

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
<b>FRISBY</b>				
<b>FRIS1</b>				
Mr M Brown	25	Our client, Mr M Brown, has genuine concerns regarding the overall strategy for the delivery of housing growth and specifically in respect of the proposed housing allocations being advanced for the settlement of Frisby on the Wreake. It is our belief that the land South of Rotherby Lane, Frisby on the Wreake (please see site plan which accompanies these representations) is a realistic & deliverable site, which should be allocated for residential development. We consider that sites FRIS2 and FRIS4 have not been assessed in sufficient detail to determine their deliverability or their possible impacts upon local amenity and landscape.	All of the sites allocated have a planning permission (Fris1) or are currently going through the planning application process (Fri2+Fri3). As part of these planning applications, additional evidence has been submitted highlighting the deliverability of these sites and contain more information regarding the deliverability then is contained within these representations. The comments received regarding Fri4 are acknowledged and agreed. As a note, the Borough Council is now no longer looking to allocate a reserve site in Rural Hubs.	Deletion of Fris 4
Helen Hartley, Nexus Planning (on behalf of Richborough Estates)	397	Richborough Estates support the allocation of site FRIS 1/ MBC/191/15 (land off Great Lane) in Frisby on the Wreake for housing in Policy CA1. However, with regard to the other allocations under Policy CA1 we do not consider the policy as currently drafted is positively prepared, justified or effective. It is worth re-iterating here in light of the 'bespoke policies' for the individual housing allocations set out in Appendix 1 of the Pre-Submission Draft Plan which specifically require a noise assessment and flood mitigation measures for the FRIS 2/ MBC/004/16 (land at Water Lane) given the proximity of the adjacent railway line and the fact the site lies largely within Flood Zone 2. For site	Comments noted. With regard to Fri3 the site promoter has shown a deliverable masterplan which meets the requirements of this policy, likewise evidence submitted in support of Fri3 planning applications shows a deliverable scheme. Comments regarding trajectory noted and forwarded to relevant officer and changes made accordingly. Moreover it is noted that Fri1 now benefits from an outline planning permission.	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		FRIS 3 / MBC/007/16 (land south of the village) the bespoke policy requires that provision is made within the boundaries of the site for the provision of the school – a cost and requirement which brings the deliverability of a site for only 40 dwellings into question. In contrast, the bespoke policy for FRIS 1/MBC/191/15 (land off Great Lane), requires no reference to technical mitigation measures, the only requirement is for developer contributions to ensure the education needs of the site are met which would be a requirement for any site [housing trajectory reps forwarded directly to relevant officer].		
Scott Bailey	9	FRIS1,2,3,4 - I consider policy C1( a) in principle to be sound and compliant but I would request with specific reference to the 78 house allocation for Frisby on the Wreake for MBC to re consider the sites chosen for these houses (specifically FRIS2 & FRIS3). The Frisby on the Wreake draft neighbourhood plan has a full evidence base and community support for the 78 houses to be sited on the Great Lane site FRIS1 and the reserve site on Rotherby Lane FRIS4, I would request that the MBC local plan be amended to reflect this. The land to the South site (FRIS3) and Water Lane site (FRIS2) both have been rejected and the full evidence to support this can be found within the draft neighbourhood plan.	Comments noted. The Council is of the belief due to information received during this consultation that Fri4 is not deliverable as either allocation or reserve. For this reason it cannot be used to supplant allocations at Fris2+3. Please see Councils response to Frisby on the Wreak Neighbourhood Development Plan Reg.14 and 16 consultation for further information on this. Please also note the Borough Council is now not looking to allocate a reserve site in Rural Hubs. [Note – further discussions have taken place since time of writing between the LPA and the NDP Group].	None.
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	Sites FRIS1 – 4 are adjacent to the Conservation Area and other heritage assets and this is not adequately reflected within the policies or	Historic context was included in all site assessments across the Borough, including relationship with nearby heritage assets. The Local Plan should be read as a whole,	

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>assessments in order to ensure a sound plan; although criteria in relation to 8 Rotherby Lane in policy FRIS4 is welcomed. FRIS1 forms an important section of the historic landscape setting to Frisby on the Wreake Conservation Area to the west and other heritage assets including the Grade I listed Church of St Thomas of Canterbury, at the entrance to the village. The site also includes what appears to be part of a well preserved and coherent area of ridge and furrow contributing as setting to the significance of the designated assets and the wider historic landscape character.</p>	<p>and it contains a clear district policy relating to the historic environment, EN13, ensuring that decisions can be made to protect the historic environment when necessary. It is therefore not crucial to reference a site being adjacent to the Conservation Area every time where it occurs in site specific policies as the policy protection is already established. The site has planning permission.</p>	
John Griarb	111	<p>I am particularly bothered about the outfall from the Great Lane site as in heavy rain, water floods in dwelling in Mill Lane from this site. Oak Way does not appear to have any drainage in this road (according to Severn Trent it is not their responsibility in these cases). Having looked at my original plans plus those of no 2, it would appear that these drawings seen through the gardens of three houses towards Hall Orchard. Who therefore is responsible for these drains and how can they be checked and identified and whose expense is it? I would have thought that at the time of examination by your building service department, your inspectors would have drawings to work to. Overall, although not against building houses here, I think this should be delayed until the drainage service has been sorted out.</p>	<p>The onus on new development is to ensure that they do not cause additional flood risk. New development is not required to fix an existing problem, only mitigate any additional run off it may cause. For specific questions regarding drainage it is best to ask Leicestershire County Council as they are responsible, not MBC.</p>	None.

**FRIS2**

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
Mr M Brown	25	<p>Our client, Mr M Brown, has genuine concerns regarding the overall strategy for the delivery of housing growth and specifically in respect of the proposed housing allocations being advanced for the settlement of Frisby on the Wreake. It is our belief that the land South of Rotherby Lane, Frisby on the Wreake (please see site plan which accompanies these representations) is a realistic &amp; deliverable site, which should be allocated for residential development. We consider that sites FRIS2 and FRIS4 have not been assessed in sufficient detail to determine their deliverability or their possible impacts upon local amenity and landscape.</p>	<p>All of the sites allocated have a planning permission (Fris1) or are currently going through the planning application process (Fri2+Fri3). As part of these planning applications, a wave of additional evidence has been submitted highlighting the deliverability of these sites and contain more information regarding the deliverability then is contained within these representations. The comments received regarding Fri4 are acknowledged and agreed.</p>	None.
Helen Hartley, Nexus Planning (on behalf of Richborough Estates)	397	<p>Richborough Estates support the allocation of site FRIS 1/ MBC/191/15 (land off Great Lane) in Frisby on the Wreake for housing in Policy CA1. However, with regard to the other allocations under Policy CA1 we do not consider the policy as currently drafted is positively prepared, justified or effective. It is worth re-iterating here in light of the 'bespoke policies' for the individual housing allocations set out in Appendix 1 of the Pre-Submission Draft Plan which specifically require a noise assessment and flood mitigation measures for the FRIS 2/ MBC/004/16 (land at Water Lane) given the proximity of the adjacent railway line and the fact the site lies largely within Flood Zone 2. For site FRIS 3 / MBC/007/16 (land south of the village) the bespoke policy requires that provision is made</p>	<p>Comments noted. With regard to Fris3 the site promoter has shown a deliverable masterplan which meets the requirements of this policy, likewise evidence submitted in support of Fri3 planning applications shows a deliverable scheme. Comments regarding trajectory noted and forwarded to relevant officer and changes made accordingly. Moreover it is noted that Fris1 now benefits from an outline planning permission.</p>	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>within the boundaries of the site for the provision of the school – a cost and requirement which brings the deliverability of a site for only 40 dwellings into question. In contrast, the bespoke policy for FRIS 1/MBC/191/15 (land off Great Lane), requires no reference to technical mitigation measures, the only requirement is for developer contributions to ensure the education needs of the site are met which would be a requirement for any site [housing trajectory reps forwarded directly to relevant officer].</p>		
Scott Bailey	9	<p>FRIS1,2,3,4 - I consider policy C1( a) in principle to be sound and compliant but I would request with specific reference to the 78 house allocation for Frisby on the Wreake for MBC to re consider the sites chosen for these houses (specifically FRIS2 &amp; FRIS3). The Frisby on the Wreake draft neighbourhood plan has a full evidence base and community support for the 78 houses to be sited on the Great Lane site FRIS1 and the reserve site on Rotherby Lane FRIS4, I would request that the MBC local plan be amended to reflect this. The land to the South site (FRIS3) and Water Lane site (FRIS2) both have been rejected and the full evidence to support this can be found within the draft neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council is of the belief due to information received during this consultation that Fri4 is not deliverable for either allocation nor reserve. For this reason it cannot be used to supplant allocations at Fris2+3. Please see Councils response to Frisby on the Wreaks Neighbourhood Development Plan Reg.14 consultation for further information on this. Please also note the Borough Council is now not looking to allocate a reserve site in Rural Hubs. [Note – further discussions have taken place since time of writing between the LPA and the NDP Group].</p>	None.
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	<p>Sites FRIS1 – 4 are adjacent to the Conservation Area and other heritage assets and this is not adequately reflected within the policies or assessments in order to ensure a sound plan; although criteria in relation to 8 Rotherby Lane in</p>	<p>Historic context was included in all site assessments across the Borough, including relationship with nearby heritage assets. The Local Plan should be read as a whole, and it contains a clear district policy relating to the historic environment, EN13, ensuring that decisions can</p>	None

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		policy FRIS4 is welcomed. FRIS1 forms an important section of the historic landscape setting to Frisby on the Wreake Conservation Area to the west and other heritage assets including the Grade I listed Church of St Thomas of Canterbury, at the entrance to the village. The site also includes what appears to be part of a well preserved and coherent area of ridge and furrow contributing as setting to the significance of the designated assets and the wider historic landscape character.	be made to protect the historic environment when necessary. It is therefore not crucial to reference a site being adjacent to the Conservation Area every time where it occurs in site specific policies as the policy protection is already established.	
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	409	In the majority of cases the sites identified have no specific heritage concern, although several are not without known heritage implications. In the latter context are BOT1, BOT4, CROX1, HAR1, HOS2 and 3, WAL1 and 2, WYM2, EAS1 and FRIS2. Development management decisions should give careful consideration to the heritage implications as required by national and local planning policy and informed by relevant guidance.	Comment noted.	None.
<b>FRIS3</b>				
Mr M Brown	25	Our client, Mr M Brown, has genuine concerns regarding the overall strategy for the delivery of housing growth and specifically in respect of the proposed housing allocations being advanced for the settlement of Frisby on the Wreake. It is our belief that the land South of Rotherby Lane, Frisby on the Wreake (please see site plan which accompanies these representations) is a realistic & deliverable site, which should be allocated for residential development. We consider that sites FRIS2 and FRIS4 have not been assessed in	All of the sites allocated have a planning permission (Fris1) or are currently going through the planning application process (Fri2+Fris3). As part of these planning applications, a wave of additional evidence has been submitted highlighting the deliverability of these sites and contain more information regarding the deliverability then is contained within these representations. The comments received regarding Fri4 are acknowledged and agreed.	Amend depiction of the site and estimated capacity to reflect current land owner intentions (48no. houses)

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		sufficient detail to determine their deliverability or their possible impacts upon local amenity and landscape.		
Helen Hartley, Nexus Planning (on behalf of Richborough Estates)	397	Richborough Estates support the allocation of site FRIS 1/ MBC/191/15 (land off Great Lane) in Frisby on the Wreake for housing in Policy CA1. However, with regard to the other allocations under Policy CA1 we do not consider the policy as currently drafted is positively prepared, justified or effective. It is worth re-iterating here in light of the 'bespoke policies' for the individual housing allocations set out in Appendix 1 of the Pre-Submission Draft Plan which specifically require a noise assessment and flood mitigation measures for the FRIS 2/ MBC/004/16 (land at Water Lane) given the proximity of the adjacent railway line and the fact the site lies largely within Flood Zone 2. For site FRIS 3 / MBC/007/16 (land south of the village) the bespoke policy requires that provision is made within the boundaries of the site for the provision of the school – a cost and requirement which brings the deliverability of a site for only 40 dwellings into question. In contrast, the bespoke policy for FRIS 1/MBC/191/15 (land off Great Lane), requires no reference to technical mitigation measures, the only requirement is for developer contributions to ensure the education needs of the site are met which would be a requirement for any site [housing trajectory reps forwarded directly to relevant officer].	Comments noted. With regard to Fri3 the site promoter has shown a deliverable masterplan which meets the requirements of this policy, likewise evidence submitted in support of Fri3 planning applications shows a deliverable scheme. Comments regarding trajectory noted and forwarded to relevant officer and changes made accordingly. Moreover it is noted that Fri1 now benefits from an outline planning permission.	Amend depiction of the site and estimated capacity to reflect current land owner intentions (48no. houses)
Scott Bailey	9	FRIS1,2,3,4 - I consider policy C1( a) in principle to	Comments noted. The Council is of the belief due to	Amend depiction of the

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>be sound and compliant but I would request with specific reference to the 78 house allocation for Frisby on the Wreake for MBC to re consider the sites chosen for these houses (specifically FRIS2 &amp; FRIS3). The Frisby on the Wreake draft neighbourhood plan has a full evidence base and community support for the 78 houses to be sited on the Great Lane site FRIS1 and the reserve site on Rotherby Lane FRIS4, I would request that the MBC local plan be amended to reflect this. The land to the South site (FRIS3) and Water Lane site (FRIS2) both have been rejected and the full evidence to support this can be found within the draft neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>information received during this consultation that Fri4 is not deliverable for either allocation nor reserve. For this reason it cannot be used to supplant allocations at Fris2+3. Please see Councils response to Frisby on the Wreake Neighbourhood Development Plan Reg.14 consultation for further information on this. Please also note the Borough Council is now not looking to allocate a reserve site in Rural Hubs. [Note – further discussions have taken place since time of writing between the LPA and the NDP Group].</p>	<p>site and estimated capacity to reflect current land owner intentions (48no. houses)</p>
<p>Liberty Stones, Fisher German (on behalf of Mr David Cook)</p>	<p>410</p>	<p>We support the allocations being made by policy C1(A), in particular site reference FRIS3 on land to the south of Frisby on the Wreake. Notwithstanding the calculation in paragraphs 4.2.18 – 4.2.22 and Table 7 of how the housing requirement should be apportioned, we strongly support the final housing numbers in policy C1(A) being based upon the actual capacity of the deliverable sites which have been identified in each settlement. Any other approach risks creating artificial and unwarranted constraints on delivery for individual sites, and would fail to accord with the Framework’s core planning principle of encouraging the effective use of land (paragraph 17) and optimising the potential of sites to accommodate development (paragraph 58). With particular regard to site reference FRIS3 on</p>	<p>Policy SS2 does use deliverable sites to deliver final allocations numbers, e.g. Asfordby Hill where an extra 26 dwellings have been allocated as the suitable sites allow it. Allocations are conservative estimations of a sites capacity, especially with regard to ensuring a robust housing land supply. It is accepted that across the Borough, dependent on site specific opportunities and constraints, some allocations will deliver more whilst others may deliver less. It is likely that the planning application on the site will resolve this issue prior to examination.</p>	<p>Amend depiction of the site and estimated capacity to reflect current land owner intentions (48no. houses)</p>



Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>land to the south of Frisby on the Wreake, we note that the policy proposes to allocate it for 40 dwellings. However, this does not reflect either the red line boundary or the total number of units proposed under outline planning application reference 16/00704/OUT, which shows how the site could be developed for a total of 48 dwellings, with vehicular access taken from Gaddesby Lane to the east. The information submitted with the application demonstrates that there are no technical constraints to the site's delivery, and there have been no objections received from any statutory consultees. As such, all 48 dwellings proposed by this application are considered to be deliverable within the next 5 year period.</p>		
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	<p>Sites FRIS1 – 4 are adjacent to the Conservation Area and other heritage assets and this is not adequately reflected within the policies or assessments in order to ensure a sound plan; although criteria in relation to 8 Rotherby Lane in policy FRIS4 is welcomed. FRIS1 forms an important section of the historic landscape setting to Frisby on the Wreake Conservation Area to the west and other heritage assets including the Grade I listed Church of St Thomas of Canterbury, at the entrance to the village. The site also includes what appears to be part of a well preserved and coherent area of ridge and furrow contributing as setting to the significance of the designated assets and the wider historic landscape character.</p>	<p>Melton Borough Council have engaged with Historic England and have agreed that Historic England and MBC will liaise and redraft the policy wording so it is amenable to both parties.</p>	<p>Amend site specific policies to ensure that the need to respect the nearby Conservation Area through design and layout are highlighted.</p>

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
<b>FRIS4 (Reserve)</b>				
Mr M Brown	25	Our client, Mr M Brown, has genuine concerns regarding the overall strategy for the delivery of housing growth and specifically in respect of the proposed housing allocations being advanced for the settlement of Frisby on the Wreake. It is our belief that the land South of Rotherby Lane, Frisby on the Wreake (please see site plan which accompanies these representations) is a realistic & deliverable site, which should be allocated for residential development. We consider that sites FRIS2 and FRIS4 have not been assessed in sufficient detail to determine their deliverability or their possible impacts upon local amenity and landscape.	All of the sites allocated have a planning permission (Fris1) or are currently going through the planning application process (Fri2+Fris3). As part of these planning applications, a wave of additional evidence has been submitted highlighting the deliverability of these sites and contain more information regarding the deliverability then is contained within these representations. The comments received regarding Fri4 are acknowledged and agreed. Please note, the Borough Council is now not looking to allocate a reserve site in Rural Hubs.	Deletion of Fris4
Scott Bailey	9	FRIS1,2,3,4 - I consider policy C1( a) in principle to be sound and compliant but I would request with specific reference to the 78 house allocation for Frisby on the Wreake for MBC to re consider the sites chosen for these houses (specifically FRIS2 & FRIS3). The Frisby on the Wreake draft neighbourhood plan has a full evidence base and community support for the 78 houses to be sited on the Great Lane site FRIS1 and the reserve site on Rotherby Lane FRIS4, I would request that the MBC local plan be amended to reflect this. The land to the South site (FRIS3) and Water Lane site (FRIS2) both have been rejected and the full evidence to support this can be found within the draft neighbourhood plan.	Comments noted. The Council is of the belief due to information received during this consultation that Fri4 is not deliverable for either allocation nor reserve. For this reason it cannot be used to supplant allocations at Fris2+3. Please see Councils response to Frisby on the Wreake Neighbourhood Development Plan Reg.14 consultation for further information on this. Please also note the Borough Council is now not looking to allocate a reserve site in Rural Hubs. [Note – further discussions have taken place since time of writing between the LPA and the NDP Group].	Deletion of Fris4

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
dr brian kirkup	163	see below my comments around flood risk in flood section below. Basically I think the choice of Fris 2 over Fris 4 (reserve site) is unsound, as it is contrary to NPPF guidance 100-101 and the correct application of a sequential test, which should promote Fris 4 above Fris2 and make Fris 2 the reserve site.	Comments noted. Fris4 has been removed due to deliverability and policy issues now.	Deletion of Fris4
Sydney George Wood obo ME, AL & SG Wood	435	The area of land which we have offered for consideration in the Melton Local Plan has not been correctly mapped by Melton Borough Council and therefore not correctly assessed. The site is offered as a single entity whereas the Authority has been subdivided it into part 'a' and part 'b'. The Authority has also without consultant included part of a neighbour's property into part 'a' of the site. This is unsound as it gives influence to a private third party over consideration of our site and it makes wrongful any consideration of possible housing allocation. The area of land comprising our site was offered as a single entity, the development of which for housing would make possible a relocation of the farm business operated from Zion House, to a more efficient location. Together with the restoration of Zion House, which has been professionally assessed as being in dire condition. Of great concern to us is the contentious planning history regarding Zion House, a Grade Two listed thatched property and our home. Local estate agents and valuers Shoulers reported to the Executors of the estate that Zion House was (and still is) in dire condition. Clarification of the	Local Planning Authorities are able to subdivide larger sites if there is a rationale in doing so. In this case your allocation was subdivided into two sites and assessed separately. This subdivision left your site ranking 4th and 6th. As the village requirement established in SS2 was met by the first 3 sites, this Only the residual requirement for a reserve remained and as the next best site (According to MBC's methodology) Fri4 took this role. Had the sites been considered together, they would have become Fri5, with land South of Rotherby Lane becoming Fri4. Furthermore, due to a change in policy, we are now no longer looking to allocate reserve sites within Rural Hubs moving forward.	Deletion of Fris4.

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>statusd of Zion House as described above remains an obstacle to the final winding up of the estate as local solicitors Latham &amp; Co can confirm. To assist Melton Borough Council is reassessing the status of Zion House I have requested that they consult with the Department of Environment Food and Rural Affairs. Thier Rurla Payments Agency has recently produced detaild mapping of our farmstead which includes Zion House, and enclosed copy of which is listed below.</p>		
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	<p>Sites FRIS1 – 4 are adjacent to the Conservation Area and other heritage assets and this is not adequately reflected within the policies or assessments in order to ensure a sound plan; although criteria in relation to 8 Rotherby Lane in policy FRIS4 is welcomed. FRIS1 forms an important section of the historic landscape setting to Frisby on the Wreake Conservation Area to the west and other heritage assets including the Grade I listed Church of St Thomas of Canterbury, at the entrance to the village. The site also includes what appears to be part of a well preserved and coherent area of ridge and furrow contributing as setting to the significance of the designated assets and the wider historic landscape character.</p>	<p>Historic context was included in all site assessments across the Borough, including relationship with nearby heritage assets. The Local Plan should be read as a whole, and it contains a clear district policy relating to the historic environment, EN13, ensuring that decisions can be made to protect the historic environment when necessary. It is therefore not crucial to reference a site being adjacent to the Conservation Area every time where it occurs in site specific policies as the policy protection is already established. Furthermore, due to a change in policy, we are now no longer looking to allocate reserve sites within Rural Hubs moving forward.</p>	Deletion of Fris4
Maurice Fairhurst	73	<p>It is not clear when planning permissions will be granted on these sites.</p> <p>These sites have been chosen from a considerartion of SHLAA submissions rather than an analysis of the capacity of each settlement.</p>	<p>The Council has limited influence on when people wish to submit planning applications, however, as part of evidence gathered for the Local Plan, developers intentions for individual sites were gathered and put into a trajectory which MBC have published. The SHLAA is the best resource the Council has to assess site availability, it</p>	Deletion of Fris4

Name	Representor Number	Response	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		<p>As a result, some sites have not been fully evaluated or even considered.</p> <p>Certain reserved sites are too large or are poorly related to the built structure of the settlement and will have serious damaging impacts on their character and rural setting.</p> <p>(eg in Old Dalby, Long Clawson, Frisby, Somerby, Harby and Waltham)</p>	<p>would be neither effective nor efficient to spend time and resource assessing sites that may not be available for development. The Council has the ability to reduce SHLAA sites into allocations or reserve sites and has done across the Borough. Reserve sites can only be brought forward if other sites in the settlement cannot come forward for development.</p>	
John Lovesay	174	<p>The reserve site for Frisby on the Wreake is ideal as it would make a brownfield site far more attractive and at the same time preserve a unique building that is in need of renovation.</p>	<p>Due to a change in policy, we are now no longer looking to allocate reserve sites within Rural Hubs moving forward.</p>	Deletion of Fris4