

Melton Borough Council - Regulation 16 Response Form

Under Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, **Bottesford Parish Council** has submitted its draft Neighbourhood Plan to Melton Borough Council. In accordance with Regulation 16, Melton Borough Council would like to invite comments from organisations and individuals on the submitted Neighbourhood Plan. All background documents are available to view on the <https://www.meltonplan.co.uk/bottesford> webpage.

Please use this form to submit your comments for the Neighbourhood Plan and return the form to: planningpolicy@melton.gov.uk. For each representation, please use a separate form and mark clearly which document and part your representations relates to.

PART A: About you & Examination

1. What is your name?

Donald Pritchett

2. What is your email?

[REDACTED]

3. Please enter your address

[REDACTED]

4. Are you a resident of the area that this Neighbourhood Plan relates?

Yes No

5. If you answered 'No' above, please select from the appropriate option below

Agent

Developer

Landowner

Stakeholder

Consultee

Other

If you have selected any of the above, please give additional information here, including who you represent.

[REDACTED]

Do you wish to be notified of the local planning authority's decision under Regulation 19 in relation to the Neighbourhood Development Plan? Yes

NOTICE: Melton Borough Council will process the information you provide in a manner that is compatible with the General Protection Regulations (GDPR), 2018. Please be aware that all representations received by the authority will be made publicly available (in due course). These will be identifiable by name and organisation (if applicable).

PART B: Representation Form (1)

1. Please indicate which part of the submitted Neighbourhood Plan or supporting documents this representation relates (e.g. submission plan, policy map)

Submission plan

Page number (if applicable)

page 83

Paragraph/policy (if applicable)

supporting local businesses

2. Do you believe that this policy/section of the Neighbourhood Plan:

	Yes	No	Unsure
Meets European Obligations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Has regard to national Planning policies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is in general conformity with the Strategic policies of the Local Plan/is compatible with adjoining Neighbourhood Plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Contributes to the achievement of sustainable development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Do you?

Support this policy/part of the plan
 Support this policy/part of the plan subject to modifications
 Object to this policy/part of the plan
 Neither support or object to this policy/part of the plan

Please provide your comments here:

Supporting Local business page 83 -85

Policy 13 supporting the local economy page 88

Village envelope page 21 para 76

Policy 1 Village envelope page 21

Industry Land off Nottingham road, Longhedge Lane

A feature of a Neighbourhood Plan that has been in progress since 2013 with no consultation, I think since 2015, is it is inevitable that some of the base material may be out of date. The extension to the Longhedge Lane Industrial Estate mentioned in the NP has been completed.

There has been a draft of a potential further extension available for over a year that could have been declared and included had there been periodic consultation with the public and businesses during the life of the NP.

Whist the policies referenced above are not precluding an extension to industrial use it would have been a positive act to have included an extension for employment growth and possible related highways benefit in the NP after comments returned in the recent previous NP consultation stage. Then moved the village envelope line proposed to be introduced by this NP.

It may be that the Parish Council have considered there is no need because policies do not preclude, I don't know?

Bottesford is 6 miles from the A1, the East West A52 runs close by and the Grantham station for the East coast mainline is 8 miles.

National Government, County Council, Melton Local Plan and the NP Policies promote employment. We also need to grasp opportunities for increasing local employment to save travel to locations miles away.

Please provide your suggestions below:

Included in above

PART B: Representation Form (2)

1. Please indicate which part of the submitted Neighbourhood Plan or supporting documents this representation relates (e.g. submission plan, policy map)

submission plan

Page number (if applicable)

104

Paragraph/policy (if applicable)

Developer contributions

2. Do you believe that this policy/section of the Neighbourhood Plan:

	Yes	No	Unsure
Meets European Obligations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Has regard to national Planning policies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is in general conformity with the Strategic policies of the Local Plan/is compatible with adjoining Neighbourhood Plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contributes to the achievement of sustainable development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Do you?

Support this policy/part of the plan
 Support this policy/part of the plan subject to modifications
 Object to this policy/part of the plan
 Neither support or object to this policy/part of the plan

Please provide your comments here:

Page 104 – Development Contributions

Summary - Developer contributions paragraph requires revision

A clear feature of the NP is a focus on heavy local involvement in the design of new build but does not clearly state how the implications of a 30% growth in population will be mitigated. At the same time includes expensive projects that do not relate to mitigation.

This developer contributions paragraph requires revision to move from knowledge of the mitigation process to show what are the priority infrastructure pressures and describe the process of

prioritisation. Briefly describing a shared strategic and individual scheme planning process between the Planning Authority (MBC) and Parish Council, stating 'discuss' is insufficient.

This paragraph should be very important in providing the foundation for developer contribution requests and other related funding requests and grant claims to public and other service organisations.

The NP paragraphs and Appendix A Community Projects contain a mix of subjects that are either key pressures for mitigation or desirable discretionary items. Paragraph 104 should bring together relevant items and expand on what are the key mitigation items. Insufficient detail in the draft NP.

The value of including the expensive highways alterations, pages 60-64 and Appendix E, that don't relate to mitigation needs serious thought.

Introduction

Throughout the Draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP) there is mention of projects and at least four significant items are included. The diagram at page 48 indicates a bridge over the River Devon as part of creating a new footpath. Pages 60 to 64 and Appendix E state two place making road junction alterations and a safe pedestrian crossing are desirable. There is no supporting study evidence that these highways changes will mitigate infrastructure pressure caused by new home or industry developments. Also, that LCC Highways Officers support after considering LCC and Department of Transport guidance. For one of the junctions changes it is likely that heritage considerations will need to be complied with.

The likely cost of these major projects will cost over £1m pounds to implement. I have informed the Parish Council that it is unlikely that MBC and LCC will fund. It should be assumed funding is a local matter, precept, reserves or, if approved by the Secretary of State, a Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) loan.

Page 88 Policy Supporting the Local Economy – A village centre car park is supported. Is this a discretionary desire or an infrastructure pressure suitable for developer contributions because some residents may not be able to cycle or walk to the centre village shops?

It is important that the developer contributions paragraph is clear on what can and is to be requested as developer contributions to remove any doubt that developer contributions will not fund unrelated discretionary projects.

The Bottesford Parish will have a number of developments during the current Melton Local Plan causing infrastructure pressures both specific to each scheme and cumulative.

Paragraphs 358 to 361

These paragraphs show awareness of the topic but are inadequate because;

- There has been no supporting work to identify what the individual and collective scheme pressures will be for allocated house numbers during the life of the current Local Plan, thus

currently unable to assist the Local Planning Authority (MBC) in agreeing obligations with developers,

- Paragraph 361 states the requirement for developer contributions to be discussed with the Parish Council for each application. This paragraph does not mention any consultation on a forward view taking into account the cumulative impact and mitigating contributions required from each scheme. It would not be appropriate for a Parish Council to 'discuss' Public service provider Section 106 submitted obligations. However, these documents are often available to view on the MBC Planning Portal.
- There is no content showing any acknowledgement and understanding of the MBC Planning consultation processes that implicitly provides for Parish involvement and the recently introduced MBC Section 106 consultation process through Ward Councillors.

Boxed numbers 1 to 3 page 104

Number one states the obvious so is it relevant, for number two I am not sure it is the responsibility of the applicant to state the impact of the proposal and for number three this is a level of judgement I am not sure is appropriate for Parish level.

Major pressures

Traffic

Page 60 paragraph 192 states from NP consultation the public are concerned about traffic safety. This would have been 2015 as I am not aware of any consultation since. Public concern has grown since 2015 and recently the PC have established a traffic committee and traffic mitigation features as significant in the recently introduced MBC Developer Contributions process and as obligations in current live planning applications.

The linear layout of the village and the centre village streets have limiting features, narrow, difficult to park, no space for further parking, parking at junctions, growing concern for crossing roads safely etc. In addition, there is nothing in the NP to address concerns with at least a 30% increase in population and as such no relating link to developer contributions.

Facilities

The Melton Local Plan notes the reduced access to school facilities after academy status. Recent Section 106 local consultation has resulted in the inclusion of facility developments as a priority but facility limitations are not covered by this paragraph in the draft NP

Please provide your suggestions below:

Included in above