

Melton North – Masterplan and Design Code document

E&T Development and Growth comments

Document Section	Comment
<p>Introduction (page 4-23)</p>	<p>The masterplan and Design Code covers part of the Melton North Sustainable Neighbourhood (SN) (Land between Scaford Road and Melton Spinney Road) and is referred to as “the site”. The masterplan, required by the relevant Local Plan policy, should cover the whole Melton North SN, as the policy requires a masterplan and design code to guide the future development, noting LCC and Richborough sites have already been considered at planning committee. It is therefore not clear how this masterplan and design code document will apply to the wider Melton North SN sites, such as through the consideration of reserved matters applications for the LCC and Richborough sites. It implies that they fall outside of its scope “MBC expects all planning applications within the site boundary to pay due regard and strong adherence to the framework and design coding set out within this document”. Indicative site boundary shown on page 6 differentiates between the different parts of the SN.</p> <p>Page 14: Up to Summer/Autumn 2019 Leicestershire County Council (LCC), as local highway authority, was involved with Melton Borough Council and consultants One Creative. The consultation section discusses on-going engagement with stakeholders such as LCC Highways up to Spring/Summer 2019. Comments and input were provided by LCC Highways, but we do not recall receiving any feedback from MBC. Work on the Masterplan and Design Code documents were undertaken in 2020 by CSA Environmental Ltd (on behalf of Barwood Land, Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land Ltd and William Davis Ltd (jointly referred to as the developers), in conjunction with Melton Borough Council). The masterplan states that “Since September 2019, the developer team and officers from MBC have worked closely together...” but we are not aware of LCC Highway involvement during this period. LCC (highways) was not involved with the work undertaken by CSA. The statement on page 14 (bullet 1) may therefore not be factually correct: “This document has been prepared with due regard to the Highways Design Guide. Consultation and on-going dialogue with LCC Highways team have enable this document to be prepared in accordance with the Highways Design Guide and to the satisfaction of the Highways team.”</p> <p>Page 19: Master planning and delivery: “...in order to achieve a comprehensive approach, the masterplan should be prepared for the whole MNSN.” As above, this does not appear to be the case.</p>
<p>Part A: Masterplan</p>	
<p>Analysis (page 26-49)</p>	<p>Page 28, 2.2 (first paragraph): Galliford Try are providing Early Contractor Involvement (ECI), and have now been awarded the contract to build the road.</p>
<p>Vision (page 50-65)</p>	<p>LCC had previously advised that the street hierarchy should reflect that set out in the Leicestershire Highways Design Guide (LHDG). The latest document continues to present its own hierarchy – “Spine street, secondary street, Mews, Lane and Courtyards...”</p>
<p>Masterplan (page 66-81)</p>	<p>“The master planning proposals for both the MNSN as a whole and subsequently for the site, have been subject to an in-depth process of consultation between the developers, and their respective consultant team with officers from LCC and MBC, together with other key stakeholders”. It would be</p>

	helpful to provide further clarification on who provided input to specific sections, to avoid misunderstanding.
<p>Access and Movement (page 82-85)</p>	<p>The “potential vehicular access point from Scalford Road/NEMMDR roundabout” is the design approved under the LCC NEMMDR planning approval. However, an option to remove this has been scoped as part of the modelling work being undertaken by the relevant landowner (as part of the modelling work undertaken by the northern consortium in support of a subsequent planning application). We understand that MBC are aware of this proposal, but it has not been reflected in the masterplan.</p> <p>How will the junction required between the fifth arm of the NEMMDR roundabout and the spine road be designed?</p> <p>Hierarchy of streets comment as above (the street hierarchy should reflect that set out in the Leicestershire Highways Design Guide (LHDG)). The latest document continues to present its own hierarchy – “Spine street, secondary street, Mews, Lane and Courtyards...”). This also has potential implications for adoptability.</p> <p>What work has been undertaken in developing the passenger transport (PT) strategy - is this a new service or diversion of an existing, what cost implications have been considered as part of this and is the principle agreeable with relevant stakeholders. What is the interim PT strategy until the spine road is completed - will a bus resource need to enter the site, turn around and leave etc, how does this affect answers to the preceding questions ?</p> <p>Bus route and bus stops: There appears to be no provision for a bus to be able to penetrate any part of the development until the spine road is complete at some point during Phase 3. Phase 3 is due for buildout between 2029 and 2034, approximately 6-11 years after the start of Phase 1. Phases 1 & 2 comprise 16.59 and 8.4 hectares respectively for residential development, compared to 10.01ha for phase 3. Very likely that the majority of phase 1 and 2 occupiers will be ingrained in their travel habits before the bus service starts penetrating the development via the spine road. Some mitigation is possible, such as a service to serve the frontages of the developments either on Scalford Road or Melton Spinney Road, but the contributions for transport infrastructure are likely to be structured around the wider MMTS strategy and may not necessarily be geared to provide a bus service to coincide with the earlier phases of development.</p> <p>There will be a reliance on pre-existing bus services diverting to serve the frontages of the development, until such time as developer funding for a bus service can be realised, and/or access constraints permit the use of the spine road. Ideally, some of the interior roads within the development would be used in the interim to allow buses to operate in a loop or with a temporary turning circle, but the masterplan states that in terms of swept path requirements, only the spine road would be able to accommodate buses. Roads being suitable for use by buses is a concern and for this reason the spine road, being the only road specified as accommodating buses, needs to be built and be able to be used as early as possible in the buildout.</p>
<p>Residential (page 86-89)</p>	<p>Direct frontage onto the MMDR presents potential concerns and areas requiring further thought such as management of the network, servicing requirements, parking, future access demand, and potential for pick-ups and drop offs on the MMDR e.g. what waiting restrictions will the MMDR have in place and was that designed with direct frontage in mind ?</p>

<p>Potential Community, Retail and/or Health Use (page 90-91)</p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>Potential Primary School (page 92-93)</p>	<p>Primary school pick up and drop off “close to the school” - how is this envisaged to be designed/operate ?</p> <p>There is a need to consider some preventative measures for school parking such as “kiss and drop” or “park and stride”.</p> <p>Have alternative measures to prevent/reduce congestion outside the school gate been considered, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drop-off or Pick-up facility – A dedicated layby or space near the school gate that enables parents/carers to drop off children safely and quickly. With the intention that drivers do not wait in these areas and that they stay in the vehicle so that through-traffic is streamlined and traffic queues are minimised. • Park and Stride - Providing parking away from the school gate, normally within 5- 10 minutes walking distance. This gives parents/carers who must drive the opportunity to walk the rest of the journey with pupils and reduces congestion directly outside of the school. <p>These are just two main examples. However, other design solutions maybe available.</p>
<p>Green Infrastructure (page 94-101)</p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>Delivery (page 102-107)</p>	<p>10.3 phasing and timescales: “a temporary construction access will also be provided off Melton Spinney Road in phase 1”. No other detail is provided - if temporary construction accesses are being mentioned, would others not be required and therefore should these also be included ?</p>
<p>Part B: Design Code</p>	
<p>Introduction (page 110-112)</p>	<p>Section 5 and Part B: Cycling facilities should adhere to the latest guidance: <i>Cycle infrastructure design (LTN 1/20)</i> and be fully integrated into the housing development and surrounding area to encourage modal shift.</p>
<p>Illustrative Streetscape Character Frontages (page 113-115)</p>	<p>Page 114 Spine Road design: Should we now be requiring developers to provide separate cycling and pedestrian facilities in accordance with latest national standards ?</p> <p>Green edges – 4.2m as shared surface does not comply with the LHDG.</p> <p>What stacking capacity is available at the junction between the 5th arm of NEMMDR to ensure that it doesn’t queue back to the NEMMDR roundabout?</p> <p>As currently shown, the horizontal alignment of the spine road is unlikely to permit a 20mph design speed without vertical features.</p> <p><i>Figure 12.2. Street design of Lanes, Mews & Courtyards</i> is contradictory in suggesting that they are shared surface yet include footways. Edge lanes of 4.2m shared surface width will not be adoptable for future maintenance by the</p>

	highway authority.
Highway Design Matrix (page 116-117)	<p>This does not appear to accord with LHDG and comments previously provided by LCC (HDM and IP). Specific comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Row required for adoptability, or are they all to be? • Is “target speed” design speed? • Radii should be designed in accordance with LHDG. • Spine streets at 6.75m wide, how will a 20mph “target speed” be achieved? • Further information on street and lay-by parking is required. • Any allocated parking spaces cannot be located within the public highway. • If both Mews, lanes and courtyards and green edges street types are all proposed as shared surfaces, there is a high chance these may extend beyond the length limit listed in LHDG. • Figure 12.3: - Traffic calming techniques do not align with the requirements of the LHDG; the strategy of controlling vehicle speeds using visual clues and parking is unlikely to be acceptable for adoption. • As per figure 12.2, the table could be misinterpreted with regard to the need for footway facilities on Lanes, Mews and Courtyards; are they shared surfaces (like green edges) or are they to have their own footways? • As per figure 12.2, Edge lanes of 4.2m width will not be acceptable for adoption. • Service margins should be a minimum width of 1.0m to ensure that they can accommodate street furniture and utility equipment within it. • Junction radii should be a minimum of 6m to comply with LHDG adoption requirements.
Spine Street (page 118-121)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crossing of the rail line previously discussed as being something requiring thought in terms of engineering requirements. Does the masterplan detail proposals for this? • Tree lined spine road should be designed so as not to create a maintenance burden within the extents of the public highway. Any planting or landscape proposals adjacent to the highway will need to be agreed with LCC as the highway authority, prior to approval for adoption of road, including measures to prevent tree roots from damaging the adjacent highway. Any vegetation/non-standard materials within the extents of the public highway will attract commuted sums. • What is intended by parallel parking bays - are these envisaged along the spine street? • Figure 14.3; Street Furniture (i.e. lighting columns, road signs, street name plates etc.) should be contained within the highway corridor, ordinarily back of footway to back of footway.
Secondary Streets (page 122-125)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal garage dimensions should accord with LHDG, if intended to be counted as parking spaces • 15.2 <i>Built Form</i> talks of use of appropriate landscaping to soften street spaces. Landscaping needs to be given proper consideration for use in the highway - if it is to be used, it should form part of a comprehensive scheme rather than isolated pockets of tree planting in hard landscaped areas (as depicted in figure 15.3), which rarely thrive or establish with good quality, healthy, self-sufficient trees. Landscaping features (alongside any other non-standard/extra over items/areas of adoption) will attract commuted sums for future maintenance.
Mews, Lanes and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These should comply with the LHDG • The text description of footways is misleading (figures 12.2 and 12.3)

<p>Courtyards (page 122-129)</p>	<p>when figure 16.3 depicts a shared surface and no separate pedestrian facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared surfaces should be avoided on routes that are likely to attract a significant amount of 'through traffic'. These are best suited to cul-de-sacs. • Speed control will need to be managed using the horizontal alignment of the road e.g. short lengths of straight roads, broken up with bends and give-way junctions. • Figure 16.3 does not take account of forward visibility through bends.
<p>Green Edges (page 130-133)</p>	<p>Green Edges and Lanes appear to be designed as private drives, rather than adopted highway. They are described as "<u>often</u> taking the form of unadopted, private drives". However, for them to be considered for adoption they would need to increase in width to provide a highway corridor of 7.5m. Use of the term <u>often</u> is inappropriate.</p> <p>They are described as shared surface, but they have separate, segregated pedestrian/cycle facilities.</p>
<p>Key Character Areas (page 134-149)</p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>Landscape Design Matrix (page 150-153)</p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>Detailed Design Guidance (page 154-163)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For areas proposed to be adopted these should be designed fully in accordance with LHDG. • Car parking courtyards, especially rear ones, are often not utilised, due to convenience and security. • Communal parking is often less effective than dedicated allocated parking that provides more formalised arrangements. • Parks – consider if cycle routes should be wider, to allow for two way cycling and side by side pedestrian movement. • Trees planted in or near the highway should be in tree pits to stop the spread of roots in and under the highway.
	<p>General / Miscellaneous (not referred to elsewhere in document)</p>
	<p>Ensure speed limits are appropriate and to be funded by the developers. Drivers notice the change in environment and speed limit as the developments come on line.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank