

**MELTON LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION  
STATEMENT OF MELTON BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**8<sup>th</sup> January 2018**

**MATTER 5**

**Other Housing Allocations (Policy C1(A) and  
Appendix 1) and Reserve Sites (Policy C1(B) and  
Appendix 1)**

**QUESTION 5.1 Overall, has the allocation of the sites in Policy C1(A) been based on a clear, robust process of site assessment and informed by sustainability appraisal? In particular:**

- 5.1.1 Yes- the allocation of sites is based on a clear and robust site assessment process. The site selection process has followed the national guidance set out in the 'Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment' section of the PPG as well as the last bullet of paragraph 159 of the NPPF. It has also taken account of the findings of sustainability appraisal (SA) as required by the NPPF (para 165).
- 5.1.2 The sites were first identified through the SHLAA process and thereafter through successive consultations on the Local Plan. The site assessment process has evolved from the Emerging Options stage through to the Focused Changes stage. Site assessment during the Emerging Options stage was based on a 'three stage sieving exercise' which discounted sites based on the physical constraints that were the main showstoppers in rendering the sites unsuitable, minimum site size and the SA conclusions. This is explained clearly in Section 4 of **Small Sites options paper** ([MBC/SS7](#)).
- 5.1.3 Following the representations received during the Emerging Options stage, the site assessment process was further revised taking into account the 'refresh' of the settlement hierarchy, and the four 'red' constraints suggested in the updated Leicester and Leicestershire Joint Methodology for Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, July 2016 (page 51 in pdf document [MBC/HS3a](#)). The assessment process is explained clearly in Sections 3.6 and 3.8 of **Appendix 1 (Full Council 19.9.16 Agenda Item 3 - Site Allocations Report)**.
- 5.1.4 Following the publication of the Pre-submission Draft Local Plan in November last year, the site assessment process was further updated for the sites previously assessed as well as new ones suggested during that consultation. It included new and updated information on suitability and deliverability for all sites (**See Appendix 2 - Section 4, pages 10-13 of Full Council 04.07.17 report Item 3E - Housing Site Allocations and Reserve Sites**).
- 5.1.5 Apart from the updated evidence, the reason the process changed between the Emerging Options stage and later stages is because the Council was responding positively to the representations received. Every site which has been allocated in the Plan has been subject to a comparable up to date final detailed site assessment at the local plan focused changes stage following the clear and robust approach explained above and in the respective appendices 1 to 3 referred to above.
- 5.1.6 All of the iterations of site assessment have been informed by the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that was carried out for every stage of the Local Plan. The sites were assessed against the objectives of the SA in detail within the SA reports (Sections 6 and Appendices 6 & 8 of [MBC/WP2d](#), [MBC/WP2e](#) and Section 5 of [MBC/WP2g](#)). The identification and appraisal of the site options has been explained well in the paragraphs 1.17-1.24 of the Non Technical Summary of the SA report of the PSD stage ([MBC/WP2f](#)) as well as in section 4 and paragraphs 5.13-5.27 of that of the Addendum stage ([MBC/WP2h](#)). The

conclusions of the SA assessment were noted on every site assessment proforma and taken account of in drawing up the overall conclusions for the suitability, availability and the achievability of the sites ([MBC/HA1a](#), [MBC/HA1b](#) and [MBC/HA1c](#)).

**i) has an appropriate selection of potential sites been assessed?**

5.17 Yes – the Council has followed the national guidance on the identification of sites (stage 1 of housing and economic land availability assessment of the PPG) as well as the joint Leicester and Leicestershire methodology which conforms to the national guidance. Sites identified and received through SHLAA since the outset and those received as representations during the consultations, have been considered for the assessment. The only filtering was to meet the site size threshold and to only include sites in locations that accorded with submitted Plan’s settlement hierarchy.

**ii) has an appropriate methodology been used and has it been applied consistently?**

5.1.8 Yes – An appropriate methodology, derived from the national guidance and then adapted to take account of representors said has been used to select the sites to include in the local plan. This is explained in paragraphs 5.1.1-5.1.7 above.

5.1.9 A consistent methodology of identifying the main constraints and calculating the site capacities based on the available net developable area has been used for all the sites assessed. They have been ranked using the published site assessment user guide ([MBC/HA3](#)), as well as the conclusions on suitability, availability and achievability of the sites. As mentioned above, the detailed process is described in **Appendix 2**.

**iii) are the reasons for selecting the preferred sites and rejecting the others clear and sufficient? Would any inaccuracies in the assessments significantly undermine the overall conclusions?**

5.1.10 Yes – the reasons for selecting the preferred sites and rejecting others are clearly set out in the Sustainability Appraisals reports mentioned above (appendix 8 of [MBC/WP2d](#)-[MBC/WP2e](#) and [MBC/WP2h](#)). They are also clearly set out in the document ‘Suggested Amendments to Policy C1a Housing Allocations and C1b Reserve Sites, MBC, 13<sup>th</sup> June 2017’ ([MBC/HA2. Appendix B](#)).

5.1.11 The process and methodologies by which the strategic allocations have been selected are covered in the Council’s Matter 4 Examination Statement.

5.1.12 Any individual inaccuracies are unlikely to affect the soundness of the Plan, because firstly, the updated five year housing land supply and trajectory position, December 2017 (MBC/HS1a) indicates there is ample housing land supply to meet the 6125 requirement with 15.8% headroom beyond that. Secondly, the allocations will deliver a 223 surplus over the planned requirement (see answer to question 5.2 below); and thirdly there is a flexibility within the allocations at each level of the settlement hierarchy - for service centres, there is a surplus of 119 dwellings and for the rural hubs there is surplus of 78 dwellings taking into account the ‘residual requirement’ as on 31<sup>st</sup>

March 2017 (please see FC1.4, Table 4 in the Addendum of Focused Changes – [MBC/G4e \(ii\)](#)).

5.1.13 As there is sufficient flexibility in the Plan, any inaccuracies (if any) in the assessments should not be so great as to undermine the overall approach underpinning Policies C1(A) or even C1(B), nor significantly affect the Plan's overall spatial strategy or its numerical housing development requirements, such that the Plan becomes unsound. The sites have been consistently assessed using the same methodology and have been subject to quality and sense checking by officers and Councillors, through consideration by a Local Plan Working Group and Full Council.

**iv) has a reasonable balance been struck between the residual requirement figure for each of the settlements in Table 4 and the allocation of sites to meet the residual requirement as closely as possible?**

5.1.14 Yes, but it is not an exact fit. This is explained in **Focused Change 1.3 for table 4** ([MBC/G4e ii](#), pages 4-7). Because not all the settlements have enough capacity to meet the requirement, surplus capacity elsewhere in the Borough for the same category of settlement has been considered. Of the 12 Service Centres, 4 villages (Asfordby, Bottesford, Croxton Kerrial and Scalford) do not meet their own residual requirement, but the remaining Service Centre villages provide enough surplus to cover the shortfall and also provide additional capacity of 119 dwellings. In the Rural Hubs, two villages do not meet their residual requirements (Gaddesby and Great Dalby), but the total capacity provided by the remainder of the Rural Hubs covers the shortfall and provides additional capacity of 78 dwellings. This surplus provides a 12% 'buffer' of capacity in the rural area adding flexibility in the plan to react to changing circumstances.

5.1.14 New sites e.g. SCAL 1 and GREA 1 were added at Focused Change stage to ensure a better fit of sites/development capacity to settlement requirement. The sites ranked highest in the assessment were chosen regardless of their size as long as the site size threshold was met.

## **QUESTION 5.2**

### **Overall, will the allocations provide sufficient flexibility to help deliver the spatial strategy?**

5.2.1 Yes the surplus capacity in several of the villages to meet the residual requirement as explained above (see answer to 5.1(iv)), together with the reserve sites identified in Policy C1(B), provide sufficient flexibility to help ensure delivery of the spatial strategy.

5.2.2 The land allocated in Service Centres can accommodate an estimated 1267 dwellings, compared with the overall requirement of 1148 for this tier of settlements, whilst the land allocated in Rural Hubs can accommodate 333 dwellings, compared to the overall requirement of 255 for this tier of settlements. Across the Service Centres and Rural Hubs the allocations provide a 14% buffer above the residual requirement for the rural area, providing flexibility to deliver the required overall number of houses planned, should all

sites not come forward as envisaged, and allowing the Plan to respond to changing circumstances.

- 5.2.3 A limited amount of flexibility is provided within Policy C1(A) through the allocations (a surplus of 223 homes), but the majority of flexibility is provided by the reserve sites (a surplus of 562 homes). There is further inherent flexibility in the site capacities, as some sites, e.g. BOT4 (planning ref: 17/00641/OUT), have or may receive planning permission for higher numbers than indicated by the estimated capacity.

### **QUESTION 5.3**

**Are the specific policy requirements for the site allocations in Appendix 1 justified and effective? Together with the Plan policies as a whole, is there reasonable assurance that the development of the allocations will be sustainable and in accordance with national planning policy?**

- 5.3.1 Yes, the criteria set out in each site specific policy was based on the constraints identified in a particular settlement as well as for each specific site. A structure was set out for each settlement before drawing up the policies, and this is reflected in the reasoned justification in the submitted Local Plan Appendix 1 that appears before the site specific policies. It comprises a short summary on a settlement and its constraints. This together with the specific site assessment conclusions, led to the site specific policies. For example, Long Clawson had limited school places, so the site specific policies for the village included contributions for those through developments. Similarly for Bottesford, flood mitigation measures were included in site specific policies. This is explained clearly in Section 3.11 of Appendix 1.
- 5.3.2 This approach was applied consistently to all the settlements with site specific policies. This was done at Pre Submission Draft stage as well as for the Addendum of Focused Changes stage.
- 5.3.3 The matters identified in the site specific policies are based on proportionate evidence, and ensure deliverability of sites at a specific point in time within the plan period. They are a result of joint working with partners, such as Historic England (see [SCG/1](#)) and are thus considered justified and effective and in accordance with paragraph 182 of NPPF. Also, the site specific policies in Appendix 1 are not to be read in isolation; they are to be read alongside Policies SS1, SS2, SS3, SS4, SS5, SS6 and other policies across the whole plan and the NPPF.
- 5.3.4 Taking the plan policies as a whole, there is reasonable assurance that the development of the allocations will be sustainable and in accordance with national planning policy. The policies have been based on joint working and are deliverable over the plan period. The specific policy requirements for the site allocations in Appendix 1 are justified and effective.

## QUESTION 5.4

### **Is the identification of `reserve sites' in Policy C1 (B) appropriate in principle?**

- 5.4.1 Yes, it is appropriate to provide flexibility.
- 5.4.2 The reserve sites are ones that were identified as suitable and achievable in the site assessment process but ranked just below the ones allocated; they would have been allocated if there was a need for further sites. They are the next most suitable, sustainable and deliverable sites and as such warrant identification, to ensure that the most sustainable pattern of development is promoted in the Plan, should any of the allocations not come forward as planned. The need to release reserve sites would be triggered by the findings of annual monitoring, or in response to specific information received in updating the five year housing land supply position, or should need arise to do an early / part review of the Plan based on the triggers identified in Policy SS6.
- 5.4.3 As explained the reserve sites were identified only to provide flexibility should the allocations fail to deliver due to any reason. This is explained in Appendix 1 of this statement (section 3.10) as well as in para 5.4.7 of the Addendum of Focused Changes ([MBC/G4e ii](#)).

## QUESTION 5.5

### **Has the basis for their identification been robust? Is there clear justification for the identification of the individual sites as reserve sites?**

- 5.5.1 Yes - sites listed in the reserve sites policy have been as rigorously assessed as the rest of the sites within the Policy C1(A) – all were identified as **suitable, available, and achievable** . The ones ranked next highest than those in Policy C1(A) were included in the reserve sites policy.
- 5.5.2 The identification of reserve sites does not preclude other sites coming forward as long as they meet criteria of Policy SS3.
- 5.5.3 The Addendum of Focused Changes identified reserve sites in Melton Mowbray and the service centres, but not for any rural hubs. This change was made to focus the identification of reserve sites in more sustainable higher order locations as per the settlement hierarchy and was determined by suitability, availability and achievability.

## QUESTION 5.6

### **Are the policy criteria of Policy C1(B) justified and effective? How will criteria iii) and iv) be assessed?**

- 5.6.1 Yes, the criteria of the Policy C1(B) are based on proportionate evidence.

5.6.2 Criteria iii) and iv) will be assessed when considering specific planning applications – based on the reaction to publicity from residents, parish councils, and Neighbourhood Plan Groups. Evidence of 'community support' in criteria iii) can also be demonstrated where sites are allocated in Neighbourhood Plans, so a minor modification to the policy wording is suggested in criteria iii) as below:

"evidence of the extent of community support through potential allocation of reserve sites in Neighbourhood Plans;"

5.6.3 A minor modification to the policy is suggested to delete criterion iv) as shown below.

5.6.4 A minor modification is also suggested to delete criterion v) from the Policy as the Plan is to be read as a whole. Policy SS3 was amended at the Focused Change stage to be a series of 'and' clauses rather than 'or's', making it potentially overly restrictive for sites whose suitability and sustainability have already been established.

### **Policy C1 (B): Reserve Sites**

Proposals for new housing development on the reserve sites listed in this policy and identified on the Policies Map, which help to meet the development needs of the Borough and secure the sustainability of the settlement, will be approved where the proposal helps to meet the identified housing target for the settlement, and it is demonstrated that allocated sites and existing permissions are unable to do so.

Where proposals on reserve sites are submitted, assessment will be carried out taking into account the following:

- i. the degree to which the allocated requirement is unmet;
- ii. the likelihood that the allocated sites and outstanding permissions in the relevant settlement category (Melton Mowbray or Service Centre) will be delivered;
- iii. evidence of the extent of community support through potential allocation of reserve sites in Neighbourhood Plans.
- ~~iv. the wider public benefits arising from the development; and~~
- ~~v. compliance with each of the criteria of Policy SS3.~~

END

**EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF FULL COUNCIL**

**19 SEPTEMBER 2016**

**REPORT OF THE HEAD OF REGULATORY SERVICES**

**MELTON LOCAL PLAN : CONSIDERATION OF SITE ALLOCATIONS**

**1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to explain the assessment work carried out on site appraisals of sites put forward in the call for land process, and the resulting proposed site allocations to be formally put forward in the submission stage as part of the production of the Melton Local Plan.

**2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

**2.1 It is recommended that:**

- i) the Local Plan is drafted on the basis of the housing allocations set out at para. 3.7.3 below.**
- ii) the Local Plan is formulated on the basis of site allocations drawn from each of the settlement summaries comprised within Appendix D.**
- iii) Council approves the approach concept of ‘reserve sites’ and inclusion of the draft policy suggestion at section 3.10 below, and additional suitable sites (where available) are allocated accordingly.**
- iv) Council agrees to settlement specific appendices within the Local Plan explaining the choices made and specific policy requirements where necessary , on the basis of the content of Appendix D.**
- v) authority is delegated to the Head of Regulatory Services in consultation with the Local Plans Manager to make consequential amendments to Chapter 4 (‘Growing Melton Borough – The Spatial Strategy’), Policies SS1 and SS2 and Chapter 5 (Melton’s Communities – Strong, Healthy and Vibrant) and related polices, in respect of the content affected by this report.**
- vi) authority is delegated to the Head of Regulatory Services in consultation with the Local Plans Manager to make adjustments to the content comprised in parts (i) – (v) above in the event of the**



**requirement arising from any of the factors set out in section 3.12 of this report, and that any such changes will be presented to Council for approval prior to inclusion in the Draft Plan (Submission version).**

### **3.0 KEY ISSUES**

- 3.1 The spatial distribution strategy was set out at the meeting of Full Council on the 1<sup>st</sup> September 2016 following consideration of a revised approach to the settlement 'roles and relationships' in the Borough, in response to comments made through consultation to the 'Emerging Options' version. The settlement hierarchy provides an approach whereby development is allocated in those settlements that have better access to services, facilities and public transport links when reviewing them with the rural context in which they are located. This is in keeping with the NPPF's key requirement of planning for sustainable development, within the context of the characteristic of the settlements in the area.
- 3.2 The results of the settlement roles and relationships work concluded that, as set out in the table below, the following villages be Service Centres and Rural Hubs:

<b>Service Centres</b>	<b>Rural Hubs</b>
Asfordby	Ab Kettleby
Bottesford	Asfordby Hill
Croxton Kerrial	Easthorpe
Harby	Frisby on the Wreake
Hose	Gaddesby
Long Clawson	Great Dalby
Old Dalby	Thorpe Arnold
Scalford	
Somerby	
Stathern	
Waltham	
Wymondham	

- 3.3 The required number of homes to be delivered in the Borough during the plan period is 6,125, with 65% of those located in Melton Mowbray and the remaining 35% being located elsewhere in the rural area, as previously determined and consulted upon as part of 'Emerging Options'. This equates to 2,144 dwellings to be accommodated in the villages. On 1<sup>st</sup> September Council agreed that 15% of this figure would be attributable to windfall development, a total of 322 dwellings. This leaves 1,822 dwellings to be provided for on allocated sites within the rural area of the Borough.

- 3.4 At the meeting of 1<sup>st</sup> September 2016, it was also agreed that the residual number of dwellings (1,822) would be distributed proportionately across the villages identified as Service Centres, by basing the number of dwellings dependent on existing population size. This approach means that, subject to the availability of suitable sites, each settlement will be allocated a similar level of growth in proportion to the existing population.

Service Centres	Current number of Households	% of population	No. of new dwellings (% of total) allocation)	Rural Hubs	Current number of Households	% of population	No. of new dwellings (% of total) allocation)
Asfordby	1019	16%	290	Ab Kettleby	93	1%	18
Bottesford	1395	23%	419	Asfordby Hill	245	4%	72
Croxton Kerrial	221	4%	72	Easthorpe	133	1%	17
Harby	388	6%	109	Frisby on the Wreake	232	4%	72
Hose	242	4%	72	Gaddesby	159	3%	55
Long Clawson	444	7%	128	Great Dalby	227	4%	72
Old Dalby	148	2%	36	Thorpe Arnold	50	1%	18
Scalford	148	2%	36				
Somerby	228	4%	72				
Stathern	303	5%	91				
Waltham	348	6%	109				
Wymondham	263	4%	72				
<b>Total</b>			<b>1487</b>	<b>Total</b>			<b>343</b>
<b>Grand total</b>				<b>1830</b>			

- 3.5 Figures have been calculated identifying the number of new dwellings to be provided in each settlement based on existing population size. This figure has been amended to take into account dwellings that have been completed or are under construction since the beginning of the Plan period in 2011 and to allow for those dwellings on small sites with an extant planning permission which are yet to be started (full figures located in appendix A). The final

residual requirement that should be allocated in each settlement is identified in the table below:

<b>Service Centre</b>	<b>Residual requirement</b>	<b>Rural Hub</b>	<b>Residual requirement</b>
Asfordby	217	Ab Kettleby	6
Bottesford	373	Asfordby Hill	61
Croxtan Kerrial	68	Easthorpe	17
Harby	84	Frisby on the Wreake	69
Hose	65	Gaddesby	44
Long Clawson	110	Great Dalby	67
Old Dalby	29	Thorpe Arnold	18
Scalford	28		
Somerby	40		
Stathern	83		
Waltham	78		
Wymondham	58		

### 3.6 Site Assessment

- 3.6.1 The 'call for sites' process in preparation for the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) provided a wide range of sites put forward for potential development, all of which have been assessed in detail over the last six months.
- 3.6.2 The assessments conclude whether sites are suitable (green), potentially suitable (amber – this should be interpreted as a site that is suitable but subject to constraint of some description), and unsuitable (red). In addition a narrative is provided describing the constraints applicable in each location and the maps show the implications for the 'amber' sites.
- 3.6.3 A summary of each of the assessments for each site are provided in Appendix B along with the maps which provide a spatial view of the proposed sites. Each assessment includes information on constraints to development in each location which may affect whether sites that are suitable may be affected by wider concerns such as the capacity of infrastructure. Large sites which already have planning permission (or a resolution to grant) are also included in the assessments and these are usually identified as the highest ranked option to meet allocations as they are already committed.

3.6.4 Following this site assessment process it has been identified that there is a shortfall of sites to meet the required number of dwellings in some of the settlements. In some cases this is due to a lack of sites being put forward and in some cases it is due to some sites being put forward not being considered to be suitable.

### 3.7 Shortfall of available and suitable sites

3.7.1 Not all settlements have sufficient allocations with the capacity to meet the residual required number of dwellings. In particular the villages of Scalford and Great Dalby have no available or suitable sites. Of the 19 villages which are identified as Service Centres or Rural Hubs, 5 do not have enough capacity to meet the residual requirement set out. Together these 5 villages, Asfordby, Hose, Scalford, Stathern and Great Dalby, have a shortfall of 162 houses which need to be identified in other locations.

<b>Service Centre</b>	<b>Residual requirement (Adjusted to allow for small sites)</b>	<b>Available sites</b>	<b>+/- Capacity compared with Residual Requirement</b>
<b>Asfordby</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>-36</b>
Bottesford	373	405	+32
Croxton Kerrial	68	103	+35
Harby	84	145	+61
<b>Hose</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>-8</b>
Long Clawson	110	242	+132
Old Dalby	29	95	+66
<b>Scalford</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-28</b>
Somerby	40	102	+62
<b>Stathern</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>-24</b>
Waltham	78	407	+329
Wymondham	58	63	+5

## Appendix 1

<b>Rural Hubs</b>	<b>Residual requirement (Adjusted to allow for small sites)</b>	<b>Available sites</b>	<b>+/- Capacity compared with Residual Requirement</b>
Ab Kettleby	6	41	+35
Asfordby Hill	61	111	+50
Easthorpe	17	22	+5
Frisby on the Wreake	69	184	+115
Gaddesby	44	55	+11
<b>Great Dalby</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-67</b>
Thorpe Arnold	18	119	+101

3.7.2 At its meeting of 1<sup>st</sup> September 2016, Council agreed that the 162 dwelling shortfall should be redistributed amongst the remaining Service Centres and Rural Hubs on a proportionate basis, dependent on population. The villages with capacity above their allocation are identified below along with the proportion of the shortfall that is added to the original residual requirement and the final consolidated number of dwellings required for that settlement:

<b>Settlement</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Population (% of villages with capacity)</b>	<b>Redistributed proportion of deficit (162) (rounded)</b>
<b>Service Centres</b>			
Bottesford	3525	34%	55
Croxton Kerrial	530	5.1%	8
Harby	931	8.9%	14
Long Clawson	1066	10.2%	17
Old Dalby	355	3.4%	6
Somerby	548	5.3%	9
Waltham	836	8%	13
Wymondham	632	6.1%	10
<b>Rural Hubs</b>			
Ab Kettleby	223	2.1%	3
Asfordby Hill	589	5.7%	9
Easthorpe	143	1.3%	2
Frisby on the Wreake	557	5.4%	9
Gaddesby	381	3.7%	6
Thorpe Arnold	120	1.2%	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>10436</b>		<b>163</b>

3.7.3 Following this redistribution of the shortfall, a final figure is therefore calculated as to the number of dwellings to be allocated in each of the settlements.

<b>Service Centre</b>	<b>Revised requirement to allow for redistribution</b>	<b>Rural Hub</b>	<b>Revised requirement to allow for redistribution</b>
Asfordby	<b>181</b>	Ab Kettleby	<b>9</b>
Bottesford	<b>428</b>	Asfordby Hill	<b>70</b>
Croxtan Kerrial	<b>76</b>	Easthorpe	<b>19</b>
Harby	<b>98</b>	Frisby on the Wreake	<b>78</b>
Hose	<b>57</b>	Gaddesby	<b>50</b>
Long Clawson	<b>127</b>	Great Dalby	<b>0</b>
Old Dalby	<b>35</b>	Thorpe Arnold	<b>20</b>
Scalford	<b>0</b>		
Somerby	<b>49</b>		
Stathern	<b>57</b>		
Waltham	<b>91</b>		
Wymondham	<b>68</b>		

**Appendix D to this report provides a breakdown of the sites that are required to accommodate these sites.**

### **3.8 Site Allocations**

3.8.1 From the site assessment process described at section 3.6 above, sites have been allocated to reach the quantity described in the above table. In each case, sites have been 'ranked' as to their suitability and the sites proposed for allocation reflect this order. In several cases there are a greater number of suitable sites than the allocation requires, so the allocation is limited to only those needed to meet the allocation.

3.8.2 Sites have not been subdivided in order to exactly match the allocation and as a result small surpluses arise in a limited number of locations.

### **3.9 Sites in Melton Mowbray**

3.9.1 The Emerging Options consultation document proposed that 65% of the overall growth would be accommodated within Melton Mowbray (3,980 houses) and that 1,500 and 2,000 would be accommodated within Sustainable Neighbourhoods to the north and south of the town respectively.

3.9.2 The SHLAA submission and assessment included sites within Melton Mowbray and these have also been assessed following the same approach described in section 3.6 above. The results are included in Appendix B. This has identified suitable sites for some 723 dwellings and potential for a further Strategic Allocation of in excess of 1,000 dwellings. The Working Group was invited to determine whether – for reasons relating to deliverability, 5 year land supply and flexibility – the Local Plan should proceed on the basis of allocating all these sites (except the strategic allocation), or alternatively to limit them to the target set out in Emerging Options, i.e to select sites (outside the areas of the Sustainable Neighbourhoods) with a combined capacity of 480 only. These sites are likely to come forward during the lifetime of the plan and would be considered suitable in principle because they are located within the most sustainable settlement.

3.9.3 The Working Group recommended that we proceed on this basis and the resultant site allocations are included in Appendix D

### **3.10 Reserve Sites**

3.10.1 Whilst the Local Plan as a whole will include a methodology for monitoring and trigger points for review, it is considered good practice to build in flexibility within the plan itself to allow for a more robust approach and to ‘insulate’ the need for review arising from relatively minor shortcomings in delivery, e.g. if an allocated site should become unavailable, problems of a detailed nature are identified at application stage or it is significantly delayed.

3.10.2 The assessment of all potential sites means that an opportunity arose to identify where additional ‘reserve sites’ might be suitable in the event that more sites were needed. This provides some flexibility for the Local Plan, in the case that allocated sites became undeliverable, there is capacity that can still be demonstrated and released by a specific policy allowing this, subject to evidence being provided to identify why the original allocated site has become undeliverable. A capacity for a further 380 dwellings have been identified in the Reserve Site Allocations.

3.10.3 It is proposed to include in the Plan ‘reserve sites’ to offer this flexibility and additional resilience within the plan itself. These would be identified within the plan and distinguished from the favoured allocation and would come into play in a defined set of circumstances. An additional policy will be required to define the circumstances in which the reserve sites are applicable. Council is invited to consider the following:

#### **Reserve sites:**

Proposals on reserve sites identified in the Plan which help to meet the development needs of the Borough and secure the sustainability of the settlement, will be approved where the proposal:

- Helps to meet the identified housing target for the settlement where it is demonstrated that allocated sites and existing permissions are unable to do so.

### **3.11 Specific policies**

3.11.1 In order to provide a settlement specific approach to identify and deal with individual constraints affecting that village and/or to sites within it, it is recommended that a settlement specific policy is included in the Local Plan. This policy will explain the particular circumstances of each settlement including service and facility capacity constraints and identify the phased release of allocated sites based on particular factors, individual site requirements or other such 'pre-requisites' . An example of this would be the capacity of schools to accommodate future growth; i.e. only when capacity can be identified, allocated sites will be released for development, or a design or layout consideration applicable to a particular site.

3.11.2 Details of these narratives and the applicable sites are contained within Appendix D to this report.

### **3.12 Other matters**

3.12.1 Members attention is drawn to the fact that there is a degree of fluidity to the exercises contained within this report, for example new sites can become available at any time or indeed those already considered could be withdrawn. In addition, work is ongoing on the viability and infrastructure requirements for the area and additional evidence continues to be received. In all of these cases the suitability and/or deliverability of the sites identified could be affected. It is therefore requested that delegated authority is approved to develop and if necessary depart from the content of this report (and its



appendices) if required by such events. Please note however that the final version(s) will be submitted for consideration by Full Council as part of the complete Draft Plan (Submission Version) for approval prior to publishing for consultation in the latter part of 2016.

#### **4.0 POLICY AND CORPORATE CONSIDERATIONS**

4.1 The Melton Local Plan Emerging Options consultation in January – April 2016 provided the vehicle to engage with people on the preferred approach to addressing the issues and challenges which need to be dealt with through the Local Plan.

4.2 A Sustainability Appraisal Report (Preferred Options) will be prepared and published alongside the Draft Local Plan. This will test and assist with testing and refining the alternative approaches and assessing their social, economic and environmental effects.

#### **5.0 FINANCIAL AND OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 There are no significant unknown financial or resource implications arising from this report. The Local Plan will be an intensive exercise, which will have a significant resource implication. However this will be met through the existing budget provisions.

#### **6.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS/POWERS**

6.1 The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework require that plans are prepared based on evidence. The site allocations have been assessed and information about the capacity of settlement facilities has been informed by consultation responses and with engagement through Reference Groups, Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Development Panels. This community engagement is a requirement of Regulation 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (as amended) 2004 and the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012.

#### **7.0 COMMUNITY SAFETY**

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

#### **8.0 EQUALITIES**

8.1 The site allocations have been developed to inform the production of policy rather than them being a policy in themselves. For that reason it will have little impact upon Equalities. The Submission version that will be influenced by the

Appendix 1

spatial hierarchy and distribution strategy will however require an Equalities Assessment.

**9.0 RISKS**

L I	A	Very High				

Appendix 1

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

**IMPACT**

<b>Risk No</b>	<b>Risk Description</b>
1	People who responded to the consultation and were involved in the Reference Groups and Neighbourhood Development Panels are not satisfied with the changes made and the response provided and will repeat their points at Submission Plan stage
2	The results of the site assessment work provide site allocations which may cause fresh representations to be received, with particular areas of land being identified specifically.

**10.0 CLIMATE CHANGE**

## Appendix 1

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

### 11.0 CONSULTATION

11.1 The Submission Version of the Local plan will be subject to a statutory 6 week consultation in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012.

### 12.0 WARDS AFFECTED

12.1 All Wards are affected.

Contact Officer: J Worley, Head of Regulatory Services

Date: 9th September 2016

Appendices: Appendix A – Table of villages including population, permissions and housing completions since 2011  
Appendix B - Site Assessments and associated maps  
Appendix C – Summary List of Allocated Sites  
Appendix D - site allocations and specific policies – **TO FOLLOW**

## **AGENDA ITEM 3E**

### **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 6<sup>th</sup> 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 19<sup>th</sup> 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 5<sup>th</sup> 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 a way 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), Scalford (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 Scalford and Stathern have had new sites put forward since the original assessments were carried out. Stathern would now meet its own allocation with some surplus and Scalford 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 is 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 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 the 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 30<sup>th</sup> 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**

<b>L I K E L I H O O D</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>Very High</b>				
	<b>B</b>	<b>High</b>				
	<b>C</b>	<b>Significant</b>			2	
	<b>D</b>	<b>Low</b>			1	

<b>E</b>	<b>Very Low</b>		3		
<b>F</b>	<b>Almost Impossible</b>				
		<b>Negligible 1</b>	<b>Marginal 2</b>	<b>Critical 3</b>	<b>Catastrophic 4</b>

**IMPACT**

<b>Risk No</b>	<b>Risk Description</b>
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: 23<sup>rd</sup> 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

