

**EXAMINATION – MATTERS AND QUESTIONS
MELTON LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION
STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF:
MARSH TRUST
LAND AT BOTTESFORD/EASTHORPE

MATTER 2: Overall Spatial Strategy
(Policy SS3)**

Martin S Herbert FRICS FAAV
Brown & Co
Granta Hall
Finkin Street
Grantham
Lincolnshire
NG31 8LD

Telephone: (01476) 514444 Facsimile: (01476) 594242

Brown & Co Ref: MSH/Imm/4/697 OPT/PRO

Date: January 2018

COPYRIGHT

The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of **Brown & Co**

MATTER 2: Overall Spatial Strategy

We have made representations to the Pre-submission version of the Plan in respect of land at Bottesford/Easthorpe. Asbury Planning, on behalf of BDW, have submitted representations and statements for the Inquiry and in respect of land they hold under Option owned by our client. In this we are addressing one other specific issue which relates to Policy SS3.

In the Matters and Questions Paper for the Examination, Question 2.2 states:

2.2 Does Policy SS3 provide effective guidance for development proposals on unallocated sites in/on the edge of existing rural settlements? How will the risk of inconsistency with the development strategy from repeated application of the policy be assessed?

Our concern as identified in the representations submitted is based upon the fact that the policy is not as clear as was in the earlier draft and it also seems to interlink with strategic proposals for Neighbourhood Plans. If it is not intended to do so, then the wording and the headings should be clearer. Specifically the focus changes at 4.2.16 state:

Development on Unallocated Sites in the Rural Area

4.2.16 Where no sites are allocated for new housing, schemes may be permitted where they demonstrably meet identified needs and/or help to sustain local services or facilities....

The words at the start **“where no sites are allocated for new housing”** is misleading and confusing. Also, there should be a greater presumption in terms of permitting development. The policy that schemes may be permitted **“where the demonstrably meet identified needs”** is in practice extremely difficult to satisfy and produce evidence. These words could frustrate development in sustainable locations. If it conforms with other Plan Policies, as was legislated for in the earlier draft **“that it is consistent with the development strategy”** that would mean that sustainable development in the right locations would be achieved and would help to sustain local services and facilities.

The wording in the policy thereafter is largely in accordance with what was provided for in the Submission Draft before the Focused Changes.

We contend that the policy should be taken back to the earlier draft and should not come under the heading of Neighbourhood plans. That would make the policy clear and consistent with other development strategies and policies within the Plan.