

Rosalind Freeman

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Representor ref numbers ANON-13H4-7YDK-Y and ANON-13H4-7Y6C-9  
05/01/2018

## **MELTON LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION**

### **MATTERS AND QUESTIONS**

(I have used the same numbers used in the questions  
to reference and number my paragraphs below)

#### **Matter 3: Overall requirements for housing and employment land and the long-term growth strategy (Policies SS2 and SS6); affordable housing need and policy targets (Policies C4, SS4 and SS5)**

**3.1** In the Sustainability Assessment, an assumption was made that larger sites would give a more positive effect than smaller sites in relation to affordable housing but their location ie near to town or in villages was not mentioned in answering- Will it contribute to the stock of affordable housing in places where a need has been established? There is not an identified need for this in Somerby at 40% of 69 houses

**3.1.1** The Policy allocating a greater proportion of affordable housing in the villages than the Town is not soundly based. It has seemingly been based on land costs rather than sustainably locating affordable housing close to amenities, public transport, job opportunity etc, logically, new development in and around Melton town should provide a greater proportion of affordable housing than the villages. There is no logic to the decision not to do so. It appears that MBC wish to use developer contributions from developments in and around the Town to fund other things at the expense of affordable housing in the right places.

**3.1.2** Larger villages such as Bottesford, Waltham and Asfordby with good road connections and good public transport and access to employment should have been defined as the main Service centres and taken larger allocations proportionately than the wrongly categorised current service centres other than these villages.

**3.1.3** The response I received from MBC on the consultation is inadequate and does not recognise the points made that the whole basis of evidence used to classify Service centres is wrong. They merely re state that Somerby has been correctly categorised using the criteria chosen by them.

**3.1.4** The response given by MBC to my comments was to say that the 4 key services were selected to identify the factors which offered the greatest contributions to sustainability. I do not agree with this, the key services-

-Primary school

-Access to employment

-Fast broadband

-Community building

are lacking the greatest contribution of all- transport links/A or B roads, work friendly public services. A community building is present in almost all villages and Fast broadband will be all over the Country within months so these are not adequate factors to use to differentiate village hierarchy.

**3.1.5** Even when lack of access to employment opportunity is evidenced to MBC by Somerby NP group, it is still ignored and they still insist it is there when they have no evidence.

**3.1.6** For the above reasons the Plan is not sound, it is not based on Sustainable development, in villages like Somerby it does not take account of lack of infrastructure, lack of employment opportunity, lack of transport availability and therefore lack of genuinely affordable homes for poorer families. I have personally spoken to a resident who was placed in council rented property in Somerby when he requested Melton town, while he loves living here, he was unsure how long he would be able to afford to stay given the bus fare and distance from Towns, supermarkets, job opportunity

**3.1.7** How should it be changed?

Require a greater proportion of developments in and around Melton Town to be affordable particularly in large scale developments and a larger proportion of developments in genuinely sustainable larger villages with job friendly bus service, closer to Melton.

Reduce the requirement in the remaining villages overall from 40% to 20% which would make smaller developments more deliverable and allow for greater developer contribution towards facilities and lessen the risk of poorer families being isolated out in villages without good and accessible transport links.