1. Do you agree with the preferred long term vision?
(Paragraph 3.4 of the Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD)
Yes.

2. Do you agree with the preferred objectives?
(Paragraph 3.5 of the Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD)
Yes. The Objectives are generally supported, in particular the Building Communities objectives.

3. Do you agree that most new development (about 80%) should be located in and adjoining Melton Mowbray?
(Paragraph 5.1-5.3 of the Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD)
Yes. The strategy is consistent with sustainable development objectives at national planning policy level, the urban concentration strategy in the draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands (supported by the Panel) and the sub-regional centre status accorded to Melton Mowbray in the Regional Plan. This approach will ensure easy access to existing local community facilities, infrastructure and services including public transport. It would appear to be a significant shift away from the previous pattern of development between 2001 and 2006.

4. Do you agree that Asfordby, Bottesford, Long Clawson and Waltham on the Wolds should be categorised as Rural Centres where a small amount of growth will be appropriate to meet local needs and help retain existing services and facilities?
(Paragraphs 5.5-5.7 of the Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD)
Yes. It would make sense to have new development in centres that have adequate services, although the amount of development may not be enough to retain local services and facilities. The settlement of Long Clawson by itself probably does not have such a large range of facilities, but the whole parish comprising Long Clawson, House and Harby is better served.

5. Do you agree that the following villages that have a limited range of local facilities are suitable only for small scale infill development?
Ab Kettleby, Asfordby Hill, Buckminster, Croxton Kerrial, Edmondthorpe, Frisby on the Wreake, Gaddesby, Great Dalby, Harby, Hose, Knipton, Nether Broughton, Old Dalby, Queensway, Redmile, Scalford, Sewstern, Somerby, Stathern, Thorpe Satchville, Twyford, and Wymondham.
(Paragraphs 5.8-5.9 of the Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD)
Yes. The listed villages have capacity to accommodate small scale infill development in a way which is consistent with the rural development strategy of the draft RSS. A modest scale of development can help to provide for local
needs housing. It is therefore appropriate to allow some development within such settlements.

6. Do you agree that development in the remaining villages that have a very poor range of local facilities should be subject to strict planning controls that are normally applied to development in the countryside?
   (Paragraphs 5.10-5.12 of the Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD)
   Yes.

7. Do you agree that all new housing development should include a mix of house types according to local needs?
   (Paragraph 6.7 of the Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD)
   Yes. Achieving a mix of housing across development sites accords with policy in PPS3 paragraphs 20-24 and will encourage development of sustainable communities. The Borough Council should ensure that this is based on up to date information contained in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment currently being prepared.

8. Do you agree that all new housing development should make a contribution towards the provision of affordable housing so that:

   a) on developments of 6 or more dwellings, 40% are affordable;

   b) on developments of less than 6 dwellings a financial contribution may be made, instead of affordable housing provision on the site.
   (Paragraph 6.20 of the Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD)

   The principle of providing for affordable housing through development is supported and is in line with Government guidance. In view of the existing lack of affordable housing, the requirement of 40% affordable housing on development of 6 or more dwellings is welcomed in principle and enables funding to be available for more targeted housing development to meet local identified housing needs. However, a number of issues need to be addressed, as set out below:

   • The policy will need to be fair and equitable so that all development will be subject to making affordable housing developer contributions.

   • There should be a flexible and balanced approach covering both local and strategic developer contribution requirements for affordable housing, infrastructure and services to ensure that the proposed housing can be developed in a sustainable manner.

   • There may be cumulative impacts from several small sites (i.e. below 10 dwellings) which may make an affordable housing contribution but would, by their size, be exempt from making developer contributions for other strategic infrastructure and services. This could affect the viability of a development in accordance with the principles established in Circular 05/2005. It should be made clear, therefore, how financial contributions are to be spent.
• Circumstances might arise where sites of less than 6 dwellings are unable to provide a financial contribution to affordable housing, and planning consent refused as a result
• The policy should take account of the Government’s proposed Community Infrastructure Levy.
• Any requirement for affordable housing should be based on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment currently being prepared rather than the 2006 Housing Needs Study, which was undertaken in accordance with earlier guidance and practice.

9. Do you agree that ‘Exception’ sites for affordable housing should be permitted in and adjoining Category 1 and 2 villages?
(Paragraphs 6.23-6.24 of the Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD)
Yes. Provision should be made for exception sites in line with guidance contained in PPS7 and PPS3.

10. Do you agree that ‘Exception’ sites for affordable housing should be permitted in Category 3 villages provided there is also a significant increase in the level of services and facilities?
(Paragraphs 6.23-6.24 of the Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD)
The need for more affordable housing, particularly in rural areas is generally recognised at national, regional and local level. The promotion of affordable housing is therefore supported in principle. However, the amount of housing developed on ‘exception’ sites in Category 3 Villages should not give rise to excessive dispersal of development into rural areas with the consequence of unsustainable development. In particular, there is the danger that vulnerable people could be housed in locations with little access to services (transport, local retail etc).

It is unlikely that there would be sufficient developer contribution from exception sites to provide an increase in the level of services. The best that could be expected is that services might be retained. This could place additional revenue burdens on local authority services and infrastructure particularly if they are not able to be funded sufficiently through developer contributions.

11. Do you agree that provision should be made for two small residential sites (5-10 pitches) and one transit (10 pitches) site to meet the needs of Gypsies and Travellers?
(Paragraphs 6.25-6.28 of the Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD)
Yes. These sites should be located close to services and facilities as identified for the provision of affordable housing. The provision matches the requirements set out in the needs assessment perfectly and the proposed locations (Melton Mowbray and the northeast of the district) are consistent with County Council data on the location of unauthorised sites and the aspirations of the Travellers that pass through the borough.
12. Do you agree that important business/industrial sites should be safeguarded from changes to other uses?

(Paragraph 7.33 of the Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD)
Yes, provided the sites are assessed against consistent criteria.

13. Do you agree that a Melton Mowbray bypass is the most effective way of reducing traffic congestion in the town (with the long-term aim of providing a complete ring-road)?

(Paragraph 8.6 of the Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD)
The Local Transport Plan (LTP) identifies a possible bypass for Melton Mowbray, as a first stage in the creation of a full ring road as a longer term objective. The proposal is therefore supported. However, complementary improvements to public transport, cycling and walking should also be sought in the town to help reduce traffic congestion.

Significant developer contributions should be made towards the staged provision of a ring road and other transport mitigation measures in the town from the housing and employment development.

It is important, however, that the timing of the delivery of any road scheme is carefully considered with the delivery of housing and any sustainable urban extension to Melton Mowbray.

14. Do you agree that Areas of Separation should be identified to give special protection to land between the settlements identified in paragraph 10.5 of the Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD?

Yes. In addition, consideration should be given to creating additional strategic open spaces in conjunction with any urban extensions.

15. Which Option for housing growth do you prefer?

(Section 13 of the Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD)
The County Council is continuing to work with the Borough Council to identify both a preferred housing location and options for new road construction that will work together to provide the best overall approach for the town.

16. Which Option for employment growth do you prefer?

(Section 13 of the Core Strategy (Preferred Options) DPD)
Option 1 (East)
Option 2 (West)
We would be looking for the most sustainable option in terms of the number and length of journeys and the potential for these to be made by public transport, cycling and walking as new employment growth needs to be closely related to housing growth to provide the greatest opportunity for people to work close to where they live. This would suggest that employment land should be provided as part of or close to a sustainable urban extension. The composition of new employment growth needs to reflect the recommendations of the Employment Land Study for Melton Borough which included the need to provide for a range of different employment uses on land and within buildings.
of different size and tenure, and encouraging higher value employment activities to increase the number of higher paid jobs in Melton.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Developer Contributions**

There is reference to developer contributions and tariffs in the title of Chapter 14 – ‘Planning Obligations and Tariffs’. However there is no detailed reference to the tariff in the text (paragraphs 14.1 -14.3). The Core Strategy would benefit from a more comprehensive and detailed explanation of the developer contributions processes and procedures. It also needs to reflect the changes to developer contributions, for example, the government’s proposed planning charge or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

The County Council’s ‘Statement of Requirements for Developer Contributions in Leicestershire’ (SRDCL) provides a consistent and integrated framework and procedure for developer contributions to ensure the adequate provision of infrastructure and services for new developments. It also provides a protocol for the developer contributions consultation process between the County Council and the Borough Council.

The SRDCL should form the basis for inclusion or adoption in full or in part as a more robust and comprehensive developer contribution policy within the Core Strategy or within a separate SPD on developer contributions. It should be adaptable to future changes and cross referenced with policies for major development proposals. This will enable developer contributions to be considered overall. The resulting levels and types of contributions secured should provide adequate provision for infrastructure and service requirements, particularly for significant local and strategic development, for the benefit of the local community.

The developer contributions policy also needs to address major developer contributions requirements through for example, master-planning, frontloading, pre applications enquiries and/or negotiations. Developer contributions must be applied to specific purposes/facilities/infrastructure and this should be reflected within an amended policy.

An Infrastructure Plan is currently being prepared on a County wide basis by the County Council to ensure joined-up understanding of future infrastructure needs, facilitate co-ordinated delivery, make most effective use of available funding and support the delivery of development sites. Developer contributions is a key element and is becoming increasingly important in securing the appropriate levels of strategic services and facilities, particularly for supporting significant development.
DETAILED COMMENTS

Para 2.7
Under Environment, consider adding
- 2 Registered Parks and Gardens
- 1,039 Recorded Archaeological Monuments

Para 2.23 (additional para, or add to 2.21)

Historic Environment
The historic environment, including buried remains, standing buildings and the historic landscape, provides a fundamental contribution to a local and regional sense of distinctiveness and place. The responses required to climate change, coupled with on-going development pressures, need careful consideration in terms of their direct and indirect implications upon this fragile resource.

Para 3.4 (Vision and Objectives)
Should make mention of Melton as a historic market town (with perhaps the earliest recorded market in the county mentioned in the Domesday Book)

Para 3.5 (Protecting the Environment)
Historic landscape character – moulded by thousands of years of human activity
Objective 25 could be strengthened to say “….and prevent development in areas at risk of flooding”.
Additional Key Issue: Protecting the historic environment. Environment objectives should include reference to the historic environment, i.e. Protect and enhance the built, historic and natural environment.

Paras 5.12 and 5.13
Whilst Para 5.12 limits development in Category 3 Villages to house extensions etc, Para 5.13 implies infill may also be acceptable. It would be better to exclude infill/small scale development, especially as there would be little prospect of 'significant improvements' to local services etc without sufficient sized proposals.

Para 6.12
The requirement that new houses should be built to Lifetime Homes Standards is very much welcomed in view of the Housing Needs Survey findings of 19% of households including someone with a disability.

Para 7.22
The reference to employment growth at Melton Mowbray should be reflected in a "policy box".

Para 9.3
It would be helpful to refer to the Melton PSICA (Planning Scheme in Conservation Areas) in this section and in background documents. This is
an agreement between County, Borough and English Heritage to fund works on historic buildings and public realm work within the Conservation Area

**Section 10**
A “policy box” for the countryside would be helpful.

**Para 10.5**
There could be a case for Areas of Separation between Melton Mowbray and Kirby Bellars and between Melton Mowbray and Asfordby Hill.

**Para 10.15**
It is inappropriate to use the term “only” in respect of 2 NNRs. There are only 3 in the entire County so Melton is fortunate to have that number and should regard them as jewels in the otherwise impoverished crown.

**Para 13.11**
6th bullet point should include a reference to Green Infrastructure.

9th bullet point - rather than simply focus on streets could refer to links (or green infrastructure); segregated non motorised routes will in some cases be a much better solution

There could also be references to:

- management of water and the desirability of Sustainable Drainage Schemes would be appropriate;
- appropriate / proportionate contributions towards services and infrastructure, both within development and wider town.