

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
MELTON MOWBRAY				
MEL1				
Pegasus Planning obo Davidsons Devts Ltd.	425	<p>MEL1 OPP granted for 85 homes and reserved matters approved in April 2016, remaining field extends to 2ha. Site could accommodate further 40-50 homes, suggest capacity to increase to 135 homes.</p> <p>Site policies should be included within main body of Local Plan, not as appendix to make plan more coherent.</p>	<p>Whole of the site was assessed as part of the site assessment process for the allocations last year, and concluded the capacity as 85 dwellings.</p> <p>Technical site constraints have been addressed through the planning process with the grant of the outline consent for 85 dwellings. The site area to the east falls outside of the planning permission and would be sensitive to development and contributes to the setting of the listed building.</p> <p>Unless there is change in the site in terms of boundary or any other change, this will only be reviewed if there is an identified need for it.</p> <p>The Appendices form part of the plan, so there is no harm arising from the material being set out there.</p>	None.
MEL3				
Stephen Hemming, Lambert Smith Hampton	117	<p>Not positively prepared</p> <p>Local Plan should meet OAN, 16 units on MEL3 will not meet housing requirement of area, MEL3 is in sustainable location, to propose only 16 units on this site means less sustainable locations will need to be developed.</p> <p>Retention of buildings on site is not justified as not listed or non-designated heritage assets; removal of these will allow more development as well as affordable housing.</p>	<p>The sites have been assessed taking into account various constraints – 9% of site lies in flood zone (SFRA 2016), which was considered to calculate the net capacities of the sites. Sites for allocations are selected in most sustainable locations within the Borough as well as to enhance sustainability and vitality of some locations that are in close proximity to either a service centre or a rural hub apart from MM itself.</p> <p>The buildings have an Article 4 direction imposed in order to ensure the character of the area is maintained. The site assessment done in July 2016 concludes that the site is on a prominent junction within the built up area of MM with many</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		MEL3 is not justified. Site capacities not been considered in drawing up MEL3, and retention of buildings is not justified. The Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report (2011) does not refer to it, nor does it identify the site LCA Sensitivity Map.	high quality buildings that are visible from many public areas, and so any scheme would require sensitive design to protect 'retained buildings'. Under Article 4 direction, permission will be needed to demolish these.	
MEL4				
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	HE object to the harmful impact that will be upon Sysonby Grange Scheduled Monument due to this allocation, mainly from development of central ridge top portion of site to the significance of monument due to loss of historic rural landscape setting. SA flags site as red/significant negative, although effects recorded as uncertain with potential to mitigate adverse effect on character through sympathetic design solutions – been negotiated with previous planning application 15/00593/OUT by reducing the site to west to protect setting of SM, but is not shown as negotiated / permitted on proposed allocation.	The Council has met with Historic England to discuss concerns raised with this site and the suggested change was agreed between both parties.	None. Amendment to the policy to say no development to take place within 100m of the eastern boundary of the Scheduled Monument
MEL5				
Christine Ide	147	MOD in its list of Sept 2016 announced the sites that they were proposing to dispose off to provide land for homes. Of the 13 sites listed, Old Dalby was also included. Boundary shown on enclosed map. Announcement came after emerging options consultation, MOD now working out disposal strategy of site and would like to commence discussions with MBC to consider potential	Support welcomed and noted. However it must be noted that Update to site assessment work has included refinement of site area calculations and developable areas. The potential capacity has therefore increased from 62 to 70 on this basis on MEL5.	Major mod – Capacity increased from 62 to 70.

Formatted: Font: +Body (Calibri)

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		development options for the site. Proposed allocation of an area of MOD land at the Defence Animal Centre, for housing (reference MEL5) is noted and supported. Completed questionnaire with information on delivery is enclosed.		
MEL13				
Roger Smith	273	MEL13 to be included as an allocation rather than a reserve site, site is currently leased to Jeldwen until 2021 which will make the site vacant, large brownfield site on the edge of MM Town Centre with easy walking distance represents sustainable location for housing. Inclusion as reserve site will result in uncertainty in the period after site becomes vacant and available for development.	The sites included in the allocations need to be “deliverable” which means they need to be “available” and “achievable” with the realistic prospect of being developed within the first five years without any major viability impacts. This site is currently occupied for employment uses and hence not “available” currently, which renders it not “achievable” for the time it is in its current employment use, which if brought forward for development will have to identify an alternative site for employment or not be in need of it. This is mentioned in the policy MEL13.	None.
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	429	Policy C1(B) Reserve Sites Large number of houses identified on reserve sites including 240 in MM. Sites with large nos. are being reserved while some locations are ‘overwhelmed’. 162 dwellings reallocated due to lack of sites in some villages, could be located on MM reserve site with less impact than in rural areas. This would also increase funds to support the MM ring road and other infrastructure requirements.	The site assessment done to identify the suitable / potential sites for future development have ranked all the sites that were assessed. The reserve sites in each settlement have been ranked after other sites in those areas meaning, other available sites have performed better. Therefore, these sites although suitable and sustainable have been put in reserve and will be released if other sites either do not become available or there is a change in their delivery assumptions. Also, the development strategy proposed in the plan aims to make the whole of the Borough sustainable including the rural areas and this helps meet our vision and aims and objectives of the Local Plan for the next 20 years.	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
			The contribution towards the road as well as the infrastructure have been considered in the allocations.	