

Response ID ANON-13H4-7YEV-B

Submitted to **Melton Local Plan Pre-Submission Draft**
Submitted on **2016-12-19 13:49:51**

About you

1 What is your name?

Name:
Colin Love

2 What is your email address?

Email:
[REDACTED]

3 Are you responding as an individual, consultee, stakeholder or other?

Resident, Other

If Consultee, Stakeholder, or Other, please give details here. :
Member of MBC LP Environment Reference Group, Member of Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

4 Address

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

5 Age

Please select your age:
[REDACTED]

Chapter 1: Introduction

1 CH1Q1: Do you consider that Chapter 1 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::
Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::
Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:
Yes

2 CH1Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH1Q3: Please give details of why you consider Chapter 1 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Chapter 1 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :
I think that throughout the document the word should be Consistent - Not consistant.

I consider that, overall, this Melton Plan is a very thorough document and should be approved.

My comments are to indicate where I think there is scope for modification and/or improvement before final submission.

I have made particular references to where I think that the number of houses currently intended to be allocated to Bottesford is inappropriate and in all cases I have provided my reasoning.

4 CH1Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make Chapter 1 legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make Chapter 1 legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Chapter 2 - Melton Borough Today – A Portrait

1 CH2Q1: Do you consider that Chapter 2 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH2Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared

3 CH2Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy Chapter 2 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Chapter 2 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

The important intention of 2.3.2 is clear - to demonstrate the 'problems' of the low skill base of many of the Melton workforce. However, the wording of the paragraph, to my reading and understanding, does not constitute logical, deductive reasoning - especially the last three lines.

Section 2.4 refers to the Bottesford railway line as having 'a good connection to Grantham'.

Clearly what constitutes 'good' is a subjective judgement. Nonetheless, it can be argued with evidence from the published timetable that it is not the case that the connection is 'good'. It may be regular - but at not necessarily convenient times from early morning until late in the evening on weekdays and may be considered even more inconvenient at weekends. It must be noted that many trains from and to Grantham pass through Bottesford without stopping.

2.3.3 Should start there IS a growing number - not there are -

2.3.5 It is unclear why four villages are identified by name as Rural Service Centres when the text continues to say that 'other larger villages particularly to the south of the Borough perform a similar role' - but these are not identified. If they perform 'a similar role' then this has a particular significance for the potential allocation of housing to Rural Service Centres beyond Bottesford, Asfordby, Long Clawson and Waltham.

2.6.6 Unlike Melton, the library in Bottesford is only a Community supported library with annually diminishing financial support from LC C and its future has to be considered uncertain.

2.6.7 Of course, in the north of the Borough, i.e. Bottesford, there is no requirement for a 'park' because the surrounding countryside is a natural park - with easy access to a substantial network of footpaths, the Grantham canal walk and other riverside walks along with a variety of children's playgrounds, adult gym and skate park. The concept of a 'park' as understood in the text of this Draft Plan is only appropriate to urban areas, not to villages situated in rural settings .

4 CH2Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make Chapter 2 legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make Chapter 2 legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

2.3.2 Could be expressed with greater detail and more clarity and deductive reasoning.

The objective within the Plan is to raise the skill level of new employment opportunities within the Borough, not remain embedded in the present predominantly low skill manufacturing base. This is not apparent in the present text.

2.4 Should be reworded that Bottesford has a regular, but not necessarily convenient, rail connection to Grantham.

2.6.6 Change to Community Library

2.6.7 Re-think the purpose of making reference to 'parks' in the northern part of the Borough. Imposing a 'park' in a village context only contributes to the urbanisation of the village character.

Chapter 3: Vision and Strategic Priorities

1 CH3Q1: Do you consider that Chapter 3 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH3Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 2) Justified

3 CH3Q3: Please give details of why you consider Chapter 3 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Chapter 3 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

Strategic Issue 8. Of course, in the north of the Borough, i.e. Bottesford, there is no requirement for a 'park' because the surrounding countryside is a natural park - with easy access to a substantial network of footpaths, the Grantham Canal walk and other riverside walks along with a variety of children's playgrounds, adult gym and skate park. The concept of a 'park' as understood in the text of this Draft Plan is only appropriate to urban areas, not to villages situated in rural settings .

4 CH3Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make Chapter 3 legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make Chapter 3 legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

3.3.2 Bullet point Focus our work in the priority areas - unclear what is meant by 'work'.

Chapter 4: Growing Melton Borough – The Spatial Strategy

1 CH4Q1: Do you consider that Chapter 4 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH4Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH4Q3: Please give details of why you consider Chapter 4 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Chapter 4 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4.2.18 Whilst the proposal to develop 'a proportionate' approach to housing allocation might, at first reasoning, seem appropriate planning policy it is open to question and challenge in some circumstances. Such a circumstance can be considered in Bottesford - a village that is recognised by the EA as the lowest point within the Borough and thus highly susceptible to the risk of flood. and that has had a major flood event in 2001 and a Flood Warning in 2012.

The historic growth of Bottesford was originally based on local organic growth. More recently, in the latter part of the 20th century, when there was far less concern about the environment and the use of cars, it was allowed to grow without the current urgent considerations for sustainability. The 'rules of the game' were different then. Now we are 'playing' to the new environment sustainability rules. According to these new 'rules', the past growth of Bottesford to its present size must NOT and cannot be the basis of justification for the 'proportionate' allocation of houses.

Such 'proportionality' will have the inevitable consequence of promoting rather than minimising daily travel requirements - contrary to Policies within this draft Plan.

Additionally, because a village is already relatively 'large' and has a range of facilities does not, by definition, mean that it can 'absorb' a further substantial number of houses. Bottesford has a relatively small and tight village centre with very restricted opportunities for additional retail outlets and limited opportunities for the additional parking facilities that further housing development would require. In planning terms, Bottesford can be considered to be already at its optimum

functional size. Further substantial development, such as that proposed, would seriously damage this optimum functionality. Hence, as in the case of Bottesford, the application of a 'proportionate' approach across the Borough without further evaluation of other specific planning features is an inappropriate and unacceptable process of housing allocation.

Bottesford is a thriving village community. However, WITH THE PROPOSED SCALE OF GROWTH within this draft Melton Plan, BOTTESFORD WILL BEGIN TO LOSE ITS ESSENTIALLY VILLAGE CHARACTER THROUGH DETRIMENTAL URBANISING INFLUENCES. This is totally contrary to the wishes of the residents of the Parish who have made it clear to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, through the processes of extensive consultation, that they want Bottesford to remain a village.

Such a substantial growth (by more than a third) as is currently proposed within the Plan for Bottesford is also contrary to Chapter 3 of this document where, within the section on Delivering the Vision, it states that MBC will 'Respect the individual character and distinctiveness of Melton Borough's villages'. Growth by a third would radically alter the character of Bottesford.

It has to be appreciated that even at the figure of 300 houses, as originally proposed in the Issues and Options document, this number of houses, if placed in the wrong areas of Bottesford, would have a very detrimental urbanising effect on the character and approaches to the village. It was this consideration that led the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to engage CABE as consultants to advise on the location(s) that would do least harm and even enhance the character of the village. Without qualification, they recommended the use of the full Rectory Farm SHLAA site as mapped in the Emerging Options document.

This site is contained, so will not encourage the village to sprawl or spoil the main approaches to the village. Its topography, with its winding river, encourages an unregimented layout. It can be well connected to the centre of the village by footpaths and cycle routes and also form part of the projected Sustrans route to Kilvington.

Further, it could provide much needed parking for the adjacent Methodist Church.

Perhaps surprisingly, maybe uniquely, the land agent for the site has engaged a design consultant, Stefan Kruckowski (the author of Building for Life 12) who, at the agent's expense, has organised a series of design workshops with the participation of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to draw up a site Master Plan that would, inter alia, take advantage of the topography and respect the proximity of the existing mid-20th century housing estate. This site would bring areas of Public Open Space and play areas to the existing housing development in the west end of the village that currently has no such facilities.

Such is the potential of this site to enhance the village that it is essential that as much of the site area as possible is confirmed as suitable for house building. This will require the challenging of Historic England's submission relating to heritage.

I SUPPORT THE REJECTION OF ALL OF THE SITES WITHIN BOTTESFORD PARISH THAT MBC HAS IDENTIFIED AS 'REJECTED' AND THE GROUNDS ON WHICH THEY HAVE BEEN REJECTED.

4 CH4Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make Chapter 4 legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make Chapter 4 legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

The wording should refer to a policy of a 'proportionate approach' applied only when and where it is considered appropriate to the existing settlement's capacity to absorb the additional numbers without detriment to its present village character and local internal infrastructure along with identified and potential flood risk.

The housing allocation for Bottesford should revert to the 300 residual figure as originally set out in the Issues and Options document and to which the Draft Neighbourhood Plan is working in accordance with the wishes of the Parish residents.

Policy SS1 - Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development

1 CH4PSS1Q1: Do you consider that Policy SS1 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH4PSS1Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH4PSS1Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy SS1 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy SS1 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

Whilst acknowledging the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development, sustainability is, in itself, is an inadequate consideration. The Melton Plan must make sure that, however 'sustainable' a development might promise to be, it should not be granted permission unless it also meets all of the high quality design criteria including appropriateness to the local setting, referred to in other sections of this document, for example Policy D1.

4 CH4PSS1Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy SS2 – Development Strategy

1 CH4PSS2Q1: Do you consider that Policy SS2 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH4PSS2Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH4PSS2Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy SS2 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy SS2 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

Whilst the first Local Plan submission was not accepted, in part because the allocation of housing development of 'only' 20% to the rural areas was considered inadequate, no evidence based justification has been given for the present intention to allocate 35% to the rural areas. Since the non-acceptance of the first Melton Plan submission, there has been a substantial increase in national concern to ensure that the delivery of 'sustainability' is applied to all new developments. A significant component of 'sustainability' is the 'travel to work' factor. Whilst the 20% figure of development in rural areas might, with some justification, be considered too low a percentage, the 'sustainability' of 35% can similarly be considered too high if this would involve a substantial number of additional 'travel to work' journey miles, most probably by car, to an urban centre of employment.

This can be demonstrated by the example of Bottesford - a village that is acknowledged as being primarily a commuter village and the furthest Service Centre from Melton. The proposed 'proportionate' allocation to Bottesford of the rural 35% would far outnumber the local housing needs as evidenced by the Midland Rural Housing Needs assessment (commissioned by MBC) and consequently add substantially to the 'travel to work' mileage and hence contribute to 'unsustainability'.

Therefore, on sustainability grounds alone, there is a justification for a reduction in the percentage allocated to Bottesford and a percentage higher than the 65% currently being allocated to Melton as the acknowledged core centre for present employment and future employment growth within Melton Borough.

4 CH4PSS2Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy SS3 – Sustainable Communities (unallocated sites)

1 CH4PSS3Q1: Do you consider that Policy SS3 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH4PSS3Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH4PSS3Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy SS3 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy SS3 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH4PSS3Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy SS5 – Melton Mowbray North Sustainable Neighbourhood

1 CH4SS5Q1: Do you consider that Policy SS5 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

2 CH4SS5Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH4SS5Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy SS5 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy SS5 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH4SS5Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy SS6 – Alternative Development Strategies and Local Plan Review

1 CH4SS6Q1: Do you consider that Policy SS6 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH4SS6Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH4SS6Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy SS6 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy SS6 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

The land to the west of Melton Mowbray should be prioritised as it is close to the core hub of employment in Melton.

The 'suitable' small sites within the rural area should be confined to the currently designated 'Reserve sites'.

4 CH4SS6Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

The 'suitable' small sites within the rural area currently designated as 'Reserve sites'.

Chapter 5: Melton's Communities – Strong, Healthy and Vibrant

1 CH5Q1: Do you consider that Chapter 5 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH5Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH5Q3: Please give details of why you consider Chapter 5 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Chapter 5 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH5Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make Chapter 5 legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make Chapter 5 legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy C2 It is pleasing to see that developments that include bungalows will be particularly supported. National house building figures confirm a dramatic decline in the build of bungalows over the past decade because developers claim they cannot make 'adequate' profit on them. Given the caveat that developments must be 'economically viable', how is it proposed within the Plan to go beyond the MBC 'welcoming' bungalows to actually demanding them - as with social housing?

Policy C2 - wheel chair access - is this comment applied only to the housing for which MBC is responsible? Within the Plan, should not all new developments be required to comply with a requirement for wheel chair access? (Future-proofing).

5.7 National Space Standards. It is my understanding that the UK has had an ongoing reduction in house internal space during the past decades - often 'disguised' by builders not installing internal walls and thus creating an illusion of 'space'. This has led to the UK having residential units amongst the lowest, if not the lowest, internal living spaces in Europe.

This will leave a totally unacceptable architectural legacy for future generations.

The Local Plan should be far more positive and assertive in requiring the best areas of living space as possible - and not be swayed by developers' well rehearsed arguments that they cannot afford to provide houses with reasonable internal space.

Further, it should be a requirement that there is easy and safe internal access to all roof spaces that must be designed and lined for storage (not roof conversions).

Policy C1 (A) – Housing Allocations

1 CH5PC1(A)Q1: Do you consider that Policy C1 (A) is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH5PC1(A)Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH5PC1(A)Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy C1 (A) – Housing Allocations is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy C1 (A) – Housing Allocations or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

Bottesford and Easthorpe

Bottesford Parish (which includes the four villages of Normanton, Muston, Easthorpe and Bottesford) has been allocated a residual build of 427 houses for Bottesford and Easthorpe a further 22, - 449 total plus any 'windfall additions. The Plan period build for the villages of Bottesford and Easthorpe is thus nearly 500 houses. This figure has been arrived at in a mechanistic manner - the 'proportionate' process of calculation referred to in Section 4, paras 4.2.15, 4.2.18 - 4.2.22, whereby houses are allocated to Social Hubs in accordance with the present size of the settlement. However this mechanistic process would result in a 33% growth of the Parish and a proportionately larger growth in Bottesford. This takes no, or little, account of the capacity of Bottesford to accommodate such a substantial increase in housing and the consequent negative impact on the village structure and character. The Draft Neighbourhood Plan evidence base clearly indicates that the parish residents do not want Bottesford to become, or be on its way, to becoming, a small town.

Chapter 3 Environment Objective 19 states that within the Borough, development should be avoided in areas prone to flooding.

Bottesford is, according to the Environment Agency, the lowest lying area of the Borough and, with three significant waterways, is categorised as a High Risk Flood Area. This was evidenced in 2001, when Bottesford and Easthorpe were subject to a major flood and in 2012 when an EA Flood Warning was issued.

The EA has formally stated, in evidence to a Parliamentary Select Committee, that in the context of climate change, the present designation of areas subject to 100 year flood events is now inadequate and that it is intending to undertake, in 2017, an updating of Bottesford Flood Risk Assessment.

As was demonstrated in 2001, it is not simply a question of houses being flooded, the entire centres of both Bottesford, including Belvoir Road, and Easthorpe were flooded hence making access to the schools and retail facilities virtually impossible, and great difficulty travelling out of the village. Therefore it is inadequate for MBC to argue that it has undertaken a flood risk assessment on each development site. The assessment has to be applied to the entire land area of the parish.

7.22.3 of this document indicates that areas within the Borough that are not subject to flood risk should be sequentially preferred to those that flood. For example, Waltham, which does not flood and has a reserved site for 168 houses, should be sequentially used in preference to the high flood risk area of Bottesford.

Further, locating a greater proportion of house development in villages closer to Melton than Bottesford would have the potential to offer far more to the Melton economy (in support of Chapter 6) as well as to reduce the 'travel to work' mileage and consequently enhance environment sustainability.

4 CH5PC1(A)Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Significantly reduce the housing allocation to Bottesford to 300 as originally indicated in the Emerging Options document.

Policy C1 (B); Reserve Sites

1 CH5PC1(B)Q1: Do you consider that Policy C1 (B); Reserve Sites is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH5PC1(B)Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH5PC1(B)Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy C1 (B); Reserve Sites is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy C1 (B); Reserve Sites or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

The Melton Plan policy clearly states that building should avoid areas subject to flooding. This must be understood as not only referring to specific SHLAA and other potential sites but also the general area in which these sites are located.

The house allocation for the Borough should not prioritise simply on the basis of 'proportionality' to the identified Rural Service Centre but prioritise on the recognised flood risk.

It has been shown elsewhere in this response that Bottesford Parish is a High Risk area for flooding. The 2001 flood not only affected individual properties but also the centres of Bottesford and Easthorpe and also parts of the Muston road network. This made access to the schools, retail facilities and industrial units precarious and, indeed, impossible.

The Melton Plan should look first at the total number of sites identified for potential development within the Borough, including those currently designated Reserve sites, and allocate the housing according to those at LEAST risk of flooding. Thus, for example, according to available evidence, Waltham is not designated as liable to flooding - but has a reserve site of 168 houses. In contrast, Bottesford with an acknowledged High Flood Risk across the parish area has the largest allocation of houses.

This makes no long-term planning sense - especially in an era of progressive climate change when it is forecast that the risk of flooding will increase,.

Additionally, using at least some of the presently designated Reserve sites that are closer to Melton than Bottesford would make a greater contribution to the core of Melton's plan for economic development within the town (Chapter 6) because those residents would be much more likely to identify with, and occupy, the employment opportunities within the town.

4 CH5PC1(B)Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy C2 – Housing Mix

1 CH5PC2Q1: Do you consider that Policy C2 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH5PC2Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH5PC2Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy C2 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy C2 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

To my understanding, presently both of these Regulations are voluntary - not mandatory.

It can be considered that within the current text of the Local Plan it is difficult, if not impossible, to see how the MBC could enforce a private developer to undertake building even to Standard M4(2).

Of course, the MBC can, for itself, set and build to the standard of M4(3). But, recognising the socially thoughtful underpinning that has led these new national Regulations - both M4(2) and M4(3) - it seems totally wrong that the Melton Plan, as currently drafted, only refers to retirement, sheltered and care homes as being required to be built to standard M4(2). There are many less physically able people who could remain, and would wish to remain, in their own private accommodation if that accommodation was built to M4(2) standards. This would be even more the situation if all new private housing was built to M4(3) standards. (Future-proof development).

It must also be recognised that these provisions would be to meet the requirements of not only residents but also visitors to those residents.

4 CH5PC2Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to

co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

The text should indicate that special preference will be given to developers who undertake to build all new houses to the Regulation M4(2) standard as a minimum.

The text should also indicate that special preference will be given to planning applications that include bungalows - also built to M4(2) standards as a minimum.

Policy C3 – National Space Standard and Smaller Dwellings

1 CH5PC3Q1: Do you consider that Policy C3 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH5PC3Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH5PC3Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy C3 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy C3 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

This is an excellent Policy - even more so if it can also require ABOVE the national space standard. The present standard still results in little more than small boxes and, as far as I understand, falls short of even the mid 20th century Parker Morris standards.

See:

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/jan/07/live-shoeboxes-housing-standards-minimum-space>

4 CH5PC3Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy C4 – Affordable Housing Provision

1 CH5PC4Q1: Do you consider that Policy C4 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH5PC4Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH5PC4Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy C4 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy C4 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

There are times when I despair!

The whole issue of so-called 'affordable' housing is open to the well rehearsed discussion - what is meant by 'affordable'?

What is not in doubt is that many people, not necessarily young people, cannot afford to buy a house. But of course, historically, buying a house - let alone the consideration that everybody has the 'right' to buy a house - was not the norm. Most people rented - with a substantial section of that rented accommodation

being supplied through Local Authority housing.

Now the Policy C4 text says that the MBC will only ENDEAVOUR to achieve the 37% subject to 'market conditions, economic viability and other infrastructure requirements'.

The developers are well rehearsed in creative accounting to demonstrate 'not economically viable' in their favour to make profit.

In the overall hierarchy of social values there is no 'right to buy'. However, it is considered in our present British society that people have a right to have accommodation. In a caring society that right to be accommodated must take priority over the right for developers to make a profit. Towards this end, to my reading, there is no evidence within this Draft Plan for the provision of 'not for profit' Local Authority (MBC) provided housing for rent to meet the local demand.

4 CH5PC4Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy C5 – Affordable Housing through Rural Exception Sites

1 CH5PC5Q1: Do you consider that Policy C5 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH5PC5Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH5PC5Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy C5 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy C5 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

The text here presents a substantial problem.

It says, in particular reference to Rural Exception Sites, that 'In some circumstances (most likely due to viability), it will be acceptable to provide an element of market housing on rural exception sites, to cross subsidise the affordable housing'.

This opens up the same 'door' to economic and social bribery by developers that they demonstrate in non-exception sites. That is, 'we will build affordables if you let us build non-affordables'!

Developers are very well practised in 'creative accounting' in attempting to illustrate that, without market housing, a site would be 'not viable'.

If it was confirmed that no market housing would be allowed, then the land value would be less expensive and the viability model would change in favour of the 'affordables'.

MBC must not lie down in its Local Plan and accept the potential social and economic 'rape' by the developers.

4 CH5PC5Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy C7 – Rural Services

1 CH5PC7Q1: Do you consider that Policy C7 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH5PC7Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH5PC7Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy C7 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy C7 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH5PC7Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy C8 – Self Build and Custom Build Housing

1 CH5PC8Q1: Do you consider that Policy C8 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH5PC8Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 3) Effective

3 CH5PC8Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy C8 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy C8 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

My hypothesis is that anyone wanting to 'self-build' will want to undertake the work and investment in a relatively favourable location.

It is my understanding that it is not unknown for developers to allocate the least desirable plots as available for 'self-build'. This then results in those plots remaining unsold and then, after the prescribed period, the developer takes them back.

This right to 'take back' after 12 months is presently contained in the wording of Policy C8.

Any such outcome would be against achieving the fundamental objective of Policy C8 - ensuring the successful outcome of self-build.

To achieve a high degree of successful outcome of Policy C8, it is necessary for the Policy to include some form of wording that ensures that those plots made available for self-build are amongst the most desirable - not the least desirable.

The proposed Rectory Farm development in Bottesford, as a site of over 100 houses, would provide an ideal opportunity for imaginative, high quality, self-build.

4 CH5PC8Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy C9 – Healthy Communities

1 CH5PC9Q1: Do you consider that Policy C9 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH5PC9Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH5PC9Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy C9 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy C9 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

This Policy section is excellent!

Section C - It has been stated in another part of the MBLP that Bottesford requires additional allotments. These could be accommodated on the eastern side of the Rectory Farm site - adjacent to the industrial site, where there is existing ridge and furrow. This would be ideal conservation - returning the area to its historic use for food production.

Section G could be enhanced by the addition of Pre-packed sandwich takeaways - an industry that is totally unsustainable (packaging/transport/energy-using cooling cabinets along with notoriously low paid labour, etc) as well as encouraging/supporting an unhealthy life style.

4 CH5PC9Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Chapter 6: Melton's Economy – Strong and Competitive

1 CH6Q1: Do you consider that Chapter 6 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH6Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 3) Effective

3 CH6Q3: Please give details of why you consider Chapter 6 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Chapter 6 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

Throughout the Chapters of the Plan emphasis is correctly placed on environmental sustainability. However, this is not reflected in the title of this chapter, nor in the economic objectives expressed in much of its content.

This would be confirmed by a reading of 'Prosperity Without Growth: Economics for a Finite Planet' by Tim Jackson (Routledge 2011).

4 CH6Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make Chapter 6 legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make Chapter 6 legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

To reflect the environmental and social intentions so central to this excellent Plan, Chapter 6 would be better entitled 'Melton's Economy - Green, Equitable and Socially Collaborative'.

Policy EC1 – Employment Growth In Melton Mowbray

1 CH6PEC1Q1: Do you consider that Policy EC1 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH6PEC1Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH6PEC1Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EC1 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EC1 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH6PEC1Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EC2 – Employment Growth in the Rural Area (Outside Melton Mowbray)

1 CH6PEC2Q1: Do you consider that Policy EC2 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH6PEC2Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH6PEC2Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EC2 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EC2 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH6PEC2Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EC3 – Existing Employment Sites

1 CH6PEC3Q1: Do you consider that Policy EC3 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

2 CH6PEC3Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

2) Justified

3 CH6PEC3Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EC3 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EC3 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

There is a strong planning case to move the present industrial estate on Normanton Lane out of the centre of the village to the Orston Lane location. The present location, along with the substantial increase in six axle, logistic, delivery systems, is now presenting a major traffic problem that was not there when the site was originally developed.

Release of the Normanton Lane site, so close to the village centre, would then provide an ideal location for housing suitable for the less physically able.

4 CH6PEC3Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EC4 – Other Employment and Mixed-use Proposals

1 CH6PEC4Q1: Do you consider that Policy EC4 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH6PEC4Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH6PEC4Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EC4 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EC4 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH6PEC4Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EC5 - Melton Mowbray Town Centre

1 CH6PEC5Q1: Do you consider that Policy EC5 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH6PEC5Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH6PEC5Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy SS1 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Melton Local Plan or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH6PEC5Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EC6 – Primary Shopping Frontages

1 CH6PEC6Q1: Do you consider that Policy EC6 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH6PEC6Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH6PEC6Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy SS1 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Melton Local Plan or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH6PEC6Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EC7 – Retail Development in the Borough

1 CH6PEC7Q1: Do you consider that Policy EC7 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH6PEC7Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH6PEC7Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EC7 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EC7 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH6PEC7Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to

co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EC8 – Sustainable Tourism

1 CH6PEC8Q1: Do you consider that Policy EC8 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH6PEC8Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH6PEC8Q4: Please give details of why you consider Policy EC8 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EC8 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH6PEC8Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Chapter 7: Melton Borough's Environment – Protected and Enhanced

1 CH7Q1: Do you consider that Chapter 7 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH7Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH7Q3: Please give details of why you consider Chapter 7 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Chapter 7 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

These are excellent objectives and full support is given to the Areas of Separation between Bottesford and Easthorpe and Bottesford and Normanton.

However, this present Draft Plan has eroded a section of the Area of Separation between Easthorpe and Bottesford that was indicated in the Emerging Options document. This erosion is apparently for the expediency of finding a location for unallocated housing.

This is an undesirable and unacceptable breach of the good intentions expressed within Chapter 7 - especially as it impinges on an identified area of Landscape Sensitivity.

The Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan consultation process has indicated Parish support for the Areas of Separation as originally shown in the Emerging Options document.

The Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan consultations are confirming existing and identifying further Green Areas within the Parish that it hopes/expects to be

accepted and respected by MBC.

4 CH7Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make Chapter 7 legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make Chapter 7 legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EN1 – Landscape

1 CH7PEN1Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN1 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH7PEN1Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH7PEN1Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN1 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EN1 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

This is an excellent Policy statement.

I support the Landscape and Fringe Settlement Sensitivity Study by Influence (commissioned by MBC) that emphasises the importance of areas of separation and minimising urbanising influences on settlement fringes. This is particularly relevant to the area to the south east of Bottesford and towards Easthorpe that they have identified as an area of high overall landscape sensitivity.

Respecting this assessment of Landscape Character Zone 3 is of paramount importance to ensure the rural setting the Bottesford and Easthorpe.

4 CH7PEN1Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EN2 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity

1 CH7PEN2Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN2 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH7PEN2Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH7PEN2Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN2 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EN2 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH7PEN2Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to

co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EN3 – The Melton Green Infrastructure Network

1 CH7PEN3Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN3 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH7PEN3Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH7PEN3Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN3 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EN3 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH7PEN3Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EN4 – Areas of separation

1 CH7PEN4Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN4 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH7PEN4Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH7PEN4Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN4 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EN4 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

I fully support the concept of Areas of Separation.

One of these, between Bottesford and Easthorpe, is identified in the MBC commissioned 'Influence' study as an area of High Landscape Sensitivity and is so categorised in the Emerging Options document.

However, in this Draft Plan part of that Area of Separation has been eroded - seemingly to accommodate some of the 'short fall' in the Borough's housing allocation.

Given its categorisation both as an Area of Separation and of a High Landscape Sensitivity, this should be fully recognised in the DMLP and this eroded section be re-instated without housing.

4 CH7PEN4Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EN5 – Local Green Space

1 CH7PEN5Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN5 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH7PEN5Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH7PEN5Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN5 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EN5 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

The development of the Rectory Farm site in Bottesford has the potential of establishing a new Green Space and riverside walk in the part of the village that currently does not have these facilities.

The Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group is currently in the advanced stage of endorsing existing, and identifying additional, Green Spaces within the Parish to be designated in the Neighbourhood Plan.

4 CH7PEN5Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EN6 – Settlement Character

1 CH7PEN6Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN6 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH7PEN6Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH7PEN6Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN6 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EN6 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

The Policy EN6 objective 4 has been strongly supported by Bottesford residents through the Neighbourhood Plan consultations. Bottesford has very pleasant rural approaches from all directions and the residents have indicated very clearly that they do not want these approaches compromised by new developments. (NP evidence available).

4 CH7PEN6Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EN7 – Open Space, Sport and Recreation

1 CH7PEN7Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN7 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH7PEN7Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH7PEN7Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN7 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EN7 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH7PEN7Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

EN8 – Climate Change

1 CH7PEN8Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN8 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH7PEN8Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH7PEN8Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN8 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EN8 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

Policy EN 12 SUDS should contribute to the quality as well as the functionality of their host landscapes.

Therefore, the MBC Local Plan should ensure that all SUDS related to housing development do NOT take the form of Pipe to Pit structures that result, as in the Barratt's Wickets' development in Bottesford, in a totally unattractive area that, with its deep sides, constitutes a danger to children and, indeed, adults. There are far more environmentally attractive forms of SUDS appropriate to well designed housing estates such as swales. The Melton Plan should make it clear that preferential support would be given to development applications that embraced the very best SUDS design appropriate to high quality residential areas.

Policy EN 10 - the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan consultation process has confirmed the clear majority of the respondents are opposed to wind farms and fracking within, or in close proximity to, the Parish. Solar farms received the fewest objections. (Evidence available).

It would be good policy for the Melton Plan to give preferential support to all new development applications that undertook to install ground source energy at the construction stage.

4 CH7PEN8Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EN9 – Ensuring Energy Efficient and Low Carbon Development

1 CH7PEN9Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN9 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH7PEN9Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH7PEN9Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN9 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EN9 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

This is generally very good. However, it is weak when, in reference to home offices, cycle storage and charging points for electric cars the requirement, as currently written, it only requires these to have been 'considered' within development proposals.

Given the laudable and fundamental objectives on energy conservation and carbon emissions within this Local Plan, there is every reason why these should be mandatory on developers. The cost, at the construction stage, would be minimal whilst post construction, home owners would face potential installation difficulties and greater expense.

Development applications that will install ground source heating at the build stage should be given preferential consideration.

4 CH7PEN9Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable Sources

1 CH7PEN10Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN10 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH7PEN10Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH7PEN10Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN10 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EN10 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH7PEN10Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EN11 – Minimising the Risk of Flooding

1 CH7PEN11Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN11 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH7PEN11Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH7PEN11Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN11 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EN11 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

Policy EN 11 above states 'The Borough Council will follow a sequential approach to flood risk management with the aim of locating development on land with the lowest risk of flooding (Zone 1). '

As mentioned in earlier sections of this response, the above statement should be applied to the Borough as a total entity.

That is to say, the Plan should take the total number of houses designated for rural locations and then prioritise allocation within the Borough to those settlements identified as having the lowest risk of flooding.

The present reality within the Plan is that the largest number of houses has been allocated to Bottesford - the settlement and area that has, according to the Environment Agency, the HIGHEST risk of flooding within the Borough. Indeed, the serious flooding in 2001 has confirmed that it is an actuality - not a risk.

There was a further Environment Agency Flood Warning in 2012.

This categorisation and evidence confirms that applying the sequential approach contained within Policy EN11 across the Borough, Bottesford should be towards the tail-end of rural housing allocation - not at the forefront.

It is not sufficient to claim that individual development sites within Bottesford Parish have, or will be, been assessed for flood risk. When Bottesford flooded it was more than individual houses that were affected. The entire centre of the village, along with the centre of Easthorpe and parts of Muston were flooded - affecting access to the schools, retail outlets and certain industrial units.

4 CH7PEN11Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EN12 – Sustainable Drainage Systems

1 CH7PEN12Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN12 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH7PEN12Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH7PEN12Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN12 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EN12 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

Policy EN 12 must ensure that all SUDS schemes incorporated in to new housing development avoid the Pipe to Pit construction that is unsightly and can, with a deep sided pit, constitute a substantial danger. Developers should be required to design and install environmentally attractive SUDS - that compliment and enhance the quality of their setting.

4 CH7PEN12Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy EN13 – Heritage Assets

1 CH7PEN13Q1: Do you consider that Policy EN13 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH7PEN13Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH7PEN13Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy EN13 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy EN13 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH7PEN13Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Chapter 8: Managing the Delivery of the Melton Local Plan

1 CH8Q1: Do you consider that Chapter 8 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH8Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH8Q3: Please give details of why you consider Chapter 81 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Chapter 8 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

The claims within 8.3.2 and 8.3.3 are not consistent with the allocation of the minimum of 470 houses allocated to Bottesford. This allocation will not reduce the need to travel by car.

As has been expressed elsewhere in this response, Bottesford is already largely a commuter parish. The allocation of 470 houses is well in excess of the evidence based Midlands Rural Housing Assessment of local need for Bottesford (commissioned by MBC). The inevitable consequence is that the allocation of this number of houses, well over local demand, will result in a substantial increase in 'travel to work' miles. Given the relatively poor train service and the very inadequate bus service, these journeys will, without doubt, be largely undertaken by cars. This is contrary to Policy SS2 and the LPT3 goals.

8.9.1 introduces the possibility of there being just one Household Waste Recycling site. This must be unacceptable. There is presently a very much used site at Bottesford. If this was to be closed I am convinced there would be no way that residents in this northern part of the Borough would drive the return journey of 30 miles to Melton.

In any case, a 30 miles round journey is not environmentally sustainable.

Of course, if the Melton Plan insists on encouraging economic growth then that will result in even more household waste. Growth is unsustainable for the planet and should not be encouraged or supported. Consume less, waste less.

See 'Prosperity without Growth: Economics for a Finite Planet', Tim Jackson, Routledge 2011

4 CH8Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make Chapter 8 legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make Chapter 8 legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy IN1 –Transport & Strategic Transport Infrastructure

1 CH8PIN1Q1: Do you consider that Policy IN1 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH8PIN1Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 2) Justified, 3) Effective

3 CH8PIN1Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy IN1 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy IN1 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

Policy 1N states (above)

All new developments should, where possible, have regard to all the following:

1. Are located where travel can be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes maximised

This policy is at variance with the present plan to place a large number of houses in Bottesford. With the current allocation of nearly 500 houses in Bottesford, this far exceeds the number identified for local need by the MBC commissioned Rural Housing Needs Assessment for the Parish.

It can thus be confidentially concluded that a very substantial percentage of the occupants of those new houses will be commuters to other locations.

As stated earlier in this response, the historic growth of Bottesford was originally based on local organic growth. More recently, in the latter part of the 20th century with the more acceptable use of cars for travel to work, it was allowed to grow without the current urgent considerations for sustainability. The 'rules of the

game' were different then. Now we are 'playing' to the new environment sustainability rules.

According to these new 'rules', the past growth of Bottesford to its present size must NOT be the basis of justification for the 'proportionate' allocation of houses. Such 'proportionality' will have the inevitable consequence of promoting rather than minimising daily travel requirements.

To this it can be added that although Bottesford has a railway station, as can be confirmed by the weekly timetable, the frequency of service is not good, indeed can be regarded as poor. Further, the bus service to Grantham and Bingham is almost non-existent. Bottesford to Melton is 15 miles, but the bus service to Melton takes one hour as it meanders through the villages - a journey that takes half that time by car.

From this it can be concluded that the majority of journeys to and from Bottesford are, and will be, undertaken by car - the very mode of unsustainable transport that the Melton Plan is intending to minimise.

4 CH8PIN1Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Towards achieving the intended objectives of Policy 1N, the Melton Plan should substantially reduce the number of houses currently being allocated to Bottesford

Chapter 9: Managing Development

1 CH9Q1: Do you consider that Chapter 9 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

No

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

2 CH9Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

1) Positively Prepared, 3) Effective

3 CH9Q3: Please give details of why you consider Chapter 9 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Chapter 9 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 CH9Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make Chapter 9 legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make Chapter 9 legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Policy D1b the wording should be changed to MUST rather than should

Policy D1 - Raising the Standard of Design

1 CH9PD1Q1: Do you consider that Policy D1 is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 CH9PD1Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 CH9PD1Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy D1 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy D1 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

This is an excellent Chapter - with clear and laudable objectives. However, these objectives will only be achieved if MBC is able to hold to them against the strength of large scale, national, developers. These developers, it can be anticipated, will use every opportunity to take advantage of the phrase 'subject to viability' that appears frequently within the current wording of this Plan.

Viability must be understood as not only referring to the limited notion of economic viability but to the far more significant environmental viability - in conjunction with sustainability. That is to say, development that will deliver a standard of design that will leave a high quality legacy for future generations. If that is not achieved, then it cannot claim to be environmentally viable.

With this in mind, it is appropriate to record that the land agent for the Rectory Farm site in Bottesford has engaged a Planning Consultant who is discussing with the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, and residents living on the edge of that site, how development could best be designed and delivered in a manner that would make the most of the typography - including the winding River Devon. The Workshops have included road layout, house design and location and SUDS along with how to best respect the existing landscape, vegetation and houses.

This is the way forward for all residential developments within the Borough. It is far away from the approach taken by many developers to try and impose their standard, country-wide, house designs and road layouts in inappropriate locations against a background claim that if they raised the standards they would deem a project not economically viable. MBC must resist any such pleadings by profit orientated developers otherwise the ideals within Policy D1 will not be achieved - to the detriment of the Borough.

4 CH9PD1Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Monitoring Framework

1 MFQ1: Do you consider that the Monitoring Framework is?

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::

Yes

Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:

Yes

2 MFQ2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3 MFQ3: Please give details of why you consider that the Monitoring Framework is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Monitoring Framework or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

Please insert text here. :

4 MFQ4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:

Examination

1 EXQ1: Can your representation seeking a change be considered by written representations or do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

Participate at the Oral Examination

If you wish to speak at examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary::

I have been substantially involved in the progression of this Melton Plan and also the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan.

I wish to speak to support many aspects of this Draft Plan and also to further explain and elaborate on, as may be required, my reasons for considering the allocation of nearly 500 houses to Bottesford Parish as inappropriate.

2 EXQ2: Moreover please indicate if you wish to continue to be involved in the Local Plan (Please tick appropriate boxes).

If you wish to be notified at the address/e-mail provided when the Melton Local Plan is submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government, If you wish to be notified at the address/e-mail provided when the Inspector's Report is available to view, If you wish to be notified at the address/e-mail provided in Part A when the Melton Local Plan is adopted, If you/your organisation wish to be included in future consultations on the Melton Local Plan

Acknowledgement

1 I understand the above statement and agree I have complied with its requirements

I agree