

Response to Melton Local Plan Emerging Options (Draft)

by

Bottesford Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

CHAPTER 2 MELTON BOROUGH TODAY – A PORTRAIT

Do you agree with the Portrait of Melton Borough

Comment

2.1 The population of Melton Mowbray is approximately 25K, making it relatively small compared to surrounding towns and cities, for example, Loughborough (57K), Grantham (41K), Nottingham (306K) and Leicester (330K).

2.2 (p14) Noting that a high percentage of housing in the borough is privately owned, we agree with 2.2.2 that additional housing should include provision for those that cannot afford to buy.

2.2.3 We agree that Bottesford relates more closely to Nottingham and Grantham than to Melton Mowbray town. In consequence, an increase in the population of Bottesford will contribute little to the providers of employment and services in and hence to the economy generally of the Borough.

2.2.4 Given firstly, that the cost of the cheapest houses on the new Wickets development in Bottesford is about £170K, significantly more than the average House price in Borough (£145K) and secondly, the inadequacy of local public transport and the limited access to services and employment, it is questionable whether Bottesford is a viable location for first time open market starter homes. Affordable housing is therefore needed to offset the resulting lack of market provision of such homes.

2.3.1 (p 15) There is a rail connection between Bottesford and Grantham (and also between Bottesford and Nottingham) but it cannot be described as 'good'.

SERVICE

Monday-Friday	10 trains Grantham to Nottingham	13 trains Nottingham to Grantham
Saturday	10 trains Grantham to Nottingham	13 trains Nottingham to Grantham
Sunday	1 trains Grantham to Nottingham	2 trains Nottingham to Grantham

Furthermore, users report a poor connection with Kings Cross trains at Grantham, and also the last train from Nottingham leaves before 9pm, making a car essential for attendance at evening events in Nottingham.

There is a long gap between the trains at 08.11 and 09.56, additionally a number of the trains do not stop at Bottesford.

The view of 94% of respondents to the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire is that rail and bus services are inadequate.

2.6.6 The library at Bottesford is a Community Library run by volunteers with a reducing budget from LCC, and is wholly dependent on local support and volunteer staff for its survival.

2.6.7 (p 17) (see also 7.7.3) A substantial amount of the public and private green space in Bottesford is not shown on the included map. Green spaces under private ownership are important to the rural atmosphere of the village and need protection. There are green spaces both existing and planned which could be used as the basis of the park which the Melton Local Plan has identified as a need for Bottesford. This issue will be taken forward by Bottesford Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.

2.7.2 (p17) There are few mentions of the Vale Of Belvoir which is an important landscape feature and attraction in the north of the Borough, and even fewer mentions of Belvoir Castle (6.17.2 and

7.23.1)

We suggest this merits a photograph in the final Melton Local Plan.

2.7.4 A better description than 'main waterway' for the Grantham Canal would be: The historic Grantham Canal, in the process of restoration, is potentially a significant heritage and leisure feature. However, it does pose a significant flood risk to Bottesford.

CHAPTER 3 VISION AND STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

Do you support the vision for the Borough - Support

Do you support the Strategic Priorities in the Plan – Support with observations

Why are you supporting or objecting

HP1 Increase the provision of houses for those that can't afford to buy, and replace all dwellings sold under 'right to buy'

ATP3 This should be reworded "*Improve access to public transport thereby reducing the need to travel by car* " This is difficult in such a rural village as Bottesford, but close liaison with the councils in neighbouring counties is needed to provide an adequate service

EP23 Building should not occur in areas prone to flooding until properly assessed and schemes are in place to control excess water. This means that development in such areas may not start until late in the plan's life.

EP24 Responses to Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire showed that –

- 73% of respondents are against Fracking,
- 78% of respondents are against Wind Turbines
- 50% of respondents are against Solar Farms

EP25 There should be a review into the creation of an East Midlands Waste and Recycling service with Nottinghamshire, Lincolnshire and Derbyshire. This might ease the problems with the Recycling centre at Bottesford and limit any difficulties due to its use by residents from Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire

The map on P 24 demonstrates how far Bottesford is from Melton Mowbray in comparison to Asfordby, Long Clawson and Waltham, which calls into question the sustainability of development in Bottesford compared with these other villages.

CHAPTER 4 GROWING MELTON BOROUGH – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY

Spatial strategy - Object

Comments.

SS1 Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development(p28) -Supported with comments

4.1(p27) Bottesford is a commuter village with most people shopping and working outside of the village The NPPF surely suggests that for maximum sustainability most development should be in or near Melton Mowbray.

4.2.3 Given the housing required by MBC in Bottesford should there be a specific policy on employment

4.2.4 Settlement Roles and Relationships

We believe that although there is a clear distinction in size, services etc between Primary and Secondary Rural Service Centres they should be combined in one group. Separating them leads to segregation where most development will inevitably take place in the primary centres to the detriment of the secondary centres. The latter may accept development should it enable them to retain facilities such as shops, schools etc. Increasing aging of the population needs a more distributed pattern of centres with greater number of facilities. Although younger more mobile residents shop further afield or via the internet, older people tend to rely on local shops.

For this reason we object to the definition of Asfordby, Bottesford, Long Clawson and Waltham on the Wolds as *Primary* Rural Service Centres and propose that, along with Asfordby Hill, Croxton Kerrial, Frisby on the Wreake, Somerby, Stathern and Wymondham, they should form part of a single class, namely *Rural Service Centres*.

Suggest other villages which you think should be included as a Secondary Rural Service Centre –

Perhaps the larger of the Rural Supporter Villages should be considered, where they would strategically support the Borough.

4.2.5. 'Appropriate and proportionate development' must take account of flood risk and other limiting factors, and should not prevent villages growing to meet the expectations of their residents.

4.2.6 (p30) As stated above, we do not agree with the split between Primary and Secondary Rural Service Centres, these should be in one group and a strategy developed to enhance and develop some of these centres across the Borough to provide improved support to Rural supporters and Rural settlements.

Constraints on Bottesford include flood risk, limited retail, limited parking, poor public transport (bus and rail), congested vehicle access to schools and no indication in the draft Melton Local Plan that Melton Borough Council has any plans or proposals to alleviate these constraints. This is in contrast to the two large developments in Melton Mowbray where proposals are being made for infrastructure and facilities.

SS2 Development Strategy(P34) Not agreed

Why do you support or object

Melton Mowbray is the only truly sustainable location in the Borough; in every other village the majority of the residents either work or shop or both outside of the village.

What changes would you like to see to the policy

4.2.11 (p33) More building at Melton Mowbray to fund infrastructure including ring road also 5.4.9, 6.13.1, 7.16.5

Melton Mowbray is the only *really* sustainable place in the Borough. It is close to employment retail and leisure facilities, and has the population density to support good public transport thus minimising car travel and helping with carbon reduction. The population, about 25K, is small for such a town, and a larger population will permit a more viable town centre in competition with nearby towns. An expanded Melton Mowbray would also provide a source of employment and a level of real sustainability to its nearby satellite villages. There should be a consideration of including the west end development firmly within the Plan timescales rather than as a contingency should additional development be needed.

The objectives for the Borough (p21) include revitalising Melton Mowbray town centre and reducing traffic congestion in Melton Mowbray including completion of the ring road. Both would be greatly aided by concentration of building in the town and the related funding that would bring to cover these infrastructure improvements.

The strategy proposed in the Melton Local Plan Emerging Options (Draft) will result in Bottesford, currently the second biggest centre in the Borough and the most remote from Melton Mowbray,, outstripping all other settlements outside Melton Mowbray itself by 2036. This will inevitably preclude improvement in the size and facilities in other villages in the Borough, and contradicts the statement in 4.2.11 that 'Vision for the Borough should not be at the expense of allowing some of our villages to grow to become more sustainable'. Is this what is intended?

Housing Distribution following the Development Strategy in Policy SS2

Do you support this way of distributing housing in the Borough - Not supported

What changes would you make

Growth should be centred on Melton Mowbray and locations close to Melton Mowbray. Such development will give greater impetus to infrastructure reinforcement particularly the completion of the ring road, desired by all, but of which only a part is envisaged in the plan. Looking at building in villages close to Melton Mowbray will reduce the travel necessary for those who use Melton Mowbray as their main centre. It will allow the shopping experience to improve and may gain trade currently going to Leicester, Loughborough etc.

For sustainability reasons, Melton Mowbray and its nearby villages should take at least 70% of development. The enhanced facilities that would result would also increase the attractiveness of the town to knowledge based industries and thereby produce higher paid employment opportunities.

4.2.14 (p36) In spite of the stated advantages of Bottesford there are many disadvantages which mitigate against development. Housing growth in Bottesford will not help the Borough's economy apart from meeting the numbers target, and, according to the Environment Agency, Bottesford has one of the highest levels of flood risk in the East Midlands. Thus the decision to put such a large number of houses in Bottesford seems bizarre.

There has been a substantial building programme in Grantham, Newark, Bingham and Nottingham over the last few years. It has been stated above that Bottesford relates to the Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire housing markets in which case we would like to know what contact Melton have had with these neighbouring Authorities in determining the need for more houses in Bottesford. Housing in Grantham, Newark, Bingham and Nottingham would be more sustainable than at Bottesford. (Duty to cooperate 1.11.1)

It has been noted that there is a small but clearly perceptible increase in house numbers for Bottesford from Table 2 - 365, Table 3 - 368 and Table 4 - 370 (pages 37-38)

4.2.20 (p37) All these figures represent a substantial increase from the 300 houses identified for Bottesford in earlier plan drafts, an increase relative to other villages which has not been adequately explained

Asfordby has a good bus service, is close to Melton Mowbray but nevertheless apparently warrants only 300 houses. The village does have a flood risk but this appears to be mainly outside the built zone

Long Clawson has a large number of potential option sites but given the house numbers expected fewer than half of the options will be taken up. Waltham on the Wolds has apparently no flood problem apart from some risks from springs and a number of large potential option plots. There is space also for improved services and facilities. It would benefit from more growth and given its central position in the Borough would be a good option for enhancement. Its road connection relating to Melton is good as it sits on A607, Loughborough and Grantham can also be accessed with some ease.

We suggest a 300 dwelling maximum for Bottesford; this has been the number for some time and in general people are familiar with this figure. The balance should be found by a more creative assessment of the available land in the other Rural Service centres along with Melton Mowbray itself.

A survey carried out by the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group found that 96% of respondents agreed that developments should be built in stages spread uniformly over the period to 2036 rather than in short term, large scale schemes which would give no time for the community and services to react.

SS3 Sustainable Communities

Do you support this policy – Support with comments

What changes would you make

How is the definition 'best and most versatile land' decided? MBC made a distinction between Rectory farm and Belvoir Road land presumably on a basis of arable being higher grade than pasture. The Sustainability Appraisal assumes all land to be 'best and most versatile'. Numbers of houses in Rural Supporters and Rural Settlements indicate no affordable housing. Is this intended? (i.e. all under 6 dwellings) Would increasing the permitted developments in Rural Supporter and Rural Settlements to six dwellings, aid housing choice by the expectation of an affordable property being provided. Compensate for this, if necessary, by limiting the number of sites being developed in these locations.

A survey carried out by the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group found that 87% of respondents agreed that developments should avoid using the 'best and most versatile land'

Policy SS4 South Melton Mowbray Sustainable Neighbourhood (p44)

Do you support this Strategic allocation - supported with observations and evidently some way on in planning.

What changes would you make to this Policy

The policy whereby all supported commercial development is to be located in Melton Mowbray surrounding villages is fully supported as the most sustainable option. Rather than leave the western development (MOD Animal Centre SS6) as a fall back, start the planning now for development to take place within the Plan period. This additional development may aid the effective completion of the ring road.

SS5 North Melton Mowbray Sustainable Neighbourhood (p50)

Do you support this Strategic allocation - supported with observations and evidently some way on in planning.

What changes would you make to this Policy

The policy whereby all supported commercial development is to be located in Melton Mowbray surrounding villages is fully supported as the most sustainable option. Rather than leave the western development (MOD Animal Centre SS6) as a fall back, start the planning now for development to take place within the Plan period. This additional development may aid the effective completion of the ring road.

SS6 Alternative development strategies and local plan review (p54)

Do you support this Policy – Supported with observations

What changes would you make to this Policy

The 5 year supply of Housing Land with planning consent needs to be identified urgently otherwise it appears that all other planning is relatively ineffective in that Planning Inspectors may approve development on sites that do not meet the relevant criteria. In the event of lack of progress with house building, and given the backlog in land supply these areas should be considered earlier rather than later. However there appear to be a number of sites in villages that are potential options but there is not an indicated housing need for them. (see the reference to Tables 7 and 8 below)These sites should also be revisited to see if the problems surrounding their use, such as excessive development in a given location can be overcome by the provision of compensating facilities.

The land to the west of Melton Mowbray (MOD Animal Centre 4.7.5) should be considered earlier than envisaged by this policy and its development planned within the timescales of the Local Plan, ideally as soon as the current users plan to move out. This latter should be included in current planning to take Melton Mowbray up to at least 70% of the required housing for the Borough as a whole.

Normanton Airfield, Dalby, Six Hills and other suitable small rural sites will be a challenge but should be seriously considered. We are only familiar with the Normanton sites and development here will put substantial pressure on Bottesford, Normanton and Long Bennington both in long term construction traffic and in overloading existing services in those villages.. It would be essential for infrastructure and services such as schools and health facilities to be provided in advance of housing development on Normanton Airfield to prevent overloading the available services in Bottesford and Long Bennington.

Table 7 (P61) and Table 8 (P63) show a substantial mismatch between the potential site housing capacity and the indicative requirement for each location, and some additional building in locations not constrained by flood risk would aid growth in these locations and add to their sustainability.

Location : Potential Capacity/Indicative Requirement

Asfordby : 177/224

Bottesford : 283/300

Long Clawson : 267/122

Waltham : 294/67

Asfordby Hill : 121/39

Croxtan Kerrial : 119/45

Frisby : 40/48

Somerby : 59/34

Stathern : 0/40

Wymondham : 186/37

The national 'presumption in favour of development' means that there is a real risk that all the work that has been put into this Local Plan and the various Neighbourhood Plans around the

Borough will be overtaken by events and development authorised in locations that we would not regard as favourable. An urgent assessment of the deliverable housing land must be undertaken, and the issue of the lack of land supply addressed.

CHAPTER 5 MELTON'S COMMUNITIES – STRONG, HEALTHY AND VIBRANT

Potential Housing Allocations

1 Please indicate whether you would support the development of sites listed in the Primary Rural Service Centres

Housing on Rectory Farm (MBC/057/13) and the adjacent site (MBC /181/13) is supported by Melton Borough Council, CABE, the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, local residents at a questionnaire results feedback event in December 2015, and our Flood Coordinator. The developers are willing to work with the NPSG to provide housing in keeping with the villagers' preferences and have detailed plans in place for expert-led workshops to handle and resolve any problems raised by residents, particularly those living close to the sites. The owners are also prepared to allocate plots for self build.

The land behind the village hall MBC/195/15 is also supported by the NPSG as being the only site near the village centre suitable for homes for the elderly. The owners are long term residents of Bottesford living adjacent to the proposed site and want to ensure that the development is in line with residents' wishes and Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group criteria.

The Housing Needs Survey carried out by Midland Rural Housing in 2015 identified that 33 open market properties were required of which 15 were bungalows. For affordable homes the total was 24 homes of which 7 were bungalows. These were for local needs only.

We are unable to comment on the remainder of the Primary Rural Service Centre sites.

2 Explain why you are supporting or objecting

Rectory Farm – Potential Option SHLAA 057/13

Provided the drainage could be properly managed from this site it is a good choice for Bottesford. Water leaving the site will join the Devon and can be channelled to where the Devon is leaving the village. It is a less sensitive site in terms of impact on landscape and the approaches to the village than other SHLAA sites in the village including MBC/012/13 off Belvoir Rd. It provides good opportunities for connectivity to existing paths into the West End estates on the north-western side of the village and an opportunity for a linear park space along the bank of the river Devon, an area which is not currently accessible to the public.

The site is within walking distance of amenities, shops and schools and employment sites. There are opportunities to re-use existing farm buildings providing a variety of development on the site. The site is well contained by the boundary of the railway line and will have a low impact on the beautiful setting of the village in the Vale of Belvoir.

Public consultation about the development of the site is very good. The agent for the site, Planit-X, is currently arranging a series of workshops led by Stefan Kruczkowski.

Stefan is an urban designer specialising in design within residential led development and is a lecturer in urban design at Nottingham Trent University's School of Architecture, Design and the Built Environment. Stefan was co-author of *Building for Life 12*, the latest version of Building for Life, re-written to reflect changes to the national planning policy.

These workshops will help the community to explore place-making and include sessions on creating a vision, connectivity, housing need, environment and ecology, water management, and the character of the village to create a masterplan for the whole site.

A survey carried out by the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group found that 93% of respondents agreed that future plans should improve opportunities to enjoy the benefits of the River Devon by means of riverside walks and cycle paths.

Normanton Lane – Potential Option SHLAA 181/15

This is a good development site in conjunction with Rectory Farm.

There is a mistake in the Sustainability Assessment of the site on p. 198. The site is almost directly adjacent to Bottesford's industrial site off Normanton Lane - Perfectos Inks, Long Clawson Dairy, Clay Pigeons along with a number of smaller firms.

3 Please indicate whether you would support the development of sites listed in the Secondary Rural Service Centres - No comment as most sites unknown

4 Explain why you are supporting or objecting - No comment as most sites unknown

5 Suggest alternative sites

The land behind the village hall MBC/195/15 is also supported by the NPSG as being the only site near the village centre suitable for homes for the elderly. The owners are long term residents of Bottesford living adjacent to the proposed site and want to ensure that the development is in line with residents' wishes and Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group criteria.

6 Comments about discounted sites

Land off Belvoir Rd, MBC/012/13

The Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports the rejection of this site. The site is in a sensitive location re landscape, identified separation areas, and the views of the Belvoir escarpment and Belvoir Castle. The raising of the site for drainage makes the development more dominant than a development ought to be on the edge of a settlement.

On the adjacent site where building is currently taking place, the developer, Barratts is draining the site into a minor waterway, the Winterbeck, and seem confused about which way the Winterbeck runs since their drainage outlet is angled upstream. In fact water from the site exits and joins the flow just before it passes under the small, low Winterbeck bridge. Houses in Belvoir Rd were flooded in 2001, a further flood warning was issued in 2012 when the water flowing through the Winterbeck had reached the height of the bridge arch.

A survey carried out by the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group found that 80% of respondents agreed that developments should be avoided on the approaches to Bottesford and in particular the area between the village and the A52.

C1 Housing Allocations(P65)

Do you support this policy - Not supported

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

Growth should be centred on Melton Mowbray and locations close to Melton Mowbray.

Development centred on Melton Mowbray will give greater impetus to infrastructure reinforcement particularly the ring road which seems to be desired by all but only a part of which is envisaged in the plan. Building in villages close to Melton Mowbray will reduce the travel necessary for those who use Melton Mowbray as their main centre. It will allow the shopping experience to improve and may gain trade currently going to Leicester, Loughborough etc.

At least 70% of new housing development should take place in Melton Mowbray and villages nearby as that would be the most sustainable option. It would also increase the chances of growing Melton's knowledge based economy and thereby produce higher waged employment opportunities.

5.4.14(p59) Bottesford does indeed feature a regular bus service to higher order centres, but it is infrequent and generally slow.

Timetables indicate –

Bottesford to Melton 9 per day each way taking 50-65 minutes dependant on route taken for the 14 miles, which would be the distance if a more direct route was taken.

Bottesford-Grantham 12 per day each way Monday to Friday and 8 on Saturday

Bottesford to Bingham (connection to Nottingham) morning and evening commuter run only

No day service

Bottesford to Newark – Effectively none; it is possible to get to Newark but not to return.

Muston has 1 bus per day and Normanton has no bus service

SA objectives correction- The current bus timetable shows that the bus journey to Melton takes 50-65 minutes depending on the route, not the 45 minutes claimed in the assessment.

5.4.18 (p60)

Table 7 (P61) and Table 8 (P63) show a substantial mismatch between the potential site housing capacity and the indicative requirement: Location : Potential Capacity/Indicative Requirement

Asfordby : 177/224

Bottesford : 283/300

Long Clawson : 267/122

Waltham : 294/67

Asfordby Hill : 121/39

Croxton Kerrial : 119/45

Frisby : 40/48

Somerby : 59/34

Stathern : 0/40

Wymondham : 186/37

This indicates that Waltham and Long Clawson have more land suitable for housing than is required, whereas Asfordby and Bottesford do not have enough. Furthermore, in these latter villages 'development options are restricted by areas.....at risk of flooding'. In contrast, Waltham on the Wolds has an excess of suitable SHLAA sites, no flood problem and is located near to Melton Mowbray where it might be expected that additional housing could have a positive impact on the economy of the town. Similarly Asfordby Hill, Croxton Kerrial and Wymondham also have more land than currently required for housing.

The sustainability of Bottesford in general is questionable. Bottesford is very low lying - It's not called Bottes-ford for nothing. There are two fords in the village. It is surrounded by Flood Zones 2 and 3 and was seriously flooded in 2001. The village centre is small. The location of the school causes congestion at peak times when buses are entering and leaving via the narrow Barkestone Lane corner with the High St and schoolchildren are crossing. Further development of Bottesford will not improve the economy of Melton Mowbray. Villagers tend to use Grantham, Newark and Nottingham for employment, retail and leisure facilities.

The Melton Local Plan does not identify the increase in people of school age which would result if additional housing were to be built, nor the capacity of both of the Schools at Bottesford to absorb them. Whether or not there is a need for additional school buildings is unknown. In particular, expansion of the primary school on its current site seems to be severely restricted.

Similarly the two Doctors Surgeries capacities to absorb extra workload is unknown but one of the surgeries has recently started to apply limits on attendances. It is noted that in Appendix 3 item 23 there would appear to be a plan to extend one of the surgeries to 180 square metres.

C2 Housing Mix (p68)

Do you support this policy - Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

5.5.5 (p66) and Table 9 From the Housing Needs Survey in Bottesford undertaken by Midland Rural Housing in the summer of 2015, housing for local needs was identified as-

Open Market Housing- 33 properties

45% were 2 bedroom, 36% were 3 bedroom, 15% were 4 bedroom and 3% were 5 bedroom
15 of these were bungalows

Affordable Housing -24 properties

21% were 1 bedroom, 71% were 2 bedroom and 8% were 3 bedroom
7 of these were bungalows

Given the size of this sample it agrees with Table 9 in that the majority of housing required is for 2 and 3 bedroom homes. The number of bungalows, identified as required, is significant.

A survey carried out by the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group found that -
91% of respondents agreed that developments should be targeted to the housing needs of local people as a priority.

95% of respondents agreed that future developments follow the historical pattern of housing in the parish with large and small houses side by side.

5.6.2 (P67) Given the aging population in Bottesford, housing provision for older and disabled people in addition to the existing Warwick Flats and Walford Close is essential. Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group is in full agreement on the accessibility requirements expressed in 5.6.3. The need for a care home in Bottesford to prevent infirm residents from becoming totally isolated from village life merits serious consideration.

C3 National Space Standard and smaller dwellings(p68)

Do you support this policy - Support

What changes would you like to see made to this policy - None

C4 Affordable Housing Provision (p70)

Do you support this policy - Supported - pro rata affordable homes provision , see also the response given to section 2.2.4

What changes would you like to see made to this policy -None

C5 Affordable Housing through Rural exception sites (p71)

Do you support this policy - Supported but not directly relevant to Bottesford

What changes would you like to see made to this policy - None

C6 Gypsies and Travellers (p73)

Do you support this policy - Supported but not directly relevant to Bottesford

What changes would you like to see made to this policy - None

C7 Rural Services(p77)

Do you support this policy - Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

Sustainable Communities

5.11.1 (p73) Growth for small villages to maintain their vitality and provide housing choice

5.11.8 Villages close to Melton Mowbray may use the town for community facilities, and may be able to support additional housing without a viability improvement

C8 Self build and custom build housing (p79)

Do you support this policy – Support

What changes would you like to see made to this policy –None

C9 Healthy Communities (p81)

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

Health - Gardens should be of varying sizes for a given house size so that buyers have the option to garden or not (housing choice). Good layer of topsoil specified for gardens.

Air Quality is an ongoing issue in the Barkestone Lane/High Street area, traffic for the schools, including a large number of buses, cause congestion and a pollution health risk. The plan should include a review of this situation with an aim of improving the village for its occupants. Additional housing in the village may make this worse. School buses should where possible be routed to and from the A52 from Barkestone Lane, thus enabling them to avoid the village centre. Safety concerns need to be addressed, and junction improvement may be necessary, but it should be noted that traffic to Belvoir Fruit Farm, the stud farm and other agricultural establishments use the junction on the opposite side of the A52 without difficulty.

CHAPTER 6 MELTON'S ECONOMY – STRONG AND COMPETITIVE

A picture of a crowded market day would have been better

EC1 Employment Growth in Melton Mowbray (p88)

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

SUDs are now the responsibility of Leicestershire CC

A commuted sum to cover ongoing maintenance, should be imposed on developers for building on sites at risk of flooding.

6.7.4 (p87) Most businesses are to be in Melton Mowbray as the as the only really sustainable place in the Borough

EC2 Employment Growth outside Melton Mowbray (p92)

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

6.8.5 (p83) Given the projected building at Bottesford and the need for sustainability, consideration should be given to schemes to increase employment in the village.

Employers have stated that they would prefer employees that lived locally.

EC3 Existing Employment sites (p94)

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

The Normanton Lane and Orston Lane sites in Bottesford should be included in the schedule of sites to be used for employment use.

Employers have stated that they would prefer employees that lived locally

6.12.3 The survey of Businesses in Bottesford showed there was some demand for office space for growing home-based businesses.

EC4 Asfordby Business Pk and Holywell Works(p96)

Do you support this policy – Support

What changes would you like to see made to this policy - None

EC5 Other Employment and Mixed use proposals (p101)

Do you support this policy – Support

What changes would you like to see made to this policy - None

EC6 Melton Mowbray Town Centre(p105)

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

Increasing the population close to Melton Mowbray will maintain the town's viability and employment opportunities, and will also enable it to compete effectively with larger neighbouring towns

EC 7 Retail development in the Borough (p106)

Do you support this policy – Support

What changes would you like to see made to this policy -None

EC8 Sustainable Tourism (p107)

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

Tourism for the Vale of Belvoir 7.1.3 one of few mentions of Belvoir Castle, surely a major feature and attraction.

CHAPTER 7 MELTON BOROUGH'S ENVIRONMENT – PROTECTED AND ENHANCED

The picture of the Grantham Canal appears to have been taken near Woolsthorpe, that is, at a location outside the borough.

EN1 Landscape (p109-111)

Do you support this policy – Support

What changes would you like to see made to this policy -None

EN2 Biodiversity and Geodiversity(p113)

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

In addition to provision of rural wildlife corridors the continuous fencing in built up areas needs gaps for hedgehogs and other wildlife to move around. It is understood that gravel boards are now available with hedgehog sized holes.

EN3 Melton Green Infrastructure Network (p116)

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy - None

There is a relative shortage of trees in Bottesford – they are attractive, useful as screens, improve air quality and help to slow water run-off which is important in an area with underlying clay.

A survey carried out by the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group found that 98% of respondents agreed that pathways in the parish should be protected.

EN4 (p117-118)Areas of Separation

Do you support this policy – Support

What changes would you like to see made to this policy - None

Bottesford/ Normanton and Bottesford/Easthorpe areas of separation included in the Plan should be rigorously maintained.

EN5 Local Green Space (p118-119)

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

7.5.3(p119). A substantial amount of public and private green space is not shown on the included map. Green spaces under private ownership are important to the rural atmosphere of the village and there are green spaces both existing and planned which could be used as used as a form of park which the Plan has identified as a need for Bottesford. This will be taken forward by the Parish Council/Neighbourhood Plan

A survey carried out by the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group found that - 97% of respondents agreed that the close links between the village centres and the countryside should be maintained.

98% of respondents agreed that areas of conservation and Protected Open Spaces should remain protected and new open spaces should be designated where appropriate.

EN6 Settlement Character (p119-120)

Do you support this policy – Support.

What changes would you like to see made to this policy - None

EN7 Open space, sport and recreation (p124)

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

7.8.3 Is there a requirement for additional allotments in Bottesford?

7.8.4 (p121) If allotment land is to be lost for development it must be replaced by better quality land. The labour and the cost to improve the soil condition must be recognised.

A survey carried out by the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group found that - 91% of respondents agreed that existing allotments should be protected and areas identified for extra provision should the demand increase.

96% of respondents agreed that the Neighbourhood Plan should recognise the inherent value of the sports clubs and should continue to protect this land from development.

EN8 Climate change (p125-128)

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

Item 4 - SUDs only compensates for the impact of the built area it will not help where flooding is external to the system.

Recommend that this Policy is combined with POLICY EN9 Ensuring Energy efficient and low carbon development

7.16 How can we dictate these measures to developers, they also must have a responsibility

How can this be monitored given that it will be an important contribution to carbon reduction.

Modify existing housing stock - encouragement to householders to improve the energy efficiency of their homes

7.16.3 Increased precipitation-increased flood risk is this taken into account with system design

7.16.5 Growth near and in Melton Mowbray will assist in the carbon reduction target

7.16.6 Homes from 2016 to be zero carbon, can we check this on new build?

7.18 (129) Sustainable construction how will this be monitored

7.18.4 (p129) Reduced fluid flow rate through sewers, blockages in undersized pipework , consider grey water use for flushing

EN9 Ensuring Energy efficient and low carbon development (p131)

Recommend that this policy is combined with POLICY EN8 Climate Change

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

Use of Semi detached and terraced houses (more village like) rather than detached houses with very little space between them.

7.20.3 (p132) Fracking in North and West of Borough if this is a LCC DECISION, will we be consulted .

Responses to Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire showed that –

- 73% of respondents are against Fracking,
- 78% of respondents are against Wind Turbines
- 50% of respondents are against Solar Farms

EN10-Energy Generation from Renewable sources (p136-137)

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

Responses to Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire showed that –

- 73% of respondents are against Fracking,
- 78% of respondents are against Wind Turbines
- 50% of respondents are against Solar Farms

LCU1 Vale of Belvoir - Turbines up to 25 metres in height, up to 3 in a cluster Past applications in the area have been rejected on the basis that the effectiveness of wind turbines in the Vale of

Belvoir is limited along with the landscape damage that they would cause.
7.20.8 (p133) Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014

EN11 Minimising the risk of flooding (p140-141)

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy –

We commend the inclusion of items 4, 7, 8, 9 and would recommend that item G is omitted
Planning relies too much on information from Agencies who are reticent about listening to local
information. Areas at risk of flooding should be left to later in the build program when accurate
studies are available.

In our view residential building must be expressly prohibited on land in zones 3a and 3b.

For the four watercourses that affect Bottesford, five organisations have to be consulted before
any effective overall action can take place.

Newark Internal Drainage Board for the Winterbeck
Severn Trent Water for the Rundle
The Environment Agency for the River Devon
Grantham Canal Trust for the Grantham Canal
Leicestershire County Council for surface water and ground water issues

A survey carried out by the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group found that 98% of
respondents agreed that developments should only take place in areas that do not flood and in
places that would not cause other areas to flood.

EN12 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (p142)

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

SUDs only compensates for the built area and does not deal with flooding from an external source.
We must not be tempted to build in flood areas and be convinced that SUDs is a cure-all.

EN13 (p143) Heritage Assets

Do you support this policy – Support

What changes would you like to see made to this policy - None

CHAPTER 8 MANAGING THE DELIVERY OF THE MELTON LOCAL PLAN

It would have been better to use a picture of the station with some people using it.

IN1 Transport and Strategic Transport Infrastructure (p150)

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

We note that this appears to help Melton Mowbray only

8.3.1 New developments should be located where travel can be minimised and use of sustainable travel modes optimised (in or close to Melton Mowbray).

8.3.3 Only Melton Mowbray permits sustainable travel options

8.3.5 Leicestershire Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) It is not clear how will this help rural communities

8.3.6 (p148)Traffic congestion, parking and public transport are also an issue for Bottesford

8.3.7 If housing was focused on Melton Mowbray, the need for highway construction in the rural areas will potentially be diminished.

8.3.8 Encourage staggered working /shopping times to help congestion in Melton Mowbray

IN1 5 We would welcome improved interchange facilities at Bottesford Station, particularly improved car parking and coordinated bus services.

A survey carried out by the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group found that -

84% of respondents agreed that developments should only be located where it allows people to access the village's amenities without the need to use the car.

93% of respondents agreed that the Neighbourhood Plan should include the extension and improvement of the Station car park.

IN2 Infrastructure contributions(P154) IDP- Infrastructure Delivery Plan (p147)

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

Parish Councils must be involved to identify the funding needs of the localities resulting from development, e.g .traffic calming schemes

The cost of infrastructure and facility enhancements that would be needed at all potential development locations should be assessed before the number of dwellings allocated to each location is finalised.

8.4 Education - We hope that a more strategic approach to housing will mean developments at schools will be better planned with improved space utilisation.

8.7, 8.7.3, 8.7.4 (p152-153) drains and drain sizing, pumping stations, allowance for the higher levels of precipitation forecast.

8.8 (P153) Policing -Crime levels are relatively low but the rural nature of the Vale of Belvoir brings it own problems with police cover in delays in responding to incidents. Concentrating building at Melton Mowbray would allow the most effective use of the existing Police force.

CHAPTER 9 MANAGING DEVELOPMENT

D1 Raising the standard of Design(p157)

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

9.4 (p156-159) Replace 'should' with 'must' to maintain control.

9.4.8 Avoidance of 'Off the peg' house designs , loop roads and cul de sacs Omit '..unless there are no other solutions'

9.4.10 Fronts of houses also facing rivers, footpaths etc (CABE advice)

9.4.12 Scale and massing of buildings Density must be less than 30/Ha for rural areas, balance by use of semis and terraces.

A survey carried out by the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group found that - 96% of respondents agreed that developments should avoid increasing the intensity of the village.

93% agreed that developments should avoid regular roof heights and roof lines and follow the village pattern of irregular roof lines and varying building shapes and heights.

97% agreed that the parish has grown organically, in a way sympathetic to the landscape. Developments should be appropriate to the shape and topography of the land rather than in hard edged, squared off, estates.

93% of respondents agreed that builders should be encouraged to use a mix of traditional materials within a diversity of designs to reflect the local style and character.

9.4.13 Density less than 30/Ha for rural areas balance by use of semis and terraces, larger gardens consider narrower, winding roads to limit speed

9.4.14 Design and Materials - supported

9.4.16 Building and development in context -supported

9.4.17 Does not adversely affect neighbours - supported

A survey carried out by the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group found that 96% of respondents agreed that developments should be sympathetic to the village character and style and should use materials, signage, road surfaces, street furniture, etc of a village and not those more associated with suburban and urban settings.

D2 Equestrian Development (p161)

Do you support this policy – Support

What changes would you like to see made to this policy –None

D3 Agricultural Workers Dwellings

Do you support this policy – Support with observations

What changes would you like to see made to this policy

9.5.6 (p163) We think it should be extended to 24 months

Appendix 1 - Policies saved from 1999 -No comment

Appendix 2 - Village Categories - Total of locations 76

Main Urban Area Melton Mowbray

Primary Rural Service Centre

Bottesford, Asfordby, and Long Clawson and Waltham -TOTAL 4

Secondary Rural Service Centre

Asfordby Hill, Somerby, Frisby on the Wreake, Stathern, , Wymondham, Croxton Kerrial TOTAL -6

Rural Supporter

Scalford, Hose, Old Dalby, Harby, Kirby Bellars, Knipton, Buckminster, Nether Broughton, Sewstern, Great Dalby, Plungar, Ab Kettleby, Hoby, Gaddesby, Thorpe Arnold, Burton Lazars, , Queensway, Twyford, TOTAL - 18

Rural Settlement

Easthorpe, Thorpe Satchville, Eastwell, Saltby, Burrough on the Hill, Pickwell, Knossington, Redmile, Sproxton, Brooksby, Ashby Folville, Muston, Barkestone le Vale, Eaton, Stonesby, Branston, Ragdale, Grimston, Rotherby, Saxelbye, Stapleford, Garthorpe, Holwell, Cold Overton, Asfordby Valley, Saxby, Belvoir, Harston, Edmondthorpe, Coston, Wyfordby, Freeby, Wartnaby, Little Dalby, John O Gaunt, Barsby, Brentingby, Shoby, Welby, Goadby Marwood, Chadwell, Leesthorpe, Normanton, Bescaby, Wycomb. Six Hills TOTAL - 47

Comment

Primary Rural Service Centres and Secondary Rural Service Centres should be combined to form a group called Rural Service Centres to encourage the development of a network of more sustainable villages that can be more easily accessed by the numerically large Rural Supporter and Rural Settlement groups.

If it is felt that these do not give sufficient coverage in the borough then perhaps a suitably placed Rural Supporter should be considered for development to fill the gap.

Village categories - Review to be carried out, some villages have not made returns so could be some changes but unlikely for Bottesford

Appendix 3

Page 5 Item 23 Extension to existing GP surgery 180 sq m

Page13 A 2Ha park for Bottesford

Appendix 4 Monitoring framework – some measures say no reduction when we ought to be looking at an increase, consider equivalence in area and quality if there are site replacements in the period.

Policies-Maps

The following features are shown in the maps: - Rejected SHLAA sites, Potential options, Areas of Separation and Local Green Spaces.

Villages and hamlets without any of these elements associated to them are not shown in this appendix. The 28 villages and hamlets that do not meet the criteria are -

Belvoir, Edmondthorpe, Leesthorpe, Shoby, Bescaby, Freeby, Little Dalby, Sproxton, Brentingby, Garthorpe, Pickwell, Stapleford, Brooksby, Great Dalby, Saltby, Stonesby, Burrough on the Hill,

Hoby, Saxby, Wartnaby, Chadwell ,Holwell ,Saxelbye, Wycomb, Coston, John O’Gaunt, Sewstern and Wyfordby

Policies

SS1 PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT Supported with comments
SS2 DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY Not agreed
SS3 SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES Supported with comments
SS4 SOUTH MELTON MOWBRAY SUSTAINABLE NEIGHBOURHOOD Supported with comments
SS5 MELTON MOWBRAY NORTH SUSTAINABLE NEIGHBOURHOOD Supported with comments
SS6 ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES AND LOCAL PLAN REVIEW Supported with comments
C1 HOUSING ALLOCATIONS Not agreed
C2 HOUSING MIX - Supported with comments
C3 NATIONAL SPACE STANDARD AND SMALLER DWELLINGS - Supported
C4 AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROVISION Supported with comments
C5 AFFORDABLE HOUSING THROUGH RURAL EXCEPTION SITES- Supported
C6 GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS Supported
C7 RURAL SERVICES - Supported with comments
C8 SELF BUILD AND CUSTOM BUILD HOUSING-Supported
C9 HEALTHY COMMUNITIES-Supported with comments
EC1 EMPLOYMENT GROWTH IN MELTON MOWBRAY-Supported with comments
EC2 EMPLOYMENT GROWTH IN THE RURAL (OUTSIDE MELTON MOWBRAY)-Supported with comments
EC3 EXISTING EMPLOYMENT SITES Supported with comments
EC4 ASFORDBY BUSINESS PARK AND HOLWELL WORKS Supported
EC5 OTHER EMPLOYMENT AND MIXED USE PROPOSALS Supported
EC6 MELTON MOWBRAY TOWN CENTRE Supported with comments
EC7 RETAIL DEVELOPMENT IN THE BOROUGH Supported
EC8 SUSTAINABLE TOURISM Supported with comments
EN1 LANDSCAPE Supported
EN2 BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY Supported with comments
EN3 THE MELTON GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORK Supported with comments
EN4 AREAS OF SEPARATION Supported with comments
EN5 LOCAL GREEN SPACE Supported with comments
EN6 SETTLEMENT CHARACTER Supported
EN7 OPEN SPACE, SPORT AND RECREATION Supported with comments
EN8 CLIMATE CHANGE Supported with comments
EN9 ENSURING ENERGY EFFICIENT AND LOW CARBON DEVELOPMENT Supported with comments
EN10 ENERGY GENERATION FROM RENEWABLE SOURCES Supported with comments
EN11 MINIMISING THE RISK OF FLOODING Supported with comments
EN12 SUSTAINABLE URBAN DRAINAGE SYSTEMS Supported with comments
EN13 HERITAGE ASSETS Supported
IN1 TRANSPORT AND STRATEGIC TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE Supported with comments
IN2 INFRASTRUCTURE CONTRIBUTIONS Supported with comments
D1 RAISING THE STANDARD OF DESIGN Supported with comments
D2 EQUESTRIAN DEVELOPMENT Supported
D3 AGRICULTURAL WORKERS DWELLINGS Supported with comments