site from the C1 policies.

3.12.2 LONG4 attracted a Parish Council objection on environmental grounds, including heritage. They are also considering making this site a Local Green Space in their Neighbourhood Plan. However, it is the view of the LPA that this would equate to being an “extensive tract of land” and in accordance with national planning policy, it should not be designated as a LGS. Historic England has not raised any concern about this site. It is proposed to continue to include this site as a housing allocation.

3.12.3 Residents also raised concern about the original assessment and ranking. The improvements to the quality and consistency of information for the updated site assessment may allay some of these concerns, but the use of data collected by the residents could not be used as it was not available on a comparable basis for all the other settlements.

3.12.4 No objections were raised to LONG1 or LONG3.

3.12.5 Recommendation

LONG 2 : delete from site allocations

3.13 Old Dalby

3.13.1 Main issues raised in Old Dalby included a request to extend OLD2. Notwithstanding that planning permission has been granted for OLD2, the suggested extended area is much poorer in its relationship to adjacent employment and railway uses and any other existing housing. In any case, the residual requirement for the settlement can be met through other allocations. The proposed response is to remove OLD2 from allocations (it is now a commitment).

3.13.2 Heritage England raised concerns about the potential impact of OLD1 on the adjacent Conservation Area. However, the site already has planning permission, granted last year. It is proposed to amend the capacity and boundary of OLD1, to reflect the planning

permission, and a more recent application for a further 8 dwellings.

3.13.3 Persimmon homes promoted the development of further houses at Old Dalby, but is in fact Queensway Old Dalby, which is a rural settlement and hence not a location the Borough Council are looking to allocate large housing schemes. As such, the site was not included in the updated site assessment.

3.13.4 Recommendation:

OLD 1: amend the capacity and boundary

OLD 2 : delete as an allocation

3.14 Somerby

3.14.1 Sites in Somerby were the subject of many representations, particularly SOM2. These objections covered a number of issues, from effect on village character and the historic environment to road infrastructure, services, access, green infrastructure and tourism. However, despite these objections, the updated site assessment work indicates that no changes are warranted. Furthermore, agreement has been reached by Historic England that the sites promoted are acceptable in principle subject to additional words in the site specific policies to ensure appropriate protection of the historic environment.

3.14.2 SOM2: it is intended to provide additional content to this policy to address representation and an assessment of archaeological interest to be completed and agreed with LCC archaeology before development of the site.

3.14.3 Recommendation:

SOM2: adjust policy content

3.15 Stathern

3.15.1 Neighbours object to STAT1 and STAT2 because of the impact upon their properties and private outlook. Historic England note that both of these sites are adjacent to or partly within the Conservation Area. The landowner confirms that STAT2 is deliverable.

3.15.2 No changes are proposed as a result of these representations. However, following a 2017 SHLAA submission and its subsequent site assessment, it is proposed that the area and capacity of STAT1 is increased, to a capacity of 65 dwellings. Another new site submitted and assessed is proposed as a reserve site to provide flexibility in the plan, though in a reduced form (45 dwellings) from the proposal submitted.

3.15.3 Recommendation:

STAT 1: increase site area and estimated capacity

3.16 Waltham on the Wolds

3.16.1 Promoters of sites within and on the edge of Waltham all submitted weighty representations, setting out the merits of their sites in comparison to others, to try and secure or retain housing site allocation status. The update to site assessments did not

suggest the need for any changes, except for a clause to be added to site specific policies to ensure appropriate protection of the historic environment requested by Historic England. There were relatively few comments from residents, partially due to the high number of applications already granted or pending a decision in the village.

3.16.2 Recommendation:

Adjust site specific policies to address heritage issues

3.17 Wymondham

3.17.1 WYM1 has been granted planning permission, and the only change proposed is to the site boundary, to align with the red line of the planning permission. No representations have been made in respect of this site and the allocation remains at 12 dwellings.

3.17.2 No changes are proposed to WYM2, which was the subject of representation regarding the proximity to the Conservation Area and other heritage assets. These can be considered in detail when the site is subject to a formal planning application and are not of sufficient concern to remove the site from allocation.

3.17.3 Further assessment has been undertaken on WYM3 following representation concerning the adjacent Conservation Area and other Heritage Assets. As such, the site assessment work has refined the site area calculations and developable areas, decreasing the capacity from 30 to 22 dwellings.

3.17.4 Recommendation:

WYM1: adjustment of boundary

WYM3: reduce capacity to 22.

Rural Hubs

3.18 Ab Kettleby

3.18.1 No issues were raised in this village

3.19 Asfordby Hill

3.19.1 Asfordby Parish Council raised concerns regarding ASFH1, stating that site lies in an "Area of Separation" (AoS) between Asfordby Hill and Kirkby Bellars. However it is a slight encroachment only, and there is an opportunity through design and mitigation to improve the urban fringe, strengthening the AoS and creating a more pleasant buffer to the South of Asfordby Hill. As such, it does not detract from the aims of the AoS.

3.19.2 Some concern was raised on ASFH1 and ASFH2 from Heritage England regarding the significance of the potential harm to the setting of 2 scheduled monuments located in Kirkby Bellars. As in para 2.14.1 above, appropriate design and layout can address these concerns, and can be addressed through development management process in due course.

3.19.3 A previous SHLAA site (MBC/004/13) was promoted, but it had already been assessed

and did not perform sufficiently to be allocated, in particular failing due to the presence of an oil pipeline and poor access.

3.19.4 Full support for both sites was received from the site owners, Tata Steel (UK) Ltd.

3.19.5 There are conformity issues with the Asfordby Neighbourhood Plan, which has recently passed examination. These will need to be resolved moving forward, the outcome of which will depend on the relative timetable for the remaining key stages of local plan preparation vis a vis NDP completion.

3.20 Easthorpe

3.20.1 EAST1 has been granted planning permission, and so a change is proposed to align the site boundary with the red line of the planning permission. Concerns have been raised by residents that the site could accommodate a higher number of units than the 9 already permitted and the impact upon the Scheduled Monument. However, impact on the SM would still be a material consideration in the determination of any other planning application that was submitted for the site.

3.20.2 No changes are proposed to EAST2; it is to remain an allocated site. Representations included concerns of overdevelopment of the village, the area of separation, flooding and the Scheduled Monument to the north of the site. It is considered that these issues can be mitigated; policy EAST2 requires flood mitigation, and provision of suitable drainage. The capacity of the site is considered to reflect the size and scale of the settlement and supports the findings of the Areas of Separation Settlement Fringe Sensitivity and Local Green Space Study.

3.20.3 One resident raised concerns regarding the total development proposed for Bottesford and Easthorpe, particularly with regards to the potential speed of development being too fast. It is considered highly unlikely however that all of the housing would be built in the next 3-5 years as the local market would not be able to support such a volume of dwellings for sale. In practice, sites built out by one developer only complete 30-50 dwellings per annum, less if there is significant competition in the same locality.

3.21 Frisby on the Wreake

3.21.1 FRIS1 has recently been granted outline planning permission, and so a boundary change to the site is proposed to reflect that. FRIS2 and 3 are both subject to planning applications which are yet to be decided. There were a number of comments relating to individual site concerns, however only one warrants a change of allocation. The landowner of FRIS4 (reserve site) has indicated to the Council the site would only be available as part of a wider site including land to the west (which would have reduced the scoring of the site to 6th in the village). As this effectively means FRIS4 is unavailable so it is proposed to remove it from Policy C1(b).

3.21.2 Furthermore, the simplified approach to distributing the residual requirement across villages set out in **item 3C of this Agenda** involves the deletion of all reserve sites in Rural Hubs, and seeking to achieve the flexibility these provided across the rural hub settlements as a whole. Only Frisby has more potentially suitable sites than are required to provide this flexibility in allocations, and because of increased capacity estimates, these

can be accommodated without the need to allocate any new sites.

3.21.3 It is therefore recommended that revised wording is applied to the policy content relating to FRIS2 and FRIS3 in order to address the comments of Historic England regarding the protection of heritage assets through design and layout, and the deletion of FRIS4.

3.22 Gaddesby

3.22.1 It is proposed to remove site GADD2 from the site allocations after a large number of objections from both residents and Historic England who objected strongly to the proposal. Its allocation would have a significant impact on the setting of heritage assets and it may not be possible to appropriately mitigate impact on landscape character, and as such, it cannot be considered suitable for development. A small replacement site to the north of the village is proposed, with site specific wording to ensure it is developed appropriately.

3.22.2 Other concerns raised related primarily to the amount of growth proposed, existing highways issues, lack of public transport, village services and facilities, and impact of development on environmental factors, such as flood risk.

3.22.3 It is recommended that GADD 2 is deleted; insertion of new site to become GADD3, former GADD3 to become GADD2.

3.23 Thorpe Arnold

3.23.1 THOR1 was the subject of representations from Historic England, LCC Archaeology and others regarding significant heritage implications of development. In response, in the updated site assessment, a cautious approach to the developable capacity of the site is proposed, reducing the potential from 27 dwellings to 13. If additional development can be demonstrated to not have unacceptable harm to the heritage assets during a planning application, further development of the site may be acceptable.

3.23.2 The reduction in capacity of THOR1 means that a proposed change to include THOR2 as an allocated site is now suggested, albeit a much reduced site area that relates more appropriately to the existing settlement and adjacent buildings, reducing encroachment into the open countryside. This can provide a small development of about 11 dwellings to meet the residual requirement, whilst limiting the impact upon the settlement. As such, the capacity of this reserve site has reduced from 48 to 11. The only representation received in regards to THOR2 was in support from the site promoter.

3.25 It is recommended that Council :

- (i) Agrees the responses outlined in the schedule of responses to representations on individual settlements within Appendix 1 (available in the Members room) be noted for agreement and;**
- (ii) Agrees the proposed suggested amendments to Policies C1(A) and C1(B) alongside suggested amendments (Appendix 4) identified in this report.**

4.0 Update To Site Assessments And Suggested Modifications To Site Allocations

4.1 An update on the assessments carried out for all sites allocated in the Draft Melton Local

Plan and those sites found potentially suitable but not ranked high enough to be allocated has been carried out in order to improve the information provided on the suitability of sites. Owing to their volume, the full content of these assessments is available in the Members Room.

- 4.2 In addition, new sites located in Melton Mowbray, Service Centres and Rural Hubs as identified in the Local Plan that have been submitted through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2017 (Appendix 5) have also been assessed and ranked against the existing sites. Alongside this, information on the availability, deliverability and viability of sites has been collated from landowners, housebuilders, planning agents and developers on each of the specific sites.
- 4.3 This update to the site assessments has informed a total of 81 modifications to the allocations and reserve sites set out in the pre-submission Draft Plan which was consulted on in November 2016. The amendments are detailed in full in Appendix 4 and are also summarised within this report. These amendments include changes to capacity and site boundaries, the deletion of sites, the inclusion of new sites and the re-numbering of sites to reflect these updates.
- 4.4 The purpose of this section is to allow consideration of site selection updates in the light of the update evidence. Section 3 reported the representations received on the sites allocated in the Pre Submission Draft Local Plan which should also be considered prior to making final decisions on the future content.

4.5 Site allocation area & potential capacity

- 4.5.1 The plotting of each site allocation has been checked to ensure it either matches the red line boundary where planning permission has either been granted or has been granted subject to s106 agreement, or that it matches the submitted site area submitted through the SHLAA process (unless changes to reduce the site area were carried out as part of the site assessment in order to make a site more suitable for development). Any inconsistencies found have been updated to reflect the correct site boundaries.
- 4.5.2 For each site assessment, the calculations used for identifying the net developable area and the potential capacity have been enhanced, providing more detail. This includes the identification of where initial site areas have been reduced and the reason why, for instance, areas within flood risk zone 3b which have been removed from the gross site area or a reduction in density due to a sensitive location of a site. The following methodology has been applied to calculate the potential capacity of sites:

Step 1: Identifying the gross site area

Gross Site Area = Total site area minus areas of the site that are identified as flood zone 3b, pipelines, overhead lines, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Sites of Special Scientific Interest.

Step 2: Identifying the net developable site area

Net Site Area = Apply the gross to net development area calculation to the gross site area to get the net developable area

Site Area	Gross to Net Development Area
Up to 0.4ha	100%
0.4ha – 2ha	82.5%
2ha – 35ha	62.5%
35ha +	50%

Step 3: Identifying the potential capacity

Potential capacity = net developable area multiplied by the expected density of development based on site location:

Site Location	Density of Development
Within Melton Mowbray	40 dwellings per hectare
Elsewhere in Borough	30 dwellings per hectare

Suitability

- 4.5.3 The NPPF requires that sites identified for housing development are considered suitable. The initial site assessments informed the selection of site allocations which were presented to Full Council on the 19th September 2016. These assessments presented key information on a range of criteria including, relationship with the settlement and access to services, facilities, employment and public transport, as well as establishing whether the site was brownfield land and whether the development of the site would result in the loss of land which is beneficial in other ways. Impact on heritage assets, flooding, biodiversity TPOs, historic parks and landscape were also identified along with an assessment of access constraints, major infrastructure requirements and the capacity of existing schools
- 4.5.4 The update to the site assessments has provided more detail and refined the initial site assessments in several ways including:
- further information on access to employment using Council datasets;
 - inclusion of the Highway Authority received in response to the Pre Submission consultation in Nov/Dec 2016 on each site;
 - detailed/updated information on primary and secondary school capacities;
 - detailed information on Health and Dental service provision;
 - a more detailed assessment of the heritage assets following comments from Historic England and the Conservation Officer;
 - updating the Sustainability Appraisal comments for each site to align with the latest version of the Sustainability Appraisal report;
 - inclusion of information on whether high pressure gas pipelines, low pressure gas pipelines, water mains, sewers, oil pipelines and both overground and underground power lines impact on the development of each site; and providing site photos for each site.

4.6 Deliverability

- 4.6.1 Information on the availability of sites, viability and deliverability was collected from promoters of sites in August 2016 to inform the November 2016 five year land supply

position and housing trajectory. Between the 5th December 2016 and May 2017 contact has been made with all landowners/ planning agents to update this and provide more detailed information on the estimated delivery of sites. This allows us establish that sites are still available for residential development and to give those promoting the sites the opportunity to identify if there are any specific viability issues for each site.

4.6.2 This work has resulted in additional information being included for each site assessment detailing availability, deliverability and viability information. This work has also informed the production of the Five Year Land Supply and Housing Trajectory Update which will be the subject of a further report **(Item 3H of this Agenda)**. Contact with the landowners/agents has reaffirmed the position on the significant majority of sites that the land identified for allocation is available for housing development within the next five years however there are cases where sites are identified as no longer available and these are discussed in section 5 below.

5.0 Suggested modifications resulting from work on suitability

5.1 As a result of the work carried out to update and refine the site assessments as set out above there have been 81 amendments to the allocations are proposed. The types of suggested modifications comprise 5 different categories:

- Site boundary updates;
- Potential capacity updates;
- Removal of sites that are no longer available, suitable or required to meet the residual housing requirement of a settlement
- Inclusion of new sites assessed through the SHLAA 2017
- Re-referencing of sites

5.2 For ease of identification the suggested modifications in each category and for each site are identified in **Appendix 6**. The new site reference is used and where appropriate the previous site reference is included in brackets. The full details of proposed amendments are identified in **Appendix 4**.

5.3 Update to site boundaries

5.3.1 As part of the update to the site assessment work, checks were made as to the area plotted for the site allocation and the red line boundary on site location plans where planning permission has been granted or granted subject to s106 agreements. These particular site allocations (14 sites) have been updated to reflect the boundaries of planning permissions. Two sites were subject to drafting inconsistencies. Site CROX2 where only the northern part of the site was identified as allocated whilst the site assessment referred to the whole site area as originally submitted in the SHLAA process. A suggested modification to increase the area to reflect the original boundary submitted and the one the site assessment was based on is identified. A site in Gaddesby, GADD1 was also subject to a drafting mistake with the site being identified on the allocation plans in the incorrect location. This allocation is based on planning permission 15/00361/OUT and therefore the site boundary has been modified to match the red line boundary of the approved planning permission.

5.4 Update to capacities

- 5.4.1 A total of 23 sites are recommended to be updated in terms of the potential capacity due to an updated calculation or where planning permission has been granted on a site for a specific number of dwellings. Following a set methodology for calculating capacity, based on gross site area the update work on the site assessments checked the site area calculations and therefore in some cases where the gross site area was updated, the capacity has increased or decreased dependent on this. The majority of these are limited in change, with the average change being 11 dwellings for sites that have altered as a result of the updated site assessments and an average change of 12 dwellings where the capacities have been updated as a result of planning permission being granted.

5.5 Removal of sites (Availability)

- 5.5.1 Confirmation has been received from one agent on behalf of a landowner to state that the land relating to Pre- Submission Plan site allocation MEL9, **Melton Building Supplies, Thorpe Road, Melton Mowbray**, is no longer available for housing development within the plan period. As a key requirement of the NPPF is that land is available for development is not met, it is suggested that this site is removed from the site allocations. Following an extensive search for the landowner of one site, it has not been possible to find details of the owner of ASF3 Paddocks, west of Saxelby Road & south of Loughborough Road, Asfordby. As it is not possible to speak to the landowner and confirm the availability of the land this site has been removed.

5.6 Removal of sites (Allocation threshold not met)

- 5.6.1 Two of the original sites identified in the Pre Submission Plan, MEL6, Land north of **Kirby Lane, Melton Mowbray** and MEL12, **Land at the rear of 74 & 88 Dalby Road** (Swale Close) have been granted planning permission since the consultation on the pre-submission Draft Plan in November 2016. Both planning permissions are for less than 10 dwellings and therefore these will now be dealt with as commitments rather than as allocations due to the agreed capacity. These are therefore removed from the allocations under policy C1(a).
- 5.6.2 Previous site BOT1 at land adjoining **Belvoir Road, Bottesford** has been removed because the site has been completed and has no residual capacity remaining to be built out.

5.7 Removal of sites (Suitability)

- 5.7.1 Further information has been received in respect of previous site GADD2, Land off Church Lane and Ashby Road, **Gaddesby**, in terms of impacts on landscape character and significant heritage assets. Historic England have registered objection to the allocation of the site due to the fact they consider that development of that particular site could not be mitigated for or designed in such away to limit detrimental impact on the setting of the Grade I listed Church of St Luke and the historic landscape setting around it which comprises of earthwork remains of medieval and later cultivation. Therefore the site assessment has been updated to take this into account and it is now considered in light of this information that the site is no longer considered suitable for allocation. It is therefore

suggested that this site is removed from the site allocations under policy C1(a).

- 5.7.2 As part of the planning application (16/00709/OUT) assessment process a technical objection to LONG2, Back Lane, **Long Clawson** has been received. Historic England have objected due to 'the loss of the ridge and furrow earthworks and the pasture field (comprising the development area) which would represent harm through setting impact to the significance the scheduled monument and listed buildings'. This objection has been maintained following additional information and survey work provided by the applicants. It is therefore on this basis recommended that the site is proposed to be removed from the site allocations under policy C1(a).

5.8 Removal of sites (no longer needed to meet housing requirement)

- 5.8.1 It is proposed that the 'residual requirement' that was set out in the Pre Submission Draft Plan (November 2016) is updated to take into account the latest monitoring of housing completions, dwellings under construction and dwellings with permission on small sites which was carried out during the first week of April 2017. The details of this update are included in table 5 below where the capacity of the updated sites identified for allocation are noted next to the residual requirement. One site which is no longer required to meet the net requirement is OLD2, Station Road, **Old Dalby**. This site has planning permission for 15 dwellings and therefore it will be identified as a commitment rather than an allocation as the potential capacity of OLD1 is sufficient for the overall requirement needed in Old Dalby. Therefore the reserve site in Old Dalby previously known as OLD3 is now proposed to be identified as OLD2 but is maintained as a reserve site.
- 5.8.2 In **Hose**, an extension to an existing site with planning permission (HOS1) was submitted through the SHLAA 2017 along with a further adjacent additional site. These two sites performed better in the site assessments in terms of suitability and deliverability and therefore ranked higher than previous HOS2 and HOS3 sites. As the housing requirement for Hose can be met by the extended site HOS1 and the new site HOS2, the previous HOS2 and HOS3 sites are proposed to be removed as they are no longer required. Due to the nature of these sites, it is more likely that they will come forward as small windfall sites rather than as a comprehensive scheme.
- 5.8.3 A site is identified as being removed in **Harby**, previous HAR3, land north of Stathern Lane. There are difficulties with this site, with a lack of access at present and also that the landowner is not committed to delivering the site. The landowner are the Parish Council and following the grant of permission on HAR3 (previously HAR6, a reserve site) on appeal they feel that the commitments in Harby are sufficient without identifying their site for delivery. Whilst it was identified that it could be included as a reserve site, a new site put forward in the SHLAA 2017 performed better in the site assessment rankings and therefore it is not considered desirable to retain the previous site HAR3 as an allocation or a reserve site.

5.9 Inclusion of new sites

- 5.9.1 Since the consultation on the pre-submission Draft Plan in November 2016 sites have been submitted through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2017 process. Full site assessments have been carried out on all sites with a capacity of above

10 dwellings or above that are not land locked or subject to significant constraints that would mean the site was unsuitable. These 18 additional sites (identified in appendix B) have then been assessed against the existing sites and where necessary the ranking of sites in each settlement has been updated along with the numbering of the sites to reflect the revised site assessment results. Of the 18 sites assessed, 9 sites were identified as being potentially suitable and have been included in the revised list of allocated sites, including sites in Gaddesby (GADD3), Great Dalby (GREA1), Harby (HAR5 Reserve), Hose (extension to HOS1 and HOS2), Melton Mowbray (MEL4), Scaford (SCAL1) and Stathern (extension to STAT1 and STAT3 Reserve).

- 5.9.2 Following the updated site assessment work, one site that was previously assessed in **Long Clawson**, Corner of Hickling Lane and Broughton Lane (MBC/144/13) has ranked more highly than sites LONG3 and LONG4. As a result this site is now proposed to be included as LONG2 (replacing the previous LONG2 site situated on Back Lane Long Clawson) with a potential capacity of 35 dwellings.
- 5.9.3 Previous site HAR6 in **Harby**, which was identified as a reserve site has been granted planning permission on appeal since the consultation on the Draft Plan in November 2016. This site has therefore proposed to be included as a new site in the list of allocations under policy C1(a) and removed from the reserve sites listed under policy C1(b).
- 5.9.4 **The updated allocations as a result of this site assessment work are identified in the three tables in Appendix 7 and the accompanying location plans (which also provide a comparison to the situation in the Pre-Submission plan consulted on in November 2016) can be found in Appendix 4.**
- 5.10 In comparing the capacity identified in the pre-submission Draft Plan from November 2016 and the updated allocated sites it is clear from table 1 in appendix 7 above that there is very little difference in the two situations for **Melton Mowbray with just 32 dwellings less being identified as a result of the update.**
- 5.11 When comparing the capacities of the updated allocated sites with the Pre-Submission allocations in the Service Centres (table 2 in appendix 7), there are some that have remained the same, including Long Clawson and Somerby and there are those settlements where the capacities have only altered marginally by 10 or less dwellings, including Old Dalby and Wymondham. There are a further 2 settlements that have altered by 20 dwellings or less including Hose and Waltham on the Wolds. These six settlements meet at least their own allocated quantity with some surplus. The next group include settlements that have had a capacity change of between 21 and 25 dwellings. Harby's capacity has increased by 24 dwellings and this is due to site HAR3 being granted planning permission on appeal.
- 5.12 Both Scaford and Stathern have had new sites put forward since the original assessments were carried out. Stathern would now meets its own allocation with some surplus and Scaford which originally had no suitable sites would now only have a deficit of 5 dwellings. Asfordby and Croxton Kerrial would decrease in capacity by 21 dwellings each. This is due to the refinement of the site assessments and more information on land ownership issues and constraints of the sites being identified. No other sites were put forward in these locations to be assessed. The remaining settlement, Bottesford would

have a decrease in capacity of 81 dwellings. This is partly related to the previous BOT1 site being built out and removed from the allocations (34 dwellings). The further proposed reduction of 47 dwellings is again down to a more thorough understanding of the constraints of the sites in Bottesford.

- 5.13 The comparison between the original and proposed updated capacities in the Rural Hub settlements are identified in table 2.3 below. Ab Kettleby has the same capacity and has not changed. Three settlements, including Asfordby Hill, Easthorpe and Thorpe Arnold would alter by less than 10 dwellings each. Gaddesby would decrease by 19 dwellings, due to GADD2, the largest site initially identified in Gaddesby, being identified as unsuitable for development due to the detrimental impact on heritage assets and their setting. Great Dalby originally had no suitable sites however a site was submitted through the SHLAA 2017 process and has been identified as being suitable for development through the site assessments and its therefore recommended to become an allocation under Policy C1.
- 5.14 The settlement with the largest change with an increase of 43 dwellings is Frisby on the Wreake. This is largely due to the capacity calculation being applied to FRIS3 which resulted in a capacity of 27 more dwellings being achievable on this site. Whilst theoretically this may be possible, the landowner is not intending on providing this number of dwellings and the current planning application currently pending consideration is for 48 dwellings. Frisby on the Wreake is the only settlement in the Rural Hubs category with more potentially suitable sites than are required and therefore FRIS3 is retained to provide this flexibility in capacity across the Rural Hubs category.
- 5.15 The update to the site assessments has provided further information and evidence on the availability, suitability, deliverability and viability of sites put forward for allocation in the Borough. As a result of this enhanced information a total of 81 suggested changes are identified to improve the site allocations and to ensure the sites identified going forward have been selected based on a robust and up to date evidence base. The majority of the changes proposed are minor, in that they clarify the site boundaries and potential capacities of existing sites.
- 5.16 There are more significant changes in that new sites are identified and existing sites are removed, as detailed above and in Appendix B. It is important to understand how these amendments to the site allocations impact on the delivery of the spatial strategy set out in policy SS2 of the Draft Plan which is discussed in **Item 3C**.

6.0 Conclusion on site assessment update

- 6.1 The update to the site assessments has provided more up to date and robust evidence to enhance the site allocation work carried out to date. It has resulted in the refinement of work to follow a clear methodology about the calculation of net developable areas and potential capacities, a more in depth consideration of constraints and an assessment of the availability and deliverability of sites.
- 6.2 The updated site assessments has allowed a refresh of the ranking of sites which has identified proposed amendments to the site allocations moving forward to make sure sites progressing through the process are available, suitable, viable and deliverable and meet

the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

6.3 The updated work on the site allocations demonstrates that the sites identified continue to provide sufficient capacity to meet the requirements of Melton Mowbray, Service Centres and Rural Hubs as set out in policy SS2 of the Draft Plan. Members will recall that the Pre Submission Local plan included a 'redistribution' housing allocation, principally to compensate for those locations where there were no sites(s) available or their capacity was insufficient. In the light of this update, it is considered that the quantities in all 3 'levels' of the spatial strategy (Melton Mowbray, Service Centres and Rural Hubs) and as such this is no longer necessary.

6.4 It is recommended that the Full Council note the update to the site assessments and agree to be put forward when the Melton Local Plan is submitted for examination as evidence base.

6.5 It is recommended that the Full Council note the resultant updated site allocations informed by the update to the site assessments in particular tables 1, 2 and 3 in appendix 7 which identify the potential capacities in the villages and agree that they are consulted on as part of the 'focused changes' as part of the reasoned justification in Chapter 5 and content of Policies C1 and C1(A).

7.0 Policies SS4 & SS5 (Sustainable Neighbourhoods)

7.1 This section summarises the representations received to Policies SS4 and SS5 of Chapter 4 of the Pre Submission Draft Melton Local Plan, and to seek views on the responses to the representations. The suggested responses may include reference to proposed focused changes that need to be consulted on before the draft local plan is submitted, or to suggest modifications that can be submitted alongside the draft local plan for Examination.

7.2 A summary and suggested responses to all of the 88 comments made in respect of policies SS4 and SS5 in this Chapter is contained in Appendix 2(a) and Appendix 2(b). There were 51 in respect of policy SS4 (Melton South) and 37 in respect of policy SS5 (Melton North). A paper copy of the extensive schedule of individual representations made and officers' proposed responses to them will be available in the Members' Room (Appendix 1a).

7.3 **Policies SS4 and SS5.** The development required in Melton Mowbray will be focussed in two new large scale sustainable neighbourhoods to the north (SS5) and south (SS4) of the town. It is proposed that they 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.

7.5 Nature of representations received

7.5.1 Representations made on this chapter encompassed a range of issues, and a total of 11 of them were expressions of support for these two policies . These representations generally considered that sustainable additions to the main town in the Borough was a logical approach to delivering growth in the borough. Many representations relate to issues common to policies SS4 and SS5. These are reported first. Individual

representations or issues which only relate to one of the sustainable neighbourhoods then follow. The following paragraphs set out the main issues raised and the suggested responses to them.

7.6 Spatial Strategy

7.6.1 Representations on the Spatial Strategy were made by objectors to both policy SS4 and policy SS5. These representations raised a number of issues, which are both matters of principle and detail. They are not directly related to the merits of the sustainable neighbourhoods, only in so far as they consider that other options for the distribution of housing development are considered to be preferable.

- There were suggestions that housing should be spread more evenly across the borough; that a new village would be preferable to the sustainable neighbourhoods or that there should only be development in either Melton or a new settlement, with none in any of the existing villages.
- The response is that the distribution of housing follows the Spatial Strategy, which takes account of the ability of different settlements to accommodate development. This strategy is designed to deliver the vision for Melton Borough. It should be noted that Policy SS6 provides flexibility to allow other options to be considered. The scale of development and associated benefits which is proposed in Melton Mowbray justifies significant new infrastructure.
- Note that other general comments about the Spatial Strategy were addressed in the report relating to policy SS2 to the Working Group meeting on 30th May 2017.

No modifications are suggested in response to these representations

7.7 Viability

- 7.7.1
- Representations question whether the developers of the sustainable neighbourhoods can fund the new road and deliver 37% affordable housing.
 - Response is that the viability of these developments and their ability to deliver housing and associated mitigation has been re-assessed and is addressed elsewhere on this agenda (**See item 3K of this Agenda**).

Modifications are suggested in response to these representations to adjust the affordable housing requirement to a minimum of 15%

7.8 Highways and transportation

- 7.8.1
- The provision of sections of a road link and the general impact of these developments upon the functioning of the local highways network were of considerable interest to those who commented on both of these policies. There are concerns that the whole road should be provided in advance of any new development; question the usefulness of the southern and northern sections of the proposed road; that traffic in the town centre will be adversely affected by these developments; that the developments would have an impact upon the wider highways network outside the borough; question the funding of the road and that any funding should be directed to improving existing roads in the town centre and not used to provide a new road outside the town. One representation suggests that the development of other large areas outside the sustainable neighbourhoods

would better deliver a new road and associated increased benefits.

- The response is that the plan (policies SS4 and SS5, plus IN1 and IN2) takes account of the need to ensure that road infrastructure and/or contributions towards it will be provided as a component of new development. Sections of road will be built as other development comes forward. It is not anticipated that the whole road will be provided in advance of associated housing. The modelling evidence shows that the new sections of road provided by the sustainable neighbourhoods would provide some relief in their own right.
- Melton is fairly remote from Leicester City and any proposed major scale development of the city. Consequently, the sustainable neighbourhoods in Melton Mowbray would have minimal impact upon Leicester City.
- Since the publication of the pre-submission plan there is now more certainty about the route of the Melton Mowbray Distributor Road (MMDR). This is detailed in Item 3F in the agenda.

No modifications are suggested in response to these representations

7.9 Bus service

- 7.9.1
- Leicestershire County Council considered that the reference to 20 minute frequency of buses would be restrictive and that varying frequencies at different times would enable operators to better meet the needs of shift works and other school and commuter patterns of movement.
 - The response is that this is a logical alteration to the plan and is accepted.

Modifications are suggested in response to these representations to remove the specification of 20 minute frequencies

7.10 Harm to landscape and heritage assets

- 7.10.1
- Representations that the proposals involve the loss of too much greenfield land and that there would be a negative impact upon the landscape and heritage assets.
 - Response is that there has been a thorough assessment of the environmental impact of these proposals, which is detailed in the plan. The plan also includes sections which address the need to consider these impacts and provide appropriate and proportionate mitigation.

No modifications are suggested in response to these representations

7.11 Policy SS4 Melton South

- 7.11.1
- Representations consider that development of this scale should be sited where there is already transport infrastructure and on a brownfield rather than a greenfield site.
 - In response, it is considered that there is insufficient brownfield land in appropriate locations to deliver the spatial strategy.

No modifications are suggested in response to these representations

7.12 Southern Boundary of Sustainable Neighbourhood

- 7.12.1
- There is a current, undetermined planning application (ref 16/00515/OUT) for the development of 1500 dwellings and associated infrastructure in the eastern portion

of this sustainable neighbourhood. In their representations these applicants state that Figure 7, Concept Plan for Melton South does not provide an appropriate basis for this proposal, in particular the indicative route of the proposed new road. This plan shows the road following the uneven line of existing hedgerows, which they consider is impractical. Their line for the road runs slightly to the south of the field boundaries, which they consider is necessary 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 transport infrastructure.

- Historic England (HE) has objected to the planning application because of the relationship between the development and the St Mary and St Lazarus Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM). They consider that it would result in substantial harm to the SAM. Historic England has not objected to policy SS4 because the southern boundary of the proposal follows the line of existing field boundaries.
- While the concept plan explains that the route of the road and associated junctions is only indicative, it was considered that there was merit in these representations. In particular, there is a need to be able to demonstrate to an Inspector that this development can be delivered. Melton BC commissioned expert historic advice to assess the relationship between the SAM and the proposed southern boundary of the sustainable neighbourhood. In summary, this advice considers that HE's objection to southern boundary of the can be successfully overcome.
- Consequently, it is proposed that the southern boundary of the sustainable neighbourhood should be amended so that it replicates the boundary of the current planning application. It should be noted that this modification will generate an objection from Historic England.
- ***Modifications are suggested in response to these representations to move the southern boundary of the sustainable neighbourhood to accord with the boundary of planning application ref. 16/00515/OUT***

7.13 Area of Separation

- 7.13.1
- Representations that there is a conflict between the Areas of Separation (AOS) and the proposed development of the Sustainable Neighbourhood and their associated policies (EN4 and SS4), as the AOS run into the Sustainable Neighbourhood.
 - Response is that there is no conflict between policies EN4 and SS4 as the plan should be read as a whole. AOS do not have a define 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.
 - ***No modifications are suggested in response to these representations***

7.14 Objection from major landowners to impact of Sustainable Neighbourhood and associated road

- 7.14.1
- Representations have been received from the family which farms land across which the proposed road crosses and includes land proposed for residential and employment development. This is part of the western end of the proposal. They state that the proposal would also have an adverse impact upon their homes and

their successful business at Eye Kettleby Lakes. They are supportive of the principle of the development of this Sustainable Neighbourhood and have endeavoured to work with the Borough Council on this proposal.

- In summary they consider that the proposal for the road and employment development on and across their land does not satisfy their needs.
- The response is that it is disappointing that at present these landowners are not able to support this proposal. This authority has been working with all parties to secure the delivery of this proposal. 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.
- Note that it is proposed that Policy IN1 should be amended to include reference to the use of compulsory purchase powers to assist in the delivery of sections of the new road.

No modifications are suggested in response to these representations

7.15 Concerns about drainage and detailed layout of this proposal

- 7.15.1
- There are a number of representations referring to various detailed technical, layout and design matters. They consider that existing drainage problems would be exacerbated by this proposal.
 - Response is that allocations in the plan have been subject to sustainability and environmental assessment, including flooding and drainage. As individual applications are submitted that will need to be supported by flood risk assessments.
 - The details of layout and construction are not matters for the plan. Note that Policy D1 seeks to raise the standard of design. The whole development will be subject to masterplanning which will set out in detail the distribution and location of land uses.

No modifications are suggested in response to these representations

7.16 Various suggested minor changes

- 7.16.1
- A number of representations make reference to a range of relatively minor changes to the plan. These relate to a few changes to wording and emphasis and are recorded in detail in the appendix to this section.

No modifications are suggested in response to these representations.

7.17 Policy SS5 Melton North

7.17.1 Housing Land Supply

- The representatives of the landowners and developers of this proposal consider that the Council's housing delivery trajectory is too low and that Melton North could provide up to 2,200 dwellings, with 1,700 delivered by 2036. The plan proposes up to 1,700, with 1,500 delivered by 2036.
- The response is that while this optimism is appreciated the authority feels more

comfortable with the approach set out in the plan. If these sites do come forward faster than allowed for in the plan it would be welcomed. No change is proposed to the figures.

No modifications are suggested in response to these representations

7.18 Viability and detailed points

- The representatives of the landowners and developers of this proposal also raise a number of detailed points. They have asked that “subject to viability “ and “where a need has been identified “ (or similar words) be inserted in various parts of this policy to emphasise the balance and need for detailed assessment which needs to be undertaken as the details of the proposal progress.
- The response is that the starting point is that the existing policies should be complied with, unless there are exceptional reasons for not doing so. Those reasons could relate to viability or need, but is not considered necessary to explicitly refer to them in every policy. This allows these matters to be taken into account.

No modifications are suggested in response to these representations

7.19 Relationship with Country Park

- Concerns expressed that the Country Park can not help to improve connectivity with the town centre as its status prohibits lighting. The route of new road would create a town park ,rather than a country park. The environment of the Country Park and bio-diversity would be harmed by new development.
- Representations were received from The Friends of Melton Country Park, reiterating their original comments and emphasising the need for a development buffer of a specified measure. The response is that the relationship between the sustainable neighbourhood and the park is addressed by paragraph 4.5.7 and the Environment section of Policy SS5 (including paras en3A and en3B), which ensure that development should integrate successfully with the Country Park and have regard to the special characteristics of the area. The details of layout, including the provision of wildlife corridors and the protection of bio-diversity sites would be addressed by a master plan. No change is considered to be necessary The policy (Environment en3: B) already refers to a protection zone. Extra wording could be added to clarify the purpose of this zone. It is not considered that a specific measurement can be applied because of the absence of evidence informing what distance it should comprise, and that it may need to vary along the perimeter based on the biodiversity interest it is intended to serve. The existing polices and the need for a master plan should address any other local concerns.

A modification is suggested in response to these representations adjusting the wording of the ‘protection zone’ and its purpose to ensure it is more prescriptive and specific regarding expectations of the zone

7.20 Melton Country Park Greenway

- While not raised in representations it is considered that the provision of this infrastructure would be better situated in Policy SS5, rather than Policy IN1. It would be a logical part of the production of a masterplan and the delivery of Policy

SS5.

- ***A modification is suggested that the provision of a Melton Country Park Greenway should be deleted from Policy IN1 and incorporated into Policy SS5.***

7.21 Increase the area of the Sustainable Neighbourhood

- Representations support the extension of this Sustainable Neighbourhood east of Melton Spinney Road ,which could accommodate approximately 360 dwellings. They note that this extension would help to provide the proposed new road to meet the A607.
- Response is that in the longer term this is a reasonable suggestion, which could be supported. At present the additional dwellings which could be provided are not currently required in this location.
- ***No modifications are suggested in response to these representations***

7.22 Various suggested minor changes

- A number of representations make reference to a range of relatively minor changes to the plan. These relate to a few changes to wording and emphasis and are recorded in detail in the appendix to this report.
- ***No modifications are suggested in response to these representations***

7.23 It is recommended that Full Council note the contents of this section and agree that the responses outlined in Appendix 2(a) and Appendix 2(b); and that the following suggested amendments are proposed to Chapter 4, in relation to policies SS4 and SS5:

- (i) **Reference to 20 minute frequency of buses be deleted from sections t2(A) in policies SS4 and SS5**
- (ii) **Move the southern boundary of the sustainable neighbourhood to accord with the boundary of planning application ref. 16/00515/OUT**
- (iii) **The provision of a Melton Country Park Greenway should be deleted from Policy IN1 and incorporated into Policy SS5.**
- (iv) **Amendments to Policy SS4 in relation to the requirements of the protection zone for the Country Park**

8.0 POLICY AND CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The Melton Local Plan Submission version and the associated contents in this report set out the Council's preferred approach to addressing the issues and challenges which need to be dealt with through the Local Plan, to deliver the development the Borough requires and to deliver the vision and objectives of the Plan.

9.0 FINANCIAL AND OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

9.1 There are no significant unknown financial or resource implications arising from this report. The Local Plan publication and consultation are core elements of the existing budget provision. Whilst will have a significant resource implication on the staffing resources and expenditure relating to statutory notices and publicity, this will be met through the existing Local Plan budget provisions.

10.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS/POWERS

10.1 The preparation of the Local Plan is governed by legislation (The Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Localism Act 2011) and also Regulations (The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012).

10.2 The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the NPPF require that plans are prepared based on the most up to date evidence.

11.0 COMMUNITY SAFETY

11.1 There are no direct community safety implications as a direct result of this report.

12.0 EQUALITIES

12.1 The Local Plan is being subject to a detailed Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) through each stage of preparation. The pre submission Local plan has been the subject of an EIA which is now published in accordance with the Council's policy. An addendum to this stage of the Local Plan will be published alongside.

13.0 RISKS

L I K E L I H O O D	A	Very High				
	B	High				
	C	Significant			2	
	D	Low			1	
	E	Very Low		3		
	F	Almost Impossible				
			Negligible 1	Marginal 2	Critical 3	Catastrophic 4

IMPACT

Risk No	Risk Description
1	Scale and nature of representations received through consultation demonstrate the plan is unsound
2	Evidence is challenged and scrutiny as part of the Local Plan Examination.
3	Evidence becomes out of date

14.0 CLIMATE CHANGE

14.1 There are no direct climate change issues arising from this report.

15.0 CONSULTATION

15.1 The evidence referred to in this report and modifications to the content of the Plan will be published alongside the 'Focussed Changes' proposed (**see item 3A of this Agenda**) in accordance with Regulation 19 of Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended.

16.0 WARDS AFFECTED

16.1 All

Contact Officer J Worley, Head of Regulatory Services

Date: 23rd June 2017

Appendices :

- Appendix 1: Responses to representations (Policy C1 and C1A) – deposited in the Members Room
- Appendix 1: Responses to representations (Policies SS4 and SS5)– deposited in the Members Room
- Appendix 2a: Summary of responses to representations (Policy SS4 Melton South)
- Appendix 2b: Summary of responses to representations (Policy SS4 Melton South)
- Appendix 3: South Sustainable Neighbourhood Map
- Appendix 4: Suggested Amendments to Policy C1 and C1A
- Appendix 5: List of SHLAA 2017 sites assessed
- Appendix 6: Summary table of suggested modifications
- Appendix 7: Tables outlining the housing allocation changes in different settlements

Background Papers: None