



14/12/2016

Dear Sir / Madam,

RE: Melton Local Plan

I am writing to express my opposition to the Melton Local Plan. I have highlighted within this letter reasons why I feel the Plan isn't justified, consistent or effective with national policy.

There are presently 158 houses in the village of Gaddesby, the proposed 55 houses allocated in the draft plan with an additional 6 houses already having planning permission (5 on Ashby Road and one further dwelling at Gaddesby Hall) totalling 61 houses indicates a markedly higher percentage of proposed housing than any of the other villages in the borough. An increase of 61 would be a 38.6% increase and would clearly change the nature of the village. From 1994 to 2014 on average one new house was built in the village every year – if this should continue an additional 20 houses would also be built during the life of the Plan. This growth pushes the figure up to an increase of 51.2%.

Gaddesby appears to have been upgraded to a rural hub. Two of the criteria relating to this upgrade the village doesn't meet.

- Access to employment opportunities – the suggestion that the 100 bus service could be relied upon to travel to work out of the village is ridiculous. The service has recently had a significant reduction to its service due to being unsustainable, with a continued risk of the service being reduced further when reviewed in 2017. Residents without access to a car would be very isolated living in the village with no amenities such as shop, post office etc.
- Superfast broadband – the actual delivered speed at the time of writing is 20Mbps or 40% of the advertised maximum 56Mbps download speed. Given this failure to perform under the existing load of the village and surrounding areas, any additional load is likely to make the service deteriorate further. Many existing residents have not yet upgraded to fibre broadband, which means that when they do this would increase the load further thereby reducing the actual speed delivered even more. Presently areas of the village remain unable to get a mobile phone signal!

Therefore the village of Gaddesby clearly doesn't meet the criteria to be classed as a rural hub and should be identified as a rural settlement.

The surrounding highways are also a concern. The Plan states that the site to the northern edge of the village (Pasture Lane) is accessed via either of two 'well connected roads'. The roads in question being Rotherby Lane and Pasture Lane. As the name suggests these roads are in fact lanes and are

both unsuitable for more than the occasional vehicle. Rotherby Lane is single lane only for majority of its length with several bends which blocks the view of any oncoming traffic – resulting in traffic at best only able to pass by using the grass verge. There have been fatalities on this lane in recent years. Both these lanes are very popular routes for dog walkers and with no footpaths and increase in traffic would only increase the risk of further casualties.

There is a weight limit on Ashby Road of 7.5tonnes which demonstrates how minor the road is into the village from the A607. The proposed building site to the south of the village is proposed opposite the village hall and Gaddesby Primary School. At school drop off and collection times cars are parked nose to tail along the school side of Ashby Road, making the road all but impassable and impossible for those that would be trying to emerge from the site. The village hall is occupied every weekday by a playgroup which is frequented by on average 25 – 30 children at any one time who are also dropped off and collected. In addition at certain other regular times cars are parked nose to tail on Ashby Road opposite the site. All this traffic makes the road dangerous to both motorists and pedestrians. Ashby Road is a busy road, which is narrow and has a sharp bend adjacent to the site which will make it impossible to see traffic coming around the bend for vehicles exiting the site. Ashby Road is clearly totally unsuitable to service the existing traffic let alone the increased traffic that the proposed developments would generate.

The Highways issues have not been assessed when considering the sites proposed.

Yours faithfully



MAY HALL