
MELTON LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION 2018

WRITTEN STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF MR STEPHEN LEE AND THE VB TRUST

MATTER 5: OTHER HOUSING ALLOCATIONS (POLICY C1(A) AND APPENDIX 1) AND RESERVE SITES (POLICY C1(B) AND APPENDIX 1)

Paragraph 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?

1. Our clients agree that the Council have identified an appropriate selection of sites based on sites submitted through the emerging Local Plan process.

Paragraph 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?

2. An outline planning application for residential development at EAST2 has been submitted and is currently pending determination (application reference 17/00996/OUT). The application is for up to 18 dwellings, which is considered to be a suitable density whilst still making an efficient use of land and without giving rise to the appearance or experience of coalescence between Easthorpe with Bottesford. Previous representations made on behalf of our clients supported the development of the site for in the region of 20 dwellings. Whilst this is an outline planning application, an illustrative masterplan has been submitted with the application to show how it could be developed.
3. The requirements for EAST2 set out at Appendix 1 are broadly considered to be justified and effective. The submitted application documents, including the illustrative masterplan show that the site can be developed in accordance with these requirements.

4. It is noted that the recently submitted Statement of Common Ground between Melton Borough Council and Historic England agrees on a further requirement to be included for EAST2: *“that the existing frontage planting is retained and access is taken off the track between the sites EAST1 and EAST2, to safeguard the setting of the scheduled monument to the north.”* This requirement is considered to be justified and accords with the findings of the archaeological assessment submitted as part of the application; that the northern hedgerow and planting provides a visual boundary between the site and the SAM. EAST2 is capable of being developed in such a way, as shown on the submitted illustrative layout.
5. The requirement for flood mitigation measures and drainage infrastructure is considered to be justified and a suitable scheme is considered possible. The Local Plan Inspector should note that the Council has undertaken a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2016) and accompanying addendum (2017). EAST2 is assessed as being predominantly within Flood Zone 1 and it is capable of providing all residential development within Flood Zone 1. The Council has also produced a sequential flood risk assessment to support the Local Plan and the allocation of EAST2.
6. The site is capable of being developed whilst also retaining the four TPO trees, as set out in the application submission. A full arboricultural method statement and arboricultural impact assessment is expected to be conditioned, as requested by the highway authority.
7. It is considered that the proposed requirement for “suitable measures to ensure that there will be **no** adverse impacts to protected species” would be better worded as “suitable measures to ensure that adverse impacts to protected species would be minimised and provide enhancements where possible” would be more in keeping with the NPPF. The county ecologist has no objection to the development of the site subject to conditions.
8. The requirement for sensitive boundary treatment requires further justification from the Council, as the Council’s own assessment at Appendix 1 confirms *“the site is not important for views into or out of the village and relates well to the existing pattern of development.”* Notwithstanding the requirement for more justification, the site would be capable of being developed to incorporate boundary treatment.