

para 1 These comments pertain to the Inspector's Guidance Notes on whether the LP can be considered sound on the basis of **justification [4.b]** in responding to the following examiner questions.

para 2 5 .1 iii] The selected sites FRIS2 and FRIS3 remain in the LP, despite clear major difficulties with both .It is entirely illogical that an alternative site [designated FRIS1A] and which has no significant difficulties is not supported in the LP. yet is the preferred option in *Frisby Neighbourhood Plan [NP]*. The question must be asked as to why this site has not been supported in the Local Plan [LP] when FRIS1 and FRIS2 have both been the subject of planning objections from the community.

We can only suspect bias in the absence of justification.

para 3 **FRIS 2 [Water Lane]**

The entrance to this site is only 35m from a busy railway crossing .

Network Rail have commented with concerns about safety.

ORR [safety regulator for road and rail] normally require a **minimum of 150m** from a level crossing .Network Rail have commented that the site entrance be moved as far as possible from the crossing.

Incredulously , the response of MBC was to state that **40 metres was as far as possible**. This was suggested as being satisfactory in the documents submitted to MB councillors!

Cavalier at best, but universally considered alarmingly dangerous by Frisby residents who are familiar with the site.

para4 There are also significant flood issues as it is partly Flood zone 2. MBC have been alerted to the need to apply a " Sequential Test" to this site but have failed to do this when clearly it is necessary

para5 **FRIS 3**

This site also has flood issues ,and currently has planning approval in principle with the proviso that a satisfactory solution to surface water flooding is provided. This approval is currently with the secretary of State whilst deciding whether to call-in the application. There are also issues regarding access which necessitates a change of traffic priorities .

para6 **Summary**

The Parish Council are perplexed as to why FRIS 2 and FRIS 3 are being pursued in the face of widespread opposition locally when a sustainable alternative has support as evidenced by the developing NP.

para7 SOLUTION Changing the Plan

The Parish Council merely request that the Local Plan is seen to incorporate those policies in the NP which are not at Strategic variance with the LP.
This is considered as especially relevant to the choice of development sites.