

Melton Local Development Framework

# Statement of Consultation

Development Site Criteria  
Discussion Paper

June 2005

## Melton Local Development Framework

### **Development Site Criteria Discussion Paper: Statement of Consultation.**

1. Introduction
  - 1.1 The Development Site Criteria Discussion Paper was approved by the Council's Rural, Economic and Environmental Committee on 16 February 2005. The Paper was released for public consultation on 14 March 2005. The consultation period closed on 22 April 2005. This document sets out the steps that were taken to publicise the paper and the arrangements that were made to give the local community and other interested parties an opportunity to make comments. This document also provides a summary of representations submitted during this period. Late responses received prior to 25 May 2005 have also been included.
  - 1.2 The Melton Development Site Criteria Discussion Paper was the seventh consultation paper to be released. It looked at the criteria we intend to use to select development sites in the new plan.
  - 1.3 The Council is keen to ensure that as wide an audience as possible can access the review. For this reason the 'Replacement Melton Local Plan – Consultation Strategy' was adopted by the Council on 22 February 2001. This strategy sets out how the consultation for the Melton Local Development Framework should be undertaken.
  - 1.4 The Melton Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) is currently being prepared under the new planning legislation. The SCI is currently the subject of public consultation and once adopted will replace the Replacement Melton Local Plan – Consultation Strategy.
  - 1.5 In order to generate awareness and interest in the Discussion Paper the following steps were taken:
    - More than 800 copies of the paper were posted directly to interested parties;
    - Electronic versions of the paper were made available for download on our community website, [www.meltononline.co.uk](http://www.meltononline.co.uk).
    - Parish councils were sent posters for display on public noticeboards;
    - Copies of the Discussion Paper were made available at Melton Mowbray and Bottesford libraries, the Melton Mobile Library, the Council Offices and Tourist Information Centre in Melton Mowbray, and village shops/ post offices;
    - A press release was issued to make the media aware of the discussion paper;
    - A Focus Group was held to discuss the paper and help generate consensus.

2. Responses to the Development Site Criteria Discussion Paper

2.1 There were 164 individual responses made within the consultation period; the majority of those responding using the formal response form. There were 10 late representations included in the statement. About 65% of the responses were from members of the public. Representatives from the development industry provided around 10% of the responses. The remainder were primarily from local groups, parish councils and government agencies.

2.2 The document sought comments on a number of points and specifically asked seven questions. The questions, and the proportion of responses received in each case were as follows:

**1. Do you agree with our intention to use a criterion based methodology to assess potential development sites?**

	% Response		
	Yes	No	Don't Know
To 25 May 2005	89.3	5	5.7

(159 responses to this question by 25 May 2005)

**2. Do you agree with the sequential impacts criterion?**

	% Response		
	Yes	No	Don't Know
To 25 May 2005	82.8	11.5	5.7

(157 responses by 25 May 2005)

**3. Are there any other sequential impacts criterion that should be considered?**

	% Response		
	Yes	No	Don't Know
To 25 May 2005	31.8	42.2	26

(154 responses by 25 May 2005)

**4. Do you agree with the development impacts criterion?**

	% Response		
	Yes	No	Don't Know
To 25 May 2005	90.4	6.4	3.2

(156 responses by 25 May 2005)

**5. Are there any other development criterion that should be considered?**

	% Response		
	Yes	No	Don't Know
To 25 May 2005	40.7	33.3	26

(150 responses by 25 May 2005)

**6. Do you agree that new development sites should be assessed against their potential to contribute to a town bypass?**

	% Response		
	Yes	No	Don't Know
To 25 May 2005	67.3	25	7.7

(156 responses by 25 May 2005)

**7. In deciding the location of new development, how important do you rate the following factors?**

<b>Natural Resources</b>	<b>Total Score</b>	<b>No. of scorers</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Rank</b>
<b>Minerals &amp; Geology</b>	<b>655</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>4.89</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Water Supply</b>	<b>1072</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>7.77</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Farmland</b>	<b>983</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>7.18</b>	<b>18</b>

<b>Community</b>	<b>Total Score</b>	<b>No. of scorers</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Rank</b>
<b>Community infrastructure provision</b>	<b>1158</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>8.39</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	<b>1030</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>7.80</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Loss of current use</b>	<b>841</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>6.47</b>	<b>20</b>

<b>Physical</b>	<b>Total Score</b>	<b>No. of scorers</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Rank</b>
<b>Ground contamination</b>	<b>1055</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>7.81</b>	<b>=12</b>
<b>Flood Risk</b>	<b>1115</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>8.38</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Unstable land</b>	<b>1062</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>7.81</b>	<b>=12</b>
<b>Road network capacity</b>	<b>1203</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>8.78</b>	<b>1</b>

<b>Cultural</b>	<b>Total Score</b>	<b>No. of scorers</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Rank</b>
<b>Historic buildings and structures</b>	<b>1134</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>8.22</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Historic parks</b>	<b>1087</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>7.93</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>950</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>6.93</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Townscape</b>	<b>1034</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>7.49</b>	<b>16</b>

<b>Environmental</b>	<b>Total Score</b>	<b>No. of scorers</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Rank</b>
<b>Wild life &amp; habitat</b>	<b>1139</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>8.25</b>	<b>=8</b>
<b>Landscape</b>	<b>1129</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>8.30</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Air quality</b>	<b>1167</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>8.46</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Water quality</b>	<b>1197</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>8.61</b>	<b>2</b>

<b>Economic</b>	<b>Total Score</b>	<b>No. of scorers</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Rank</b>
<b>Development costs</b>	<b>850</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>6.30</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Contribution to improved physical infrastructure</b>	<b>999</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>7.40</b>	<b>17</b>

<b>Infrastructure</b>	<b>Total Score</b>	<b>No. of scorers</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Rank</b>
<b>Surface water &amp; foul drainage facilities and capacity</b>	<b>1158</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>8.58</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Vehicular access to a site</b>	<b>1081</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>8.25</b>	<b>=8</b>

**(Note: Average score = Total score (cumulative score attributed by all respondents scoring) divided by number of respondents attributing a score**

**Rank = position of importance. Taken from average score, 1 = least important, 10 = most important consideration)**

- 2.3 A summary of the individual responses received are set out in Appendices 1 and 2. Appendix 1 reports the responses received to the questions set in the paper. Appendix 2 provides a summary of additional comments that were submitted. Full copies of the representations made are available for inspection. The representations have been grouped together in the following order: Business (Bus), Councillor (Cllr), Consultant (Cons), Government agency (Gag), Government (Gov), Local Authority (LA), Local group (Loc), Parish Council (Par), Member of the Public or Individual (Pub), Retailer (Ret), Utility/ Statutory Undertaker (Util).
- 2.4 A record of the Focus Group is set out in Appendix 3.
3. What Happens Next?
- 3.1 The Development Site Criteria Discussion Paper was the seventh in a series of Discussion Papers that we wish to release over the coming months. Whilst a document like this will be produced at the end of the consultation period for each paper it is important that we also make sure that any conclusions that are drawn are made known to the public.
- 3.2 To achieve this we will set out our conclusions from the whole Discussion Paper programme in a newsletter which will be produced after the last Discussion Paper has been released. This newsletter will be sent to every household in the borough. This will provide a final opportunity to make views known before the Local Development Framework is prepared. We expect this newsletter to be published next year.
- 3.3 Following the publication of our conclusions we will prepare the first documents of the Local Development Framework for consultation. Initially this will include the Core Strategy (Issues and Options) DPD followed by the Land Allocations (Issues and Options) DPD. The formal programme will be set out in the Melton Local Development Scheme which is currently being finalised.

- 3.4 If you wish to find out more about the Local Development Framework process, or its content please contact:



Melton Borough Council, Council Offices, Nottingham Road  
Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, LE13 0UL

Phone: 01664 502383

Fax: 01664 410283

Email: [ldf@melton.gov.uk](mailto:ldf@melton.gov.uk)

Website: [www.melton.ac.psiweb.com/LocalPlan/localplan.htm](http://www.melton.ac.psiweb.com/LocalPlan/localplan.htm)

Details relating specifically to the consultation for the Local Development Framework, including publications released to date can be found at:

[www.meltononline.co.uk/mldf](http://www.meltononline.co.uk/mldf)

## Appendix 1 - Responses to the questions asked by the Development Site Criteria Discussion Paper

		<b>Q</b>	<b>Q</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	<b>Q5</b>	
Consultee:	Mr C Hall	Yes		No		No	
			Don't Know		Yes		Yes
Representation	Bus5/SC/1						
Date Received:	18/03/2005						
Consultee:	Lafarge Aggregates Ltd	Yes		No		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		Don't Know
							*
Representation	Bus9/SC/1						
Date Received:	31/03/2005						
Consultee:	Councillor P M Posnett	Yes		Yes		No	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
							*
Representation	CIlr11/SC/1						
Date Received:	20/04/2005						
Consultee:	Councillor P. J. Swain	Yes		No		No	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	CIlr12/SC/1						
Date Received:	16/03/2005						
Consultee:	Councillor N Slater	Yes		No		Don't Know	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	CIlr13/SC/1						
Date Received:	06/04/2005						
Consultee:	Councillor R. Hyslop	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know	
			Yes				Yes
Representation	CIlr14/SC/1						
Date Received:	01/04/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

		<b>Q</b>	<b>Q</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	<b>Q5</b>	
Consultee:	Councillor D.R. Wright	Yes		Yes			
			Yes		Yes		
Representation	Cllr3/SC/1					Yes	*
Date Received:	24/03/2005						
Consultee:	Councillor C.O. Chapman	Yes		Don't Know			
			Yes		Yes		
Representation	Cllr5/SC/1					Yes	*
Date Received:	20/04/2005						
Consultee:	Councillor V J Manderson	Yes		No		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		
Representation	Cllr9/SC/1					Yes	*
Date Received:	15/03/2005						
Consultee:	Brown and Co.	Yes		No		Yes	
			No		Yes		
Representation	Cons12/SC/1					No	*
Date Received:	21/04/2005						
Consultee:	Shouler and Son	Don't Know		Don't Know		Yes	
			Don't Know		Don't Know		
Representation	Cons17/SC/1					Yes	*
Date Received:	17/03/2005						
Consultee:	Humberts	Yes		Don't Know		Yes	
			No		Yes		
Representation	Cons22/SC/1					No	*
Date Received:	22/04/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

	Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee: Smiths Gore						
Representation: Cons29/SC/1						*
Date Received: 21/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr R Long	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Don't Know	
Representation: Cons32/SC/1					No	*
Date Received: 22/04/2005						
Consultee: Peacock & Smith	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Representation: Cons33/SC/1					Yes	*
Date Received: 21/04/2005						
Consultee: Mr M Fairhurst	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	
Representation: Cons38/SC/1						*
Date Received: 19/04/2005						
Consultee: The Littman Partnership						
Representation: Cons39/SC/1						*
Date Received: 21/04/2005						
Consultee: GVA Grimley						
Representation: Cons40/SC/1						*
Date Received: 25/04/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

		Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee:	Atisreal	Don't Know		Don't Know		Don't Know	
			Don't Know		Don't Know		Don't Know
Representation	Cons41/SC/1						
Date Received:	01/04/2005						
Consultee:	Pegasus Planning Group	Yes		Yes		No	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Cons43/SC/1						*
Date Received:	21/04/2005						
Consultee:	Smith Stuart Reynolds						
							*
Representation	Cons6/SC/1						
Date Received:	22/04/2005						
Consultee:	Rutland Country Homes	Yes					
						No	
Representation	Dev2/SC/1						*
Date Received:	31/03/2005						
Consultee:	C R Crane and Son Ltd	Yes		Yes		No	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Dev3/SC/1						*
Date Received:	01/04/2005						
Consultee:	Persimmon Homes	Yes		No		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		No
Representation	Dev4/SC/1						*
Date Received:	18/03/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

		Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee:	House Builders Federation						
Representation	Dev5/SC/1						*
Date Received:	21/04/2005						
Consultee:	Countryside Agency (East Midlands)	Yes		Yes		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		No
Representation	Gag10/SC/1						*
Date Received:	25/04/2005						
Consultee:	English Nature						
Representation	Gag2/SC/1						*
Date Received:	12/04/2005						
Consultee:	Environment Agency	Yes		Yes		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		Don't Know
Representation	Gag3/SC/1						*
Date Received:	21/04/2005						
Consultee:	English Heritage						
Representation	Gag4/SC/1						*
Date Received:	21/04/2005						
Consultee:	Sport England	Yes		Yes		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Gag6/SC/1						*
Date Received:	22/04/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

		Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee:	Melton, Rutland and Harborough Primary Care Trust	Yes		No		No	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Gag8/SC/1						
Date Received:	01/04/2005						
Consultee:	Secretary of State						
							*
Representation	Gov1/SC/1						
Date Received:	22/04/2005						
Consultee:	Police Architectural Liaison Officer	Yes		No		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		Don't Know
							*
Representation	LA1/SC/1						
Date Received:	06/04/2005						
Consultee:	Leicestershire County Council	Yes		No		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
							*
Representation	LA2/SC/1						
Date Received:	26/04/2005						
Consultee:	Harborough District Council	Yes		No		No	
			Yes		Yes		No
							*
Representation	LA4/SC/1						
Date Received:	31/03/2005						
Consultee:	National Farmers Union					Yes	
					Yes		
							*
Representation	Loc1(A)/SC/1						
Date Received:	23/03/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

		Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee:	Leicestershire Wildfowlers Association	Yes		No		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		No
Representation	Loc10/SC/1						*
Date Received:	23/03/2005						
Consultee:	Melton Mowbray Chamber of Trade	Yes		Yes		Yes	
			No		Yes		Yes
Representation	Loc19/SC/1						*
Date Received:	05/04/2005						
Consultee:	Great Dalby Action Group	Yes		No		Don't Know	
			Yes		Yes		No
Representation	Loc3/SC/1						*
Date Received:	14/04/2005						
Consultee:	Melton Mowbray Town Estate	Yes		No			
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Loc4/SC/1						*
Date Received:	23/03/2005						
Consultee:	The Ramblers Association (Melton Mowbray)	Yes		No		No	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Loc5/SC/1						*
Date Received:	29/03/2005						
Consultee:	Council for the Protection of Rural England (Melton)	Don't Know		Don't Know		Don't Know	
			Don't Know		Don't Know		No
Representation	Loc7/SC/1						*
Date Received:	21/04/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

		Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee:	Melton Mowbray and District Civic Society	No		Yes		Yes	
			No		Yes		Yes
Representation	Loc8/SC/1						*
Date Received:	21/04/2005						
Consultee:	Long Field High School	Yes		Yes		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		No
Representation	Loc9/SC/1						*
Date Received:	20/04/2005						
Consultee:	Somerby Parish Council	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know	
			Yes		Yes		Don't Know
Representation	Par12/SC/1						*
Date Received:	20/05/2005						
Consultee:	Clawson Hose & Harby Parish Council	Yes		No		Don't Know	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Par13/SC/1						*
Date Received:	18/04/2005						
Consultee:	Knossington & Cold Overton Parish Council	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Par19/SC/1						
Date Received:	06/04/2005						
Consultee:	Buckminster Parish Council						
							*
Representation	Par22/SC/1						
Date Received:	21/04/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

		<b>Q</b>	<b>Q</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	<b>Q5</b>	
Consultee:	Clerk to Thrussington Parish Council	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Par23/SC/1						
Date Received:	13/05/2005						
Consultee:	Hoby with Rotherby Parish Council	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Par25/SC/1						
Date Received:	14/04/2005						
Consultee:	Grimston Parish Council	Yes		No		No	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Par3/SC/1						
Date Received:	17/03/2005						
Consultee:	Burton & Dalby Parish Council	Don't Know		No		Don't Know	
			Don't Know		Yes	No	*
Representation	Par4/SC/1						
Date Received:	21/04/2005						
Consultee:	Barkstone, Plungar & Redmile Parish Council,	Yes		Yes		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Par6/SC/1						*
Date Received:	20/04/2005						
Consultee:	Gaddesby Parish Council	Yes		No		No	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Par7/SC/1						
Date Received:	15/04/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

	Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee: Mr R C Wright	Yes		No		Yes	
		Yes		No		Yes
Representation Pub10/SC/1						*
Date Received: 29/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr P M Smith	Yes		Don't Know		Yes	
		Yes		Yes		No
Representation Pub100(A)/SC/1						*
Date Received: 18/04/2005						
Consultee: Mr A Green	Yes		Yes		No	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub101/SC/1						*
Date Received: 23/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr M and Mrs L Holt	Yes		No		No	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub102/SC/1						*
Date Received: 30/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr S and Mrs J McGarry	Yes		Don't Know		Yes	
		Yes		Yes		No
Representation Pub103/SC/1						*
Date Received: 29/03/2005						
Consultee: R Heywood	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub105/SC/1						*
Date Received: 01/04/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

	Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee: Mrs L Watkins	No		Don't Know		Don't Know	
		Yes		Yes	No	*
Representation Pub108/SC/1						
Date Received: 23/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr J Woolward	Yes		No		Yes	
		Yes		Yes	No	*
Representation Pub11/SC/1						
Date Received: 21/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr M Howard	Yes		No		No	
		Yes		Yes	Yes	
Representation Pub112/SC/1						
Date Received: 29/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr R H B Ranns	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know	
		Yes		Yes	Yes	
Representation Pub117/SC/1						
Date Received: 30/03/2005						
Consultee: Dr E M Pearce	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		No		No	Yes	*
Representation Pub123/SC/1						
Date Received: 18/03/2005						
Consultee: P Fynn	Yes		No		No	
		Yes		Yes	Don't Know	*
Representation Pub124/SC/1						
Date Received: 12/04/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

	Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee: Mr J Kimber	Yes		Yes		No	
		Yes		Yes		No
Representation Pub131/SC/1						*
Date Received: 21/03/2005						
Consultee: Mrs J Musson	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub132/SC/1						*
Date Received: 12/04/2005						
Consultee: Miss J Wilson	Yes		Yes		Don't Know	
		Yes		Yes		Don't Know
Representation Pub137/SC/1						*
Date Received: 25/04/2005						
Consultee: Dr A H Cooper						
						*
Representation Pub141(2)/SC/1						
Date Received: 19/04/2005						
Consultee: Mrs B Cooper						
						*
Representation Pub141/SC/1						
Date Received: 20/04/2005						
Consultee: Mrs J M Dobbin	Yes		Yes		No	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub146/SC/1						*
Date Received: 21/03/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

	Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee: Mr J E Hickling	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub147/SC/1						
Date Received: 29/03/2005						
Consultee: Mrs F Daniel	Yes		No			
		Yes			No	*
Representation Pub15/SC/1						
Date Received: 29/03/2005						
Consultee: Mrs J B Watson	Yes		Don't Know		No	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub152/SC/1						*
Date Received: 21/03/2005						
Consultee: Dr M J Fitzpatrick						
Representation Pub16/SC/1						
Date Received: 18/04/2005						
Consultee: Mr R Lumb	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Yes		Yes		Don't Know
Representation Pub160/SC/1						*
Date Received: 23/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr and Mrs Peters	No		No		No	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub163/SC/1						*
Date Received: 22/03/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

		<b>Q</b>	<b>Q</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	<b>Q5</b>	
Consultee:	Ms A Cambell-Lamerton	Yes		Yes		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Pub17/SC/1						*
Date Received:	30/03/2005						
Consultee:	Mr B W Ludwig	Yes		Yes		No	
			Yes		Yes		No
Representation	Pub176/SC/1						
Date Received:	14/04/2005						
Consultee:	Mr I Kitchener	Yes		No		No	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Pub178/SC/1						
Date Received:	21/03/2005						
Consultee:	Mr W Boardman	Yes		Yes		Yes	
			Yes		No		Yes
Representation	Pub181/SC/1						*
Date Received:	29/03/2005						
Consultee:	Mr D Peck	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know	
			No		No		Yes
Representation	Pub183/SC/1						
Date Received:	22/03/2005						
Consultee:	Mrs H Boddy	No		Yes		Yes	
			No		No		Yes
Representation	Pub185/SC/1						
Date Received:	29/03/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

	Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee: Mr P Carter	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub188/SC/1						*
Date Received: 29/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr A J Richardson	Yes		No		No	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub19/SC/1						
Date Received: 21/03/2005						
Consultee: Ms C Hulse	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub197/SC/1						*
Date Received: 22/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr J Roe	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Yes		Yes		No
Representation Pub206/SC/1						*
Date Received: 29/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr R Ormond	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub211/SC/1						*
Date Received: 01/04/2005						
Consultee: Mr and Mrs Chell	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub212/SC/1						
Date Received: 29/03/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

	Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee: J & W Rackstraw	Yes		No		Don't Know	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub215/SC/1						
Date Received: 12/04/2005						
Consultee: Mr C E Hatherley	Don't Know		Don't Know		No	
		Don't Know		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub216/SC/1						
Date Received: 29/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr J Meads	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub22/SC/1						*
Date Received: 18/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr H Smith	Yes		No		No	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub225/SC/1						*
Date Received: 22/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr M Mayes	Yes		No		No	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub226/SC/1						
Date Received: 14/04/2005						
Consultee: Mr J Rudman	Yes		No			
		Yes		Yes		No
Representation Pub24/SC/1						*
Date Received: 12/04/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

		<b>Q</b>	<b>Q</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	<b>Q5</b>	
Consultee:	Mr and Mrs Bates	Yes		No		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Pub243/SC/1						*
Date Received:	15/04/2005						
Consultee:	Mr G Garfoot	Yes		Don't Know		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Pub244/SC/1						*
Date Received:	01/04/2005						
Consultee:	Mr and Mrs K Ketcher	No		No		Yes	
			No		No		No
Representation	Pub250/SC/1						*
Date Received:	15/04/2005						
Consultee:	Mr C H and Mrs P R Wells	Yes		No		Don't Know	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Pub256/SC/1						*
Date Received:	23/03/2005						
Consultee:	Mrs C Crafts	Yes		No		Don't Know	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Pub258(A)/SC/1						
Date Received:	29/03/2005						
Consultee:	Mr C Larson	Yes		Yes		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Pub271(C)/SC/1						*
Date Received:	22/03/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

	Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee: Lynne Beale	No					
Representation Pub276/SC/1						*
Date Received: 21/04/2005						
Consultee: Mrs M Tollemache	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Representation Pub28/SC/1						*
Date Received: 14/04/2005						
Consultee: N W Hoskins	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Representation Pub283/SC/1						
Date Received: 19/04/2005						
Consultee: Miss S Wadsworth	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Don't Know
Representation Pub285/SC/1						
Date Received: 21/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr and Mrs Daynes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Representation Pub287/SC/1						*
Date Received: 21/04/2005						
Consultee: Mr L G Cardwell	Yes	Yes	Don't Know	Yes	Don't Know	Yes
Representation Pub289/SC/1						
Date Received: 12/04/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

	Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5
Consultee: Mr R H Wadsworth	Yes		No		
		Yes		Yes	No
Representation Pub292/SC/1					Yes
Date Received: 05/04/2005					
Consultee: Mr M R Crocker	Yes		Yes		No
		No		Yes	
Representation Pub3/SC/1					Yes
Date Received: 31/03/2005					
Consultee: Mr H Blakebrough	Yes				
		Yes		Yes	
Representation Pub302/SC/1					Yes
Date Received: 22/04/2005					
Consultee: Mr R Brown	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know
		Yes		Yes	
Representation Pub322/SC/1					Yes
Date Received: 21/03/2005					
Consultee: Mr G P and Mrs J D Simpson	Yes		Don't Know		No
		Yes		Yes	
Representation Pub323/SC/1					Yes
Date Received: 21/03/2005					
Consultee: Mrs J E Bicker	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know
		Yes		Yes	
Representation Pub324/SC/1					Yes
Date Received: 14/04/2005					

\*

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

		<b>Q</b>	<b>Q</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	<b>Q5</b>	
Consultee:	Mr P Knowles	Yes		No		No	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Pub328/SC/1						
Date Received:	30/03/2005						
Consultee:	Mrs A Wright	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know	
			Yes		Don't Know		Yes
Representation	Pub334/SC/1						*
Date Received:	21/04/2005						
Consultee:	Nicky Stephen	Yes		No		No	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Pub339/SC/1						
Date Received:	07/04/2005						
Consultee:	Sir David Sykes, Bt	Yes		No		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		No
Representation	Pub342/SC/1						*
Date Received:	24/03/2005						
Consultee:	Mrs F E Wilson	Yes		Yes		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		No
Representation	Pub343/SC/1						*
Date Received:	21/04/2005						
Consultee:	Dr N R and Mrs C A Breveton	Yes		No		Don't Know	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Pub346/SC/1						
Date Received:	21/03/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

	Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee: Mr T R Blake						
Representation Pub351/SC/1						*
Date Received: 23/03/2005						
Consultee: Mrs A M Codd	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know	
		Yes		Yes	Yes	
Representation Pub356(A)/SC/1						*
Date Received: 01/04/2005						
Consultee: Mr S Dungworth	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Yes		Yes	Yes	
Representation Pub357/SC/1						*
Date Received: 24/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr P C Briant	Yes		No		Don't Know	
		Yes		Yes	Yes	
Representation Pub359/SC/1						
Date Received: 22/04/2005						
Consultee: Mr M Osborne	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know	
		Yes		Yes	No	
Representation Pub36/SC/1						*
Date Received: 25/04/2005						
Consultee: Mrs J Hand	Yes		No		Don't Know	
		Yes		Yes	No	
Representation Pub361/SC/1						
Date Received: 21/03/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

	Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee: Mr and Mrs Green	Yes		No		No	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub368/SC/1						
Date Received: 22/03/2005						
Consultee: Mrs G Cross	Yes		No		No	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub369/SC/1						*
Date Received: 31/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr M Robinson	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub37/SC/1						*
Date Received: 04/04/2005						
Consultee: Mrs J Collins	Yes		Yes		Don't Know	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub375/SC/1						*
Date Received: 21/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr R Collins	Yes		No		No	
		Yes		Yes		No
Representation Pub378/SC/1						*
Date Received: 01/04/2005						
Consultee: S P Smith	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub38(A)/SC/1						*
Date Received: 04/04/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

	Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee: Ms L Lomas	Yes		No		No	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub382(A)/SC/1						
Date Received: 17/03/2005						
Consultee: M Christian	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub385/SC/1						*
Date Received: 22/04/2005						
Consultee: Mr J Wood	Yes		Don't Know		Yes	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub386/SC/1						*
Date Received: 15/04/2005						
Consultee: Dr R A Lambert	Yes		No		Yes	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub390/SC/1						*
Date Received: 29/03/2005						
Consultee: Mrs J Sheppard	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know	
		Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know
Representation Pub394/SC/1						
Date Received: 18/04/2005						
Consultee: Mrs C Ferguson	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		No		No		No
Representation Pub402/SC/1						*
Date Received: 23/03/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

	Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee: R Trower	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Representation Pub403/SC/1						*
Date Received: 29/03/2005						
Consultee: Mrs L Verrall	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Representation Pub404/SC/1						*
Date Received: 29/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr A Wilen	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Representation Pub405/SC/1						*
Date Received: 22/04/2005						
Consultee: Ms R Cates	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Representation Pub408/SC/1						*
Date Received: 25/04/2005						
Consultee: Prof and Mrs J H Scholefield	Don't Know	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Representation Pub409/SC/1						*
Date Received: 31/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr P Smith	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Representation Pub410/SC/1						*
Date Received: 04/04/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

		<b>Q</b>	<b>Q</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	<b>Q5</b>	
Consultee:	Jan Barratt	Yes		No		No	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Pub411/SC/1						
Date Received:	12/04/2005						
Consultee:	Mr P Watkins	No				Yes	
			No		Yes		No
Representation	Pub412/SC/1						*
Date Received:	14/04/2005						
Consultee:	Ms S Meech	Yes		Yes		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Pub413/SC/1						*
Date Received:	20/04/2005						
Consultee:	David Storer & Partners	Yes		No		No	
			Yes		Yes		No
Representation	Pub42/SC/1						*
Date Received:	18/04/2005						
Consultee:	Mrs C Stein	yes		Yes		No	
			Yes		Yes		No
Representation	Pub49/SC/1						*
Date Received:	16/03/2005						
Consultee:	Mr C G Ginns	Yes		No		No	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Pub51/SC/1						*
Date Received:	18/03/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

	Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee: Mr David Webb	Yes		No		No	
		Yes		Yes		
Representation Pub52/SC/1						
Date Received: 07/04/2005						
Consultee: Mr and Mrs Semper	Yes		Don't Know		Yes	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub53/SC/1						*
Date Received: 31/03/2005						
Consultee: Dr I Stewart	Yes		No		No	
		No		Yes		No
Representation Pub57/SC/1						*
Date Received: 18/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr M Cuddigan	Yes		Yes		No	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub59/SC/1						*
Date Received: 30/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr R Taylor	Don't Know		Don't Know		Don't Know	
		Yes		Yes		No
Representation Pub6/SC/1						
Date Received: 08/04/2005						
Consultee: Dr N Small	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub61/SC/1						*
Date Received: 21/03/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

		<b>Q</b>	<b>Q</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	<b>Q5</b>	
Consultee:	Mr T J Burton	Yes		Yes		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Pub63/SC/1						*
Date Received:	27/04/2005						
Consultee:	Mrs J Wippich	Yes		Don't Know			
			Don't Know		Yes		Yes
Representation	Pub64(A)						
Date Received:	14/04/2005						
Consultee:	Mrs E Waldron	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Pub66/SC/1						
Date Received:	23/03/2005						
Consultee:	Mr A Ponter	Yes		No		No	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Pub75/SC/1						
Date Received:	18/03/2005						
Consultee:	Mr J B Blayney	Yes		Yes		Yes	
			Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation	Pub76/SC/1						*
Date Received:	12/04/2005						
Consultee:	Miss E M Mackie	Yes		No		No	
			Yes		Yes		No
Representation	Pub80/SC/1						*
Date Received:	12/04/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

	Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee: Mrs P Baguley	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know	
		Yes		Yes		No
Representation Pub81/SC/1						
Date Received: 31/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr and Mrs J M Scott	Yes		Don't Know			
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub87/SC/1						*
Date Received: 04/04/2005						
Consultee: Mr and Mrs A Jackson	Yes		No		No	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub89(A)/SC/1						
Date Received: 21/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr R A Marshall	Yes		Don't Know		No	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub92(A)/SC/1						
Date Received: 29/03/2005						
Consultee: Mrs R Marshall	Yes		Don't Know		Don't Know	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub92(B)/SC/1						
Date Received: 01/04/2005						
Consultee: Mr M Goodwin	Don't Know		Don't Know		Don't Know	
		No		Yes		Yes
Representation Pub99/SC/1						*
Date Received: 12/04/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2

	Q	Q	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Consultee: Mr and Mrs Linnett	Yes		No		Yes	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Ret1/SC/1						*
Date Received: 21/03/2005						
Consultee: M Wheeler	Don't Know		Don't Know		Don't Know	
		Don't Know	No		Yes	
Representation Ret23/SC/1						*
Date Received: 31/03/2005						
Consultee: Mr M Greene	Yes		No		No	
		Yes		Yes		Yes
Representation Ret25/SC/1						
Date Received: 20/05/2005						
Consultee: Network Rail						
Representation Util1/SC/1						*
Date Received: 08/04/2005						
Consultee: Transco	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Don't Know		Yes		Don't Know
Representation Util4/SC/1						*
Date Received: 29/03/2005						
Consultee: Central Trains Ltd	Yes		No		No	
		Yes		Yes		Don't Know
Representation Util5/SC/1						
Date Received: 29/03/2005						

\* comment also made. See Appendix 2



## Appendix 2 - Comments received on the Development Site Criteria Discussion Paper

### Consultee

### Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Lafarge Aggregates Ltd

Development impacts should include the impact of development on existing industrial operations.

Representation Ref: Bus9/SC/1

Date 31/03/2005

Consultee: Councillor P M Posnett

Whilst agree that new development sites should be assessed against their potential to contribute to a bypass the aim should be to provide a ring road. We do not want or need people bypassing the town centre or shopping will never improve.

Representation Ref: Cllr11/SC/1

Date 20/04/2005

Consultee: Councillor D.R. Wright

The sequential impacts criterion should include consideration of village envelopes, public open spaces and conservation areas within Category 1 villages.

Representation Ref: Cllr3/SC/1

Date 24/03/2005

Consultee: Councillor C.O. Chapman

Traffic should be re-routed away from the town centre. This would reduce the traffic problem by 40%.

Representation Ref: Cllr5/SC/1

Date 20/04/2005

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Councillor V J Manderson

A bypass proposal must be included in the local development framework.

Representation Ref: Cllr9/SC/1

Date 15/03/2005

Consultee: Brown and Co.

1. Although in agreement with the sequential approach, preference should be given to development within a Category 1 village ahead of land on the outskirts of Melton Mowbray.

2. The need to encourage economic vitality and preserve existing services in development locations must be a major factor, particularly in respect of Category 1 villages.

Representation Ref: Cons12/SC/1

Date 21/04/2005

Consultee: Shouler and Son

1. Pressure for development in the town should be geared to provide relief roads.

2. Not convinced on the need for a bypass within the town. More work needs to be done to make a southern inner relief road to complete an inner ring.

Representation Ref: Cons17/SC/1

Date 17/03/2005

3. Land in the vicinity of Queensway, Old Dalby and the ironworks adjoining Asfordby, should be examined for housing.

Consultee: Humberts

1. The strategy is unnecessarily restrictive and inflexible and entirely market indifferent, particularly with regard to Saltby.

2. The selection process only applies to sites of one hectare or more - what of smaller windfall sites?

Representation Ref: Cons22/SC/1

Date 22/04/2005

3. Marketability, availability and deliverability are all absent from the Development Impacts criteria.

4. Question whether the potential to contribute or support a town bypass is consistent with the aims of sustainability?

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Smiths Gore

Representation Ref: Cons29/SC/1  
Date 21/03/2005

1. Restricting development in rural areas, such as Belvoir, may have undesirable social and economic consequences such as rising house prices and declining rural services.
2. Although surface and foul water drainage can be a constraint to development, it is often simply a network or capacity issue. This should not be regarded as a particular 'weighty' constraint to development.
3. Electricity, gas and telephone lines do not represent physical constraints to development. Such services can always be provided, the question is only of cost.
4. Social and economic issues are particularly important to smaller rural communities.
5. A clear methodology should be set out for how the council intends to undertake the exercise to assess the criterion in combination. Some are extremely subjective.
6. New development sites should not be assessed against the potential to contribute to a town bypass.
7. If there is a case for a bypass then this should be planned for now and paid for by the public purse. It should not be relevant to the issue of finding the most appropriate location for growth.

Consultee: Mr R Long

Representation Ref: Cons32/SC/1  
Date 22/04/2005

1. Criteria should not limit possible options for development in the initial stages and should include category 2 villages.
2. Category 2 villages should be included in the sequential approach. They could be grouped together as service centres.
3. New development should not have to finance the bypass. If the bypass impact is included it should be heavily weighted.
4. It is difficult to use a scoring system since the importance of impacts will depend on the degree of impact (adverse or positive) and the ability to resolve.

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Peacock & Smith

It is difficult to rate the factors for assessing development as this will differ depending on the type of development proposed.

Representation Ref: Cons33/SC/1

Date 21/04/2005

Consultee: Mr M Fairhurst

1. Agree with the sequential impacts criteria provided that the weightings applied are sophisticated enough to choose the most acceptable sites.

2. When development is needed in the villages to sustain vital social facilities or public transport, it should not be denied at the expense of development on the edge of Melton Mowbray.

3. The thresholds of population numbers and characteristics needed to maintain the viability of vital community facilities should be examined. This will help in deciding the levels of growth needed in the category 1 villages.

4. Agree with the development impacts criteria but they are often much less important than community well being. Infrastructure will be provided following the completion of development and should not dictate the order or location of development.

5. Flood risk and road network capacity are more important than gas, electricity and water supply. Wildlife habitats and cultural assets such as listed buildings, archaeology and ancient monuments can often be safeguarded and enhanced as part of a sympathetic development scheme.

6. The town development sites should be assessed against their potential to contribute towards a town bypass. The sites in the villages should not.

7. The criteria will vary according to the use proposed. However, in many cases they are likely to have the following descending order of importance; community well being, involving the viability of essential social facilities and regular public transport; enhancement of the local rural economy; townscape, street scene and open areas; flood risk and road network capacity; land, air and water quality impact; mineral deposits, landscape and wildlife habitats; historic buildings, archaeology and monuments; and water, sewer, power and telephone provision.

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: The Littman Partnership

Strongly supportive of the principle of promoting sustainable transport choices, and integrating land use planning and transport policies.

Representation Ref: Cons39/SC/1

Date 21/04/2005

Consultee: GVA Grimley

1. It is inevitable that the scoring of sites will carry an element of subjectivity and it is important to ensure that the site assessment is transparent, consistent and robust. The wider objectives of the council must not be undermined as a result of individual preferences and bias.

Representation Ref: Cons40/SC/1

Date 25/04/2005

2. It would seem appropriate to weight criteria according to the extent to which they achieve Government and Melton Borough Council objectives.

3. The government does not place an embargo on greenfield development. Whilst the Council should prioritise the use of previously developed land relevant policies should be flexible enough to allow sustainable greenfield development in appropriate circumstances.

3. It is unclear whether development impacts of a site at a site specific or micro level or will be considered differently to those at a Borough level. This is considered to be particularly relevant in the case of social and economic issues.

4. The inclusion of a criterion related to a bypass could skew site assessment in favour of land which performs poorly when tested sequentially and would otherwise be regarded as inappropriate.

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Pegasus Planning Group

Representation Ref: Cons43/SC/1  
Date 21/04/2005

1. It is important that a scoring methodology is devised that allows for a greater degree of sensitivity than one relying on 'good', 'average' or 'bad'.
2. It is agreed that the sequential impacts criterion set down is the best way forward in order to deal with the location of development sites.
3. Other sequential impacts that should be considered include the opportunity to improve facilities and provide for necessary infrastructure projects within the town.
4. The development impacts are generally supported but it will be necessary to see the list and the way the scoring will take place.
5. A new bypass for Melton Mowbray is of particular importance in terms of improving the town centre and providing a benefit not only in terms of improvements to the environment but also in terms of economic benefit to the town. It is felt that all new developments need to be assessed against their potential to contribute to a town bypass.

Consultee: Smith Stuart Reynolds

Representation Ref: Cons6/SC/1  
Date 22/04/2005

1. The threshold for identifying land outside of Melton Mowbray should be lower than one hectare, possibly 0.5 Hectare.
2. Supportive, in principle, of the intention to use a criteria based methodology.
3. The criteria are flawed in that they place undue emphasis on the potential to support a town bypass.
4. Category 1 villages should only include Asfordby and Bottesford, and not Long Clawson or Waltham on the Wolds.
5. It is imperative that the brownfield status of a site is worked into the strategy. For example, a brownfield site in a Category 1 village might be given preference over a greenfield site on the edge of Melton Mowbray.

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Rutland Country Homes

1. Strict adherence to the sequential impacts criteria could limit development to Melton. PPG3 and PPG7 advocate some development in villages.

Representation Ref: Dev2/SC/1

Date 31/03/2005

2. Housing should follow highways. Allocating land to fit with a highway that may not be built could lead to inappropriate development.

Consultee: C R Crane and Son Ltd

Access for motor cars should be taken into account as well as public transport.

Representation Ref: Dev3/SC/1

Date 01/04/2005

Consultee: Persimmon Homes

Site criteria should include greenfield urban fringe and movement at Melton town boundary to include these sites.

Representation Ref: Dev4/SC/1

Date 18/03/2005

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: House Builders Federation

Representation Ref: Dev5/SC/1  
Date: 21/04/2005

1. Query the level of developer involvement in advising of the commercial viability of sites identified in the Urban Capacity Study. Just because sites are identified, does not mean they will get built. Therefore, it is important that some flexibility exists in order that the overall housing figure is met.
2. The text makes reference to a plan period of 1996-2016 but government guidance states that plans should cover a lifespan of ten years. The new Melton Local Plan's lifespan will need to be extended to comply with this, in particular to ensure a ten year (or continuous and uninterrupted) supply of housing land.
3. Employment facilities frequently become unsuitable for continued use and the Council will need to consider whether such facilities have become surplus to requirements and, if so, whether they could instead be suitable for residential use.
4. The Council cannot seek contributions for a town bypass regardless of whether proposals directly generate an additional need for transport infrastructure. Some major new developments might result in lower traffic generation than current or recent permitted uses.

Consultee: Countryside Agency (East Midlands)

Representation Ref: Gag10/SC/1  
Date: 25/04/2005

1. It should be recognised that rural sites for local need may not 'fit' the criteria.
2. Quality of life Assessment should be used to assist in site selection.
3. Consideration should be given to preparing concept statements to support the approach using development impacts criteria.
4. Sites should not be assessed against their potential to support a town bypass, but against the full scope of sustainability.

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: English Nature

Representation Ref: Gag2/SC/1  
Date 12/04/2005

1. The importance of wildlife sites and green space should be a sequential impact criterion.
2. The importance of protecting and enhancing biodiversity within developments and integrating it across the town or village cannot be emphasised too strongly.
3. Existing habitats and species must be taken into account at the earliest stage with ecological surveys being undertaken.
4. If the potential for a bypass is to be used as a criterion for the selection of development sites an SEA should apply to the plan or programme.

Consultee: Environment Agency

Representation Ref: Gag3/SC/1  
Date 21/04/2005

1. Although flood risk is identified as a physical constraint, sites should be selected using a sequential approach as per PPG25, paragraph 30.
2. Environmental issues could also be considered as environmental constraints.

Consultee: English Heritage

Representation Ref: Gag4/SC/1  
Date 21/04/2005

1. All designated historic assets should be considered when assessing potential development sites.
2. Non-designated features of local historic interest and value should be fully considered as these can make an important contribution to creating a sense of place and local identity.
3. Urban characterisation and landscape character assessment, including historic landscape characterisation studies can be used to help assess the potential impact of a development site on landscape and townscape character.
4. Conservation Area Appraisals are an important tool for understanding the likely impact of development on conservation areas.
5. It might be acceptable to include the 'potential to support a town bypass' as an additional assessment criterion, but it should override the requirements of PPG3 with regard to the sequential test or the requirement to protect historic assets as set out in PPG15 and PPG16. The desire for a bypass should not pre-empt the achievement of the overall sustainable development principles of the plan.

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Sport England

1. Development may be a destination itself, so it is access by non-motorised means is important when considering sequential impacts.

Representation Ref: Gag6/SC/1  
Date 22/04/2005

2. Sport and recreation facilities should be included under the cultural assets section of Development Impacts.

3. Whilst a bypass for Melton Mowbray may be important, it should not prevent funding from developer contributions for other non-transport infrastructure such as sport facilities.

Consultee: Secretary of State

The Council can only seek to negotiate contributions from developers. Considering which land to allocate against the potential to contribute to a town bypass could lead to development being sited in inappropriate locations.

Representation Ref: Gov1/SC/1  
Date 22/04/2005

Consultee: Police Architectural Liaison  
Officer

Crime and Disorder and Community Safety should be included as development impacts.

Representation Ref: LA1/SC/1  
Date 06/04/2005

Consultee: Leicestershire County  
Council

1. It is very difficult to generalise and rate the development impacts. It depends on the site and would therefore have to be done on a site by site basis.

Representation Ref: LA2/SC/1  
Date 26/04/2005

2. The issues covered in the paper include many of those that are a priority in LTP2 of the Structure Plan and as such are supported.

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Harborough District Council

Do not agree that development should be assessed against it's potential to support a town bypass.

Representation Ref: LA4/SC/1

Date 31/03/2005

Consultee: National Farmers Union

1. The sequential impact criteria are right for major development but should not be used to judge smaller developments like farm and rural diversification.

Representation Ref: Loc1(A)/SC/1

Date 23/03/2005

2. The developers impact criteria should include effect on existing neighbouring uses. For example, new housing development should not be sited near to existing bad neighbour uses such as sewage works, grain driers or livestock buildings.

Consultee: Leicestershire Wildfowlers Association

Developers should not be asked or have costs imposed on them as a condition of planning consent whether for house building or new road construction.

Representation Ref: Loc10/SC/1

Date 23/03/2005

Consultee: Melton Mowbray Chamber of Trade

1. Category one villages should be increased to include Croxton Kerrial and Harby.

2. Asfordby and Bottesford should carry the brunt of future housing after Melton.

Representation Ref: Loc19/SC/1

Date 05/04/2005

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Great Dalby Action Group

Representation Ref: Loc3/SC/1  
Date 14/04/2005

1. The potential to meet the housing needs of local people should be given greater emphasis.
2. Contamination should not be seen as an absolute constraint. It is government policy that damaged land should be remediated and brought back into beneficial use.
3. It would be wrong to allocate development sites because of their potential to contribute to a town bypass. Such an approach conflicts fundamentally with the criteria regarding potential or actual accessibility by non-car modes of transport.
4. A town bypass is not a matter for the Local Development Framework. If justified, it should be brought forward through the Leicestershire Local Transport Plan and the Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Structure Plan, neither of which contain policies supporting an aspiration for a bypass.

If the development sites are to be assessed against their potential to contribute to a bypass, the criterion should carry minimal weight.

Consultee: Melton Mowbray Town Estate

Representation Ref: Loc4/SC/1  
Date 23/03/2005

1. Good road access is vital for emergency services.
2. If there is no bus service this should not stop a development.

Consultee: The Ramblers Association  
(Melton Mowbray)

Representation Ref: Loc5/SC/1  
Date 29/03/2005

A bypass is a necessity for Melton and every effort should be made to accelerate its implementation. Contributions from developers might reduce costs but the slow implementation is intolerable.

## Consultee

Consultee: Council for the Protection  
of Rural England (Melton)

Representation Ref: Loc7/SC/1  
Date 21/04/2005

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

1. It is unclear whether the paper relates to brownfield or greenfield sites.
2. Each site should be considered on its individual merits according to the type of development proposed and not simply scored against others.
3. Although the governments sequential approach must be applied, a degree of flexibility is necessary in order to respond to local needs.
4. Although broadly in agreement with the development impacts criteria, 'wildlife', 'habitat' and 'landscape' should be grouped under the heading 'Environmental Assets'. 'mineral deposits', 'air and water quality' and 'farmland quality' should be grouped under 'Natural Resources'.
5. Housing and Transport issues should be dealt with separately. It would compromise the authority's ability to impartially judge a housing application if it were pre-empted by this connection.

Consultee: Melton Mowbray and  
District Civic Society

Representation Ref: Loc8/SC/1  
Date 21/04/2005

1. Whilst a systematic methodology for site selection may be a useful tool, it should not be the only arbiter. Consideration of local impact, perhaps by varying weight of each criterion, should also be employed.
2. Waltham on the Wolds and Long Clawson are clearly different in character from Bottesford and Asfordby. They have little scope for increase in employment and are unsuitable for development sites of one hectare or more. Development would simply increase commuter traffic. Undue weight is given to access to social facilities but access to workplaces and schools is more important.
3. Care should be exercised to ensure that the interplay of the various impacts is understood. E.g. the economic benefits through tourism of cultural assets.
4. The town bypass should only be used to assess potential development sites if it is a realistic possibility. At the present it is simply on a political wish-list.
5. All factors have equal weight apart from farmland which is an over supplied resource.
6. A scheme for the timing of the release of development sites is essential to ensure that developers do not cherry pick the easy and most profitable sites.

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Long Field High School

Representation Ref: Loc9/SC/1  
Date 20/04/2005

1. Sites of equal standing in the sequential approach should be judged for preference on their ability to release community benefit/ gains.
2. Development criteria could include the ability of a scheme to release funds which would be invested in much needed community/ educational resources.

Consultee: Somerby Parish Council

Representation Ref: Par12/SC/1  
Date 20/05/2005

1. Development costs should be the consideration of the developer.
2. The 'buying' of planning permission with contributions to infrastructure should only be considered if the development meets all other criteria and should not go ahead purely for planning gain.
3. A greater consideration should be given to those villages which still provide services to assist in maintaining a viable community.
4. More lower cost housing with fewer executive type housing, even if this is not attractive to developers.

Consultee: Clawson Hose & Harby  
Parish Council

Representation Ref: Par13/SC/1  
Date 18/04/2005

1. Long Clawson should not be a Category 1 village.
2. No building or development should take place on floodplains.

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Buckminster Parish Council

Representation Ref: Par22/SC/1  
Date 21/04/2005

1. It is not possible to score, on a scale of 1 - 10, the factors for consideration when choosing a site. The process must be flexible, because hypothetically while one factor may be of overriding importance on one site, equally it could be unimportant on another site.

2. Agree with the statement 'In some instances the development of a site can contribute to the physical regeneration of an area or help to revitalise or broaden a local community', which it considers supports the request for Sewstern to be changed from Category 3 to Category 2.

3. It is hoped that when choosing sites consideration will be given to providing much needed affordable housing.

Consultee: Burton & Dalby Parish Council

Representation Ref: Par4/SC/1  
Date 21/04/2005

To link development with the provision of a bypass is not appropriate to the planning process.

Consultee: Barkestone, Plungar & Redmile Parish Council,

Representation Ref: Par6/SC/1  
Date 20/04/2005

Development impacts should include access to the rail network.

Consultee: Mr R C Wright

Representation Ref: Pub10/SC/1  
Date 29/03/2005

1. Rivers should be dredged to make flooding less likely.
2. Waltham would need a bypass if more development was allowed.

**Consultee**

**Development Site Criteria Comments Made**

Consultee: Mr P M Smith

Whilst good for Melton Mowbray, a bypass will only increase traffic in the surrounding villages.

Representation Ref: Pub100(A)/SC/1

Date 18/04/2005

Consultee: Mr A Green

1. Appropriate infrastructure requirements for both existing and new development should be met before any development is agreed.

Representation Ref: Pub101/SC/1

Date 23/03/2005

2. The provision of a bypass is less important than ensuring that development is focused on Melton Mowbray and not the Category 1 villages.

Consultee: Mr M and Mrs L Holt

As long as no development takes place in the Category 2 villages the proposed framework is very good.

Representation Ref: Pub102/SC/1

Date 30/03/2005

Consultee: Mr S and Mrs J McGarry

Development impacts should include the impact on existing communities.

Representation Ref: Pub103/SC/1

Date 29/03/2005

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: R Heywood

1. The size of houses should be restricted (i.e. 2 three bedroom houses instead of 1 six bedroom house). Especially in village developments.

Representation Ref: Pub105/SC/1  
Date 01/04/2005

2. Greenfield sites should only be used where absolutely necessary.

3. If a site is derelict the owners should be compelled to bring it into use.

Consultee: Mrs L Watkins

1. A criteria based method should not be used to assess sites. Human instinct should be used.

2. Assessing sites against their potential to contribute to a bypass would make the process too open to 'deals' which could conflict with the MLDF. Sites could be passed in order to obtain something.

Representation Ref: Pub108/SC/1  
Date 23/03/2005

Consultee: Mr J Woolward

Asfordby should not be absorbed into Melton.

Representation Ref: Pub11/SC/1  
Date 21/03/2005

Consultee: Dr E M Pearce

1. Development within category 2 villages should take place before development adjoining category 1 villages.

2. Environmental issues should be considered before all other criteria.

Representation Ref: Pub123/SC/1  
Date 18/03/2005

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: P Fynn

Whilst the question of a bypass is important it is a separate issue from general development. It cannot be judged under the same overall criteria.

Representation Ref: Pub124/SC/1

Date 12/04/2005

Consultee: Mr J Kimber

The conversion of existing non residential buildings should be optimised.

Representation Ref: Pub131/SC/1

Date 21/03/2005

Consultee: Mrs J Musson

1. A further sequential impact might be the category of home owner envisaged for a given site.
2. The peace and quiet of an area should be considered as a development impact.
3. Whether the development would have a high visibility should be considered as a development impact.

Representation Ref: Pub132/SC/1

Date 12/04/2005

Consultee: Miss J Wilson

1. Sequential impacts should include the impact of development on its surroundings.
2. The Council should be more active in gaining developer contributions to meet community need.
3. The Council should work with villages on Conservation Area Appraisals and Village Design Statements to give a clear steer on rural development.

Representation Ref: Pub137/SC/1

Date 25/04/2005

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Dr A H Cooper

The sequential approach is not appropriate to Long Clawson. It should not be a Category 1 village.

Representation Ref: Pub141(2)/SC/1

Date 19/04/2005

Consultee: Mrs B Cooper

The sequential approach is not appropriate to Long Clawson. It should not be a Category 1 village.

Representation Ref: Pub141/SC/1

Date 20/04/2005

Consultee: Mrs J M Dobbin

1. Long Clawson must have adequate low cost homes for local people. The impact of commuters living here must be addressed.

2. Long Clawson must also have a sports/ community hall.

Representation Ref: Pub146/SC/1  
Date 21/03/2005

3. Long Clawson school must be enlarged.

4. A bypass around Melton is urgently needed.

Consultee: Mrs F Daniel

Development is so unpopular, particularly in the villages, that it needs to offer communities some benefits, such as schools, facilities, some expensive infrastructure for the loss of open space.

Representation Ref: Pub15/SC/1

Date 29/03/2005

**Consultee**

**Development Site Criteria Comments Made**

Consultee: Mrs J B Watson

1. Archaeological finds should be researched before their removal and destruction of the site.
2. Housing should not be developed on any area subject to flooding.

Representation Ref: Pub152/SC/1

Date 21/03/2005

Consultee: Mr R Lumb

Object to the classification of Long Clawson as a Category 1 village.

Representation Ref: Pub160/SC/1

Date 23/03/2005

Consultee: Mr and Mrs Peters

Low costs affordable housing should take priority over large houses in villages.

Representation Ref: Pub163/SC/1

Date 22/03/2005

Consultee: Ms A Cambell-Lamerton

The development impacts need to consider on-street parking issues.

Representation Ref: Pub17/SC/1

Date 30/03/2005

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Mr W Boardman

Representation Ref: Pub181/SC/1  
Date 29/03/2005

1. The sequential impacts criteria should take into account local facilities, schools, hospitals, shops etc.
2. The development impacts criteria should take into account how welcome the development is to the people who already live there.
3. 10 villages should have 10 houses each rather than one village have 100.
4. Far more provision for affordable housing should be made.

Consultee: Mr P Carter

Representation Ref: Pub188/SC/1  
Date 29/03/2005

Long Clawson does not meet the criteria to be a category 1 village.

Consultee: Ms C Hulse

Representation Ref: Pub197/SC/1  
Date 22/03/2005

More building in Bottesford will exacerbate the severe traffic problems.

Consultee: Mr J Roe

Representation Ref: Pub206/SC/1  
Date 29/03/2005

1. There should be no building on protected open areas.
2. The open aspect of areas should be considered.
3. There should be no building on the sky line or high ground.

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Mr R Ormond

Employment, local economy and pride in our town hang on the ring road and the town centre and shopping being resolved.

Representation Ref: Pub211/SC/1

Date 01/04/2005

Consultee: Mr J Meads

1. Consideration should be given to new planned villages instead of tackling development on the edges of existing villages.

2. Criteria should include access to rail network.

Representation Ref: Pub22/SC/1

Date 18/03/2005

Consultee: Mr H Smith

1. Any new housing developments should have off-road parking for residents.

2. Further development in and around the villages should be considered carefully with special attention paid to the quality of the road network.

Representation Ref: Pub225/SC/1

Date 22/03/2005

3. A bypass is a must if Melton Mowbray is to continue successfully. Traffic congestion is a major problem and people would rather go to Nottingham or Leicester.

4. Car parking facilities in the town are less than adequate now.

Consultee: Mr J Rudman

All developments should have ample provision for community infrastructure including sewerage, water, roads and public transport.

Representation Ref: Pub24/SC/1

Date 12/04/2005

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Mr and Mrs Bates

Representation Ref: Pub243/SC/1  
Date 15/04/2005

1. Developers should be required to build environmentally friendly houses.
2. Developments should be small to avoid self contained units within a town or village.
3. Landscaping should be given a high priority.

Consultee: Mr G Garfoot

Representation Ref: Pub244/SC/1  
Date 01/04/2005

1. More shops are needed in the town.
2. A village should be built on Dalby airfield. It should have 50% affordable homes and a ring road.
3. Build a multi-storey car park on Wilton Road.

Consultee: Mr and Mrs K Ketcher

Representation Ref: Pub250/SC/1  
Date 15/04/2005

1. The impact changes will have on the existing community should be taken into account as a development impact.
2. The figures for the amount of development that will be planned for are seriously misleading. Other sources suggest more than 1,000 homes.

Consultee: Mr C H and Mrs P R Wells

Representation Ref: Pub256/SC/1  
Date 23/03/2005

A possible bypass along St Bartholomew's Way should be referred to the Ancient Monuments Board as there are medieval enclosures to the west of Sysonby Farm.

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Mr C Larson

Representation Ref: Pub271(C)/SC/1  
Date 22/03/2005

1. Sequential impacts should include considering utilising the space above offices and shops first.
2. The development impacts of the villages needs to consider the 'balance' of the population, the impact on the 'heart' of the village, the need for additional services such as policing, and the impact on neighbouring villages (especially from increased traffic).
3. There needs to be flexibility to allow different types of dwellings such as single storey.

Consultee: Lynne Beale

Representation Ref: Pub276/SC/1  
Date 21/04/2005

Disagree with the use of a methodology as the only criteria used by the council is the presence of a doctors surgery.

Consultee: Mrs M Tollemache

Representation Ref: Pub28/SC/1  
Date 14/04/2005

1. Affordable housing should be built in urban areas because the occupants need access to services.
2. Where two criteria are of equal importance they will vie against each other and one will have to be sacrificed unless an alternative can be found.

Consultee: Mr and Mrs Daynes

Representation Ref: Pub287/SC/1  
Date 21/04/2005

Impacts should include the suitability of roads, local schools, public transport availability, local shops etc and retention of village atmosphere.

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Mr M R Crocker

It may be necessary to relax some of the criteria if the proposed development is of significant benefit to the surrounding area.

Representation Ref: Pub3/SC/1

Date 31/03/2005

Consultee: Mrs A Wright

1. No more housing in dormitory villages such as Barketstone as commuters do not bring much to the village.
2. Villages should be allowed some small businesses.

Representation Ref: Pub334/SC/1

Date 21/04/2005

Consultee: Sir David Sykes, Bt

1. It is of utmost importance that any future development is in keeping with its surroundings.
2. The bypass should not create 'infill' sites which detract from urban village scenes.

Representation Ref: Pub342/SC/1

Date 24/03/2005

Consultee: Mrs F E Wilson

Development impacts should include the accessibility and availability of educational and medical facilities to support the population, attracting new jobs of a quality that will retain the population.

Representation Ref: Pub343/SC/1

Date 21/04/2005

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Mr T R Blake

1. Bring the Ye Olde town back, concentrate on the cattle market, build a new swimming bath at the station, aiming for Olympic standards. Build a cycle track on the old railway tracks, bridging the roads.

Representation Ref: Pub351/SC/1

Date 23/03/2005

2. The bypass should aim for 30 to 40 years ahead, meaning go out into the country.

Consultee: Mrs A M Codd

It is no use building more houses if there are no jobs.

Representation Ref: Pub356(A)/SC/1

Date 01/04/2005

Consultee: Mr S Dungworth

1. A criteria to assess the 'cumulative effect' of development should be considered. One off developments are OK, but what about another one near by?

Representation Ref: Pub357/SC/1

Date 24/03/2005

2. An assessment of the potential re-uses should be undertaken. i.e manufacturing uses means the potential for future recreational use is out.

Consultee: Mr M Osborne

Do not believe that too much emphasis should be given to the response received about whether new development should contribute towards a bypass.

Representation Ref: Pub36/SC/1

Date 25/04/2005

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Mrs G Cross

Farmland is important if it is well managed with good hedges and is, for example, organically farmed. If it is not well managed and is just fields of chemicals it is not important.

Representation Ref: Pub369/SC/1

Date 31/03/2005

Consultee: Mr M Robinson

1. The impact of all residential and industrial development should not overload existing facilities or cause serious congestion on highways.

2. The provision of a bypass for Melton Mowbray is essential before large scale development is permitted.

Representation Ref: Pub37/SC/1

Date 04/04/2005

Consultee: Mrs J Collins

Sequential impact of additional traffic to support new development site.

Representation Ref: Pub375/SC/1

Date 21/03/2005

Consultee: Mr R Collins

1. A bypass is not appropriate for Melton Mowbray.

2. The town needs a ring road, and one that is close enough to the town to attract most of the traffic that would otherwise pass through the town.

Representation Ref: Pub378/SC/1

Date 01/04/2005

## Consultee

Consultee: S P Smith

Representation Ref: Pub38(A)/SC/1

Date 04/04/2005

Consultee: M Christian

Representation Ref: Pub385/SC/1

Date 22/04/2005

Consultee: Mr J Wood

Representation Ref: Pub386/SC/1

Date 15/04/2005

Consultee: Dr R A Lambert

Representation Ref: Pub390/SC/1

Date 29/03/2005

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

1. Sequential impacts should include existing infrastructure and ability to cope with future development and the effect on the character of the area.

2. Development impacts should include the effect on the character of the area.

1. More homes means more cars. If a town is to prosper, car parking must increase with housing. Improving public transport will not suffice - people will get into their cars and head for the surrounding cities.

2. Development should be spread outwards from the town centre, towards the bypass before any on the 'outside'.

Development impacts should include the close proximity of the rail network.

1. The criteria should say more about the visual amenity and historic/ cultural landscapes.

2. Development should be directed towards the town with the villages being protected from development. The farmland and villages of the wolds are valued as part of our rural scene.

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Mrs C Ferguson

Health facilities in a town like Bottesford are already immensely over burdened. There is now a lack of available land in the immediate area for a larger surgery, partly due to overbuilding of houses.

Representation Ref: Pub402/SC/1

Date 23/03/2005

Consultee: R Trower

There are other ways of carrying out site assessments. Why only these criteria? You cannot rank factors without details of each factor.

Representation Ref: Pub403/SC/1

Date 29/03/2005

Consultee: Mrs L Verrall

1. The sequential impacts criteria should stop at within the urban area of Melton Mowbray.

2. Psychological impact should be considered. The value of peoples homes will be overturned and their lifestyle destroyed.

Representation Ref: Pub404/SC/1

Date 29/03/2005

3. The bypass should not be the only justification for new development. The need for the development should be established first.

Consultee: Mr A Wilen

Taking into account the potential contribution of development towards the construction costs of a bypass is highly likely to result in unwelcome compromise when making decisions that result in the choice of development location, and potentially the route and design of the bypass, falling short of that which would otherwise be preferable.

Representation Ref: Pub405/SC/1

Date 22/04/2005

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Ms R Cates

1. Other villages apart from Asfordby should have their share.
2. There should be green belts between village and bypass.

Representation Ref: Pub408/SC/1

Date 25/04/2005

Consultee: Prof and Mrs J H Scholefield

Need to consider whether residents will use non-car methods of transport or merely bring more cars to the area.

Representation Ref: Pub409/SC/1

Date 31/03/2005

Consultee: Mr P Smith

1. Asfordby and Bottesford are different types of settlement from Waltham and Long Clawson, which themselves are indistinguishable from a large number of other settlements in the borough.
2. A list of criteria that cannot distinguish a large settlement with a population of several thousand offering businesses and employment from a small dormitory village is clearly flawed.
3. The criteria should be designed to take into account the likely impact on established settlements of major development projects taking into account the size and fragility of the settlement.

Representation Ref: Pub410/SC/1

Date 04/04/2005

Consultee: Mr P Watkins

This approach has no regard to the market. Where developers want to develop should be looked at first. The sequence should be; 1. how much development is needed; 2. where do developers want to develop; 3. What are the constraints on the preferred sites; 3. selection of preferred sites.

Representation Ref: Pub412/SC/1

Date 14/04/2005

**Consultee**

**Development Site Criteria Comments Made**

Consultee: Ms S Meech

Development and sequential impacts should include the mix of housing with support services such as GPs and schools, local employment opportunities and transport, parking and public transport.

Representation Ref: Pub413/SC/1

Date 20/04/2005

Consultee: David Storer & Partners

Request the allocation of land at Grantham Lane, Bottesford for employment or residential development.

Representation Ref: Pub42/SC/1

Date 18/04/2005

Consultee: Mrs C Stein

If a bypass is built the sequential impacts criteria should include ensuring that housing feeds onto it.

Representation Ref: Pub49/SC/1

Date 16/03/2005

Consultee: Mr C G Ginns

Agree with the need to keep small villages small.

Representation Ref: Pub51/SC/1

Date 18/03/2005

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Mr and Mrs Semper

1. If the creation of jobs for the local community is a plus factor for a development then an evaluation should be made of the local labour available to ensure that the qualities/ skills required are available. Otherwise this could mean importing labour from outside the area.

Representation Ref: Pub53/SC/1  
Date 31/03/2005

2. Support a bypass if it is a ring road so all through traffic from all directions is kept out of the town centre.

Consultee: Dr I Stewart

1. It would be more rational to develop within a category 1 village than before on the edge of Melton to avoid use of greenfield sites.

Representation Ref: Pub57/SC/1  
Date 18/03/2005

2. Against provision of bypasses generally. More roads equals greater vehicle use and greater congestion, thus greater demand for road provision.

Consultee: Mr M Cuddigan

1. The terms 'within', 'adjoining' and 'edge' need defining. Does within mean infill or land within the 30mph signage.

Representation Ref: Pub59/SC/1  
Date 30/03/2005

2. Conditions of planning consent could mean that the developer has to compensate for land take that effects wildlife and habitat.

3. Changes in farm subsidies could mean farm buildings and land becoming redundant. Sympathetic consideration should be given to permitting change of use and development of non-agricultural and residential development.

4. As land and buildings become scarce, the physical, environmental, economic and infrastructural restrictions of particular sites will become self regulating in terms of the markets willingness to pay for them.

Consultee: Dr N Small

In allocating an additional 1,000 dwellings it seems axiomatic that scope to deliver a range of community facilities, improved services, sufficient infrastructure, and secure a bypass would be maximised if the bulk of this were identified as a sustainable urban extension to the town. 30Ha of business land could also be incorporated, reducing the need to travel. The pre-existing proposal for the airfield could be modified to achieve all these objectives on previously developed land of little landscape or wildlife value.

Representation Ref: Pub61/SC/1  
Date 21/03/2005

## Consultee

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

Consultee: Mr T J Burton

1. Agree with the sequential criterion.

Representation Ref: Pub63/SC/1

Date 27/04/2005

2. There is no way young people can stay in the community they are from. Most do not fit the housing association criteria. A new structure should be looked at.

Consultee: Mr J B Blayney

New development should be designed so that it does not swamp existing features. It is important to consider carefully the existing buildings before demolition, many are worth preserving for their local historical value or the people who lived in them.

Representation Ref: Pub76/SC/1

Date 12/04/2005

Consultee: Miss E M Mackie

1. The sequential approach should be used as a starting point and must not be inflexible in its use.

2. Relying on the bypass could lead to complications if it does not come forward.

Representation Ref: Pub80/SC/1

Date 12/04/2005

3. It is important that any development is appropriate in size to its surrounding area.

Consultee: Mr and Mrs J M Scott

Using a criteria based methodology might well negate the use of a more creative and imaginative use of development land.

Representation Ref: Pub87/SC/1

Date 04/04/2005

## Consultee

Consultee: Mr M Goodwin

Representation Ref: Pub99/SC/1  
Date 12/04/2005

Consultee: Mr and Mrs Linnett

Representation Ref: Ret1/SC/1  
Date 21/03/2005

Consultee: M Wheeler

Representation Ref: Ret23/SC/1  
Date 31/03/2005

Consultee: Network Rail

Representation Ref: Util1/SC/1  
Date 08/04/2005

## Development Site Criteria Comments Made

1. Will the criteria apply to all sites, both 'large' and 'small'?
2. Substantial new housing is required is Category 1 villages to meet the housing figures. To achieve this, the development of single plot sites should be curtailed and a minimum of ten units of housing should be the only type of development allowed.

1. Residents in the immediate area should be considered utmost.
2. Liaise with the rail company and promote links to Leicester and Peterborough.
3. Do not give retail planning to stores that are already covered in the town.
4. A multi storey car park is needed and parking should be cheaper.
5. The town needs individual retail units to attract people.

It is very important that the town builds on its assets.

Support the Council's stance with regard to using the sequential test to analyse the suitability of sites for development. In particular preference should be given to brownfield land over greenfield land and also to sites with good accessibility to public transport.

**Consultee**

Consultee: Transco

**Development Site Criteria Comments Made**

Development should be located away from Major Accident Hazard Pipelines.

Representation Ref: Util4/SC/1

Date 29/03/2005