

Representation ID	Name of respondent/organisation	Support/Object	Summary of response
4000	R Thorpe	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4001	J Dunkley	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4002	No name provided	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4003	Oakley	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4004	M Tibbent	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4005	Sarah & Rob Bartholomew	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4006	J Trott	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4007	D Ward	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4008	K Wearmouth	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4009	Cave	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4010	Rachel Gardner	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4011	L Kingscott	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4012	Mrs Shilton	Object	Refer to Representation 915

4013	Simon Hurd	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4014	B A Robertson	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4015	J T Finch & H Finch	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4016	Vivian Robertson	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4017	R A Harding	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4018	Mrs N Baker	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4019	N Simkins	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4020	R Drabble	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4021	No name provided	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4022	P Davies	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4023	P Croson	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4024	Hunter	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4025	Susan Coxon-Didcott	Object	Refer to Representation 915

4026	Mr & Mrs Hassan	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4027	Miss M A Boshell	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4028	Mr & Mrs Tyldesley	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4029	M G Bowron	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4030	Val Talbot	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4031	R Hines	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4032	Jon Dunn	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4033	J Bostock	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4034	Mr & Mrs W Warriner	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4035	G L Perry	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4036	J & C M Shaw	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4037	S Pope	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4038	D Lawrence	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4039	P E	Object	Refer to Representation 915

	Craddock		
4040	Mr & Mrs Howells (distinct from #3777)	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4041	Simon McCarron	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4042	P Sudworth	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4043	Paul Andrew	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4044	P M Laycock	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4045	Vicky Santy	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4046	Mr & Mrs Leach	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4047	Bourne	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4048	Kaleigh Adams	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4049	Mr O Bird	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4050	Manwaring	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4051	Wendy	Object	Refer to Representation 915

	Freer		
4052	M Ensor	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4053	Mr & Mrs A Hall	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4054	E Heller	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4055	Jonathan Harris	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4056	Katherine Ambler	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4057	Rachel Thompson	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4058	Sherwin	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4059	M Mason	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4060	Furmiss	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4061	G Morley	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4062	Mr C Pearee	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4063	No name provided	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4064	Pa-lne	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4065	Goddard	Object	Refer to Representation 915

4066	M Wells	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4067	M Conibear	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4068	M Bostock	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4069	Mrs J Willoughby	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4070	Mr & Mrs Nash	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4071	Merryweather	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4072	Michael Ball	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4073	Chesworth	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4074	Bradley	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4075	J Harrison	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4076	Smithard	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4077	Staforth	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4078	J Bolton	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4079	Mrs M Talbot	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4080	M Taylor	Object	Refer to Representation 915

4081	Smith D A	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4082	Mr R Bryan	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4083	Picford / Johnson	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4084	R Edwards	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4085	R Edwards	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4086	Law	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4087	S Ansell	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4088	Dr H C Low	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4089	Philip Harley	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4090	Sue Power	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4091	Dr & Mrs Ensor	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4092	K T Edge	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4093	M Geary	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4094	G D Geary	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4095	K Berry	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4096	Jones	Object	Refer to Representation 915

4097	Mrs V Graham	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4098	Coley	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4099	J King	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4100	C Close	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4101	Statham	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4102	J J Chute	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4103	Bruce Jones	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4104	Adele Leadbeater	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4105	Brian Lamb	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4106	Masters	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4107	Charlotte Hancock	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4108	Sanders	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4109	D Fowler	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4110	Mr A Hall	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4111	D Jones	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4112	I D Fiddler	Object	Refer to Representation 915

4113	Russell	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4114	P Parkinson	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4115	D Essex	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4116	Sue Neseyif & Martin Deakin	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4117	G Crawshaw	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4118	Mrs Stewart	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4119	J R Morrissey	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4120	J Watson	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4121	S V J Lascelles	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4122	Alex B Peters	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4123	John White	Object	Refer to Representation 915
4124	P Porter	Object	Refer to Representation 1310
4125	Karin	Object	Refer to Representation 1310

	Siddals		
4126	EMA		<p>Q1 – Supports the Vision</p> <p>Q2 - Supports the objectives</p> <p>Q21 – Have some concern over the possible housing south of Park Lane. Part of the site is within NEC C would not normally be granted for noise sensitive development (PPG24). The draft proposals for the site leave no room for error of the future growth (outwards) of the noise contour, as forecast in the aviation white paper and EMA Masterplan, and would therefore seem to be contrary to Paragraph 12 of PPG24.</p> <p>Q27 – Have similar concerns in relation to the possible housing site north of Ashby Road in Kegworth. At present the site lies outside of the 57db night noise contour but this leaves no room for growth of the contour.</p> <p>Q39 – They understand the concerns about a clear regional steer to the issue of Strategic Rail Freight Interchanges and consider more guidance should be provided.</p> <p>Q40 – Are aware of the favoured site and consider this has a number of potential advantages and disadvantages for the airport. To access the site by rail would require the provision of a new line from the existing Nottingham – Burton line which has been presented as having the potential to be extended further south to serve EMA in the longer term. They have asked the express freight companies on the airport site with the result that they do not consider the use of rail services for them to deliver their express freight from the airport would be viable for them at this time. It is possible that some of the customers of the warehouses on the SFRI site could use the services of the express freight companies to distribute by air to markets across Europe on a next day basis.</p> <p>There is some speculation that this is a proposal for the airport which it is not which they've sought to clarify. They have no strong view on the proposal at present and can see benefits in meeting regional and Sub Regional needs, but also considerable environmental effects.</p> <p>Q42 – Support the employment zone but the proposal will need to be carefully defined to achieve the aims of the plan to support aviation and motorsport related employment opportunities whilst avoiding inappropriate development contrary to the Regional Plan.</p> <p>Q44 – Supports the economic strategy subject to the definition of the term 'directly associated employment uses only' as their response to Q48.</p> <p>Q46 – Support the approach to the airport and refer to the RSS, Aviation White Paper and towards/ Developing a Sustainable Transport System (T/DaSTS) consultation in which EMA is recognised as a key international gateway to the Country due to its freight operations.</p> <p>Q47 – No</p> <p>Q48 – Annex B of PPG13 contains a useful definition of airport development at paragraph 7 and a definition based on the first two bullet points and allowing for the third where the relationship to the airport business is explicitly justified would be useful and seem to accord best with Government policy.</p> <p>Q53 – Welcome the commitment to work in partnership with EMA and others to improve accessibility to the airport and point out that public transport accessibility to the airport has improved dramatically in recent years</p>

		<p>with the airlink 55 bus service with other villages served by the Derby-Loughborough Skylink service with some evidence that local residents are using the airport as a public transport hub to other airport based bus services. The recent opening of Parkway Station also provides opportunities in this regard.</p> <p>Q56 – Consider that S106 agreements should continue to be used as CIL could result in lower level of value uplift and a lower return for supporting infrastructure which will be a significant issue in low growth areas. This (CIL) will further exacerbate the gap between the low and high growth areas.</p> <p>They consider that CIL is unhelpfully and unduly focussed on taxing the land value uplift associated with large scale housing developments. In the case of national infrastructure including airports it is illogical to impose a tax on the development of infrastructure in order to fund the provision of infrastructure. Aviation already funds most of its infrastructure such as terminals, runways, air traffic control and surface access.</p> <p>Major transport development, such as airports, often, already have substantial planning obligations in place under existing S106 and Highways Act s278 processes.</p> <p>Q54? (Wind Turbines) – The airport is happy to discuss potential sites for wind turbines within the District and actively encourage pre app discussions where potential conflicts between turbines and aviation issues (as per C01/2003) can be resolved. It is not felt that an ‘exclusion zone’ for all proposed wind turbines in the 30km zone around the airport is appropriate.</p> <p>Their safeguarding comments are done on a case by case basis and the possible effect of a proposed turbine upon air traffic radar is complex and relates to the number of turbines, their size, construction materials and location and shape of the blades. Cumulative impacts also need to be considered.</p> <p>They also point out that the airport itself is proposing to erect four 45m wind turbines on site which is intended to provide around 10% of the sites electricity needs, albeit these turbines are considerably smaller than most commercial turbines.</p>
4127	M Walker	Refer to Representation 1310
4128	Pegasus Planning Group o.b.o. Bellway Homes	<p><u>Question 62</u></p> <p>Attention is drawn to the Schedule of Further Changes to the Regional Plan published in March 2009, the Secretary of State has noted that there is a lack of agreement about the validity of some of the renewable energy targets, and these should be subject to early review. The EIP Panel expressed some concerns about the higher targets for 2020 due to over-reliance on micro-generation technologies. Given the likelihood that the targets are to be reviewed, it would seem inappropriate for the Core Strategy to seek to incorporate district wide targets at this stage.</p>
4129	Heart of the	Urge the Council to include Core Strategy policies identifying the Heart of the Forest Park as a special policy area where specific approaches to development (different to general countryside) should apply.

	National Forest Foundation		<p>For the Vision and Action Plan to be successful (Roger Tym and Partners appointed), it is essential that appropriate supportive policies are embedded in the Core Strategy for NW Leics and S Derbys with such policies to recognise the importance of the national Forest and support further development of the National Forest economy, environment and community as a strategic exemplar and test bed for the establishment of the woodland landscape and economy.</p> <p>They refer to the need to clearly identify the area as a main focus or 'strategic location' for Forest related developments, including leisure, tourism and recreational development within a woodland economy, supporting the National Forest through the attraction of additional visitors and the creation of employment.</p> <p>Hope that the identification of the area as a 'Strategic Location' would influence future delivery mechanisms at the Regional and Sub Regional level, helping to release major infrastructure resources aimed at promoting high quality sustainable development opportunities and related connectivity, thereby supporting a wide range of local and regional regeneration objectives.</p>
4130	Andy Mawer	Object	Refer to Representation 634
4131	Mrs Mawer (Sarah)	Object	Refer to Representation 634
4132	Mrs A Luckman	Object	Refer to Representation 1310
4133	M Spencer	Object	Refer to Representation 104
4134	Landmark Planning		<p>Issue 3a</p> <p>Agree that Ibstock should be included as a Rural Town and Ellistown should be excluded. Ibstock meets all of the 8 criteria for inclusion and has significant potential to expand in a sustainable way. A better and more sustainable site options exists at Ibstock Brick, off Leicester Road. This site was put forward as part of the SHLAA (Site Ref 62) with an estimated potential of 200-250 dwellings. The potential for the development of this land was recognised in the current Local Plan with its inclusion in the Minerals Policy M2. The site can comply with all this criteria and identification as a residential development site in the submission version of the Core Strategy would give developers the certainty needed.</p> <p><u>Issue 3b</u></p>

		<p>Option 1 is the best fit with the development strategy set out in the RSS. Focus of development on Coalville should be supported. In order to ensure the required housing numbers are delivered if the development of the Coalville SUE is delayed, a more balanced approach would be to retain the focus on Coalville with a slightly altered split across the Rural Towns, for example:-</p> <p>Coalville – 9000 dwellings (focus retained) Ashby – 750 dwellings (recognising the good level of services but protecting character) Castle Donington - 750 dwellings (support economic benefits of development around the airport and race track) Ibstock – 300 dwellings (reflecting the good level of services but remaining essentially rural) Kegworth – 100 dwellings (reflecting the good level of services but remaining essentially rural) Measham – 100 dwellings (reflecting the good level of services but remaining essentially rural)</p> <p><u>Issue 5</u></p> <p>Specific sites should be identified rather than broad locations. Size of 100 dwellings or more (or 1 hectare of employment) is considered reasonable. However if Options 1 or 2 are taken, sites in Kegworth and Measham, would not be specified, therefore giving no certainty for developers or investors. In this case, the site thresholds should be reduced to 50 dwellings, as sites of this scale are strategic in relation to the size of these settlements.</p> <p>Support the development of the site off Leicester Road. The site advantages are listed and the following comments are made in response to the listed disadvantages:-</p> <p>Site retained for employment use: the brickworks are an established business on the site and the land has not been necessary for the brick works operation.</p> <p>Cost of remediation work could affect viability for developers: - any develop taking an interest in the site would undertake an assessment of ground condition and need to factor in any cost into their viability appraisal.</p> <p>To small to deliver community benefits: - this could be a disadvantage for all of the options. The contributions made necessary by the development and subsequently secured would be proportionate to the development proposed. When pooled with other contributions these would be able to deliver significant community benefits.</p> <p><u>Issue 20</u></p> <p>In terms of Ibstock, the provision of additional housing of the scale envisaged off Leicester Road would support existing services. The payment of contributions (or provision of land) could give rise to facilities for specific</p>
--	--	--

			groups, such as teenagers being provided.
4135	Mrs A J Straw	Object	<p>Question 10</p> <p>The issue of the Green Wedge should be considered separately and as part of a separate consultation. The residents of Whitwick have not had opportunity to make their representations. Object to building on the Green Wedge. Particularly concerned about the identified development of 2000 houses on the Eastern Green Wedge. The Wedge provides separation between Coalville and Whitwick. Whitwick is an historic village (mentioned in the Domesday Book). If the Green Wedge is built on, this will cause Whitwick to lose its strong sense of identity and character and just become part of urban Coalville. Do not agree with the criteria against which the Green Wedge has been assessed.</p> <p>Eastern Wedge is used everyday by local residents and is the last open area with public footpaths that pass through it. Copies of reports have been supplied that show that exposure to open green spaces and environments promote good health and are crucial in reducing health inequalities and have a positive impact on people's lives. Loss of the Green Wedge will result in the loss of rural culture, loss of wildlife, loss of habitat and loss of environment.</p> <p>Development on the Green Wedge will add to traffic congestion on already busy roads, including Stephenson Way and Hermitage Road. New roads will not compensate for the additional traffic that would be created. Congestion leads to environmental effects, health hazards, and air quality and road chaos. Also lead to an increase in buses, lorries and emergency services and congestion will prolong response time.</p> <p>The planned regeneration of Coalville Town Centre will not provide enough employment for new residents. New residents will put pressure on hospitals, surgeries, schools etc. Increased electrical demand will increase amount of pylons needed, water pressure will be an issue and sewage could overload the system.</p> <p>There will be an unacceptable impact on residential amenity, such as noise, vibration, smell, light and other pollution, as well as loss of light and overlooking.</p> <p>Currently the Eastern Green Wedge allows water to be absorbed into the ground. If this land is hard surfaced, this will result in water run off that will cause flooding. Rainfall levels in Whitwick are increasing year on year. The Eastern Green Wedge covers the old mining workings for Whitwick Colliery. There is a risk of subsidence to the new properties. The presence of mine shafts will also increase risk of flooding should the fields no longer be able to soak up much of the increasing rainfall. Abandoned mineshafts hold more water than surrounding soil.</p> <p>A number of questions are raised concerning land ownership and reference made to a recent application on</p>

			Hermitage Road which was refused for a variety of reasons, including Green Wedge.
4136	Paul Harlow & Lynn Harlow	Object	Refer to Representation 1310
4137	emda		<p>Vision – welcome the recognition that a strong and successful business sector should be at the heart of the vision.</p> <p>Objectives – Support objective SO8 re housing and the specific reference to diversifying the economic base including identifying sufficient land for employment purposes.</p> <p>Are there other options not considered</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the focus of the majority of development upon the larger settlements but also considers it necessary that the villages are provided with opportunities for development. • To classify a village as ‘sustainable’ or not on the basis of the three or four services present sounds very crude and does not take into account the location of the village to higher order settlements and services elsewhere. Also the nature of service provision may change over time. • Even in sustainable villages there is not intention to allow infill development except on sites of 0.1Ha or less and question this approach. • There is no reference to the relevance of local employment opportunities in this policy and does not consider that transport provision may be easier to provide in some settlements rather than others <p>Q5 Should 9600 dwellings be a minimum provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the likely increase in housing numbers for the RSS Review it would be useful for the Core Strategy to include reference to the likelihood of higher housing requirements. <p>Q6 – Consideration may be needed for longer term sites for development</p> <p>Q7 – With the exception of Option 3 all options accord with the RSS and the amount of development in the other settlements should accord with the results of the SHLAA and the role and potential of these settlements. They welcome reference to the Ptolemy model.</p> <p>Q9 – Refer to definition of sustainable villages and questions the restrictive nature of local needs settlements. Definition of employment is more appropriate.</p> <p>Q12 – Supports approach of allocating strategic sites in line with PPS12.</p> <p>Q13 (Strategic Sites) – emda identify employment sites of 10,000 square metres of housing of 250 dwellings as being regionally and sub-regionally significant for their role as a statutory consultee on planning applications</p> <p>Q34 – Affordable housing – consider that alternative options should be considered comparing the different percentages of affordable units sought, and different options for various size thresholds. A strong and rigorous on</p>

		<p>how viability can be assessed based on a residual land valuation approach is appropriate.</p> <p>Q38 – housing strategy – the following should be included-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • having sufficient housing and neighbourhood renovation, particularly retrofit • securing sustainable neighbourhood management practices • ensuring that sufficient units are provided to meet and support the needs of vulnerable households, with these not needing to be lumped together. <p>Economic issues</p> <p>Q39 - welcome the proactive stance in recognising the need to make provision for strategic distribution sites</p> <p>Q40 – (J24 Site) - emda commissioned a focal earth study to consider a range of sites centered on but not limited to South Derbyshire which did not consider the J24 site. However they consider the scale and location of the site relates well to Policy 21 of the RSS, albeit that it will require significant investment in transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Q42 – (employment zone) – The strategic (regional and national) significance of EMA and Donington Park will need to be reflected in the Core Strategy which will require a different approach to purely local considerations. Broadly support, although the favoured approach does not specify where an employment zone would be located and what mechanisms would be put in place for bringing it forward.</p> <p>Q43 – (Small business space) – the amount would depend on the business plans of Donington Park and EMA as well as emerging work on local economic assessments and employment land studies.</p> <p>Q44 – (economic strategy) – Lacking some detail including the amount of floorspace required but the PACEC study should help inform this. Refer to Policy 18 of the RSS (Joint working with emda to implement the RES) and consider that more explicit recognition of the RES should be reflected in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Q46 – EMA – need to consider the airport masterplan with national and regional policy supporting the expansion of regional airports, and the Councils favoured option 2 must be developed in such a way as to allow for the operational development (including freight) of EMA in the future.</p> <p>Q48 (definitions of operational and airport related development) – would advocate close working between the Council and EMA, although the airport acknowledge the approach is in line with the aviation white paper and the RSS.</p> <p>Q53 –(Transport) – wider economic benefits should be included in the criteria, congestion charging if implemented will be done on a sub- regional or more strategic level. They support references to accessibility and the importance of improving access by non-car modes.</p> <p>Q55 and 56 – Sustainable development</p> <p>Besides bfl there will be a need to promote other comparable standards like Lifetime Homes and Code for Sustainable Homes. Investment and renovation may be necessary for existing stock in terms of neighbourhood improvements.</p> <p>Q57 and 58 – CIL or S106 – The Councils position should be based on a robust analysis of infrastructure needs with regard to the regional picture of infrastructure provision. Two pieces of work that are of relevance are the</p>
--	--	---

			<p>Tyms infrastructure study and the emda commissioned Arup study which looks in detail at regional infrastructure from the supply side.</p> <p>Whether a CIL is introduced or not S106 remains the mechanism for affordable housing and a document should be prepared as to how the CIL and S106 will work together, having regard to details of how financial constraints on site development will be approached. It should not be assumed that affordable housing is supplied only after a CIL contribution has been provided.</p> <p>Q53 to 56 – Climate Change and Renewable energy – emda have commissioned a piece of work to consider the scope for renewable energy provision across the region on a HMA basis which will inform the option through the RSS partial review.</p>
4138	Andrew Martin Associates on behalf of Nutron Dev'ts Ltd	<p>Support</p> <p>Support</p> <p>Support</p>	<p><u>Question 1</u></p> <p>Support the favoured vision for sustainable development in the District.</p> <p><u>Question 2</u></p> <p>Support the favoured objectives for sustainable development in the District</p> <p><u>Question 3</u></p> <p>Recognise that Coalville is identified as a SRC. Support the approach to distribution of development and appropriate for Ashby to be identified as a Rural town.</p> <p><u>Question 5</u></p> <p>Agree that 9600 dwellings should be considered a minimum provision given the review of the Regional Plan. Sensible to plan for more housing than is required because whilst allocated sites should be deliverable, historically it has been shown that large sites do not always come forward for delivery in the timescale expected.</p> <p><u>Question 6</u></p> <p>No reason why the Core Strategy should not address potential development needs beyond end of the plan period, providing there is a phasing mechanism so that the delivery of preferred sites is not prejudiced. The Core Strategy should indicate the phased delivery of housing aided by monitoring of completions etc.</p> <p><u>Question 7</u></p>

		Support	<p>Option 1 is supported. Significant development will need to be focused in Coalville to bring the investment in infrastructure to achieve the urban renaissance envisaged in the Council's objectives. Option 1 also needs to involve a sensitive amount of development to Rural Towns as these will have a significant role to play in achieving Council's objectives.</p> <p>Option 2 would provide focus towards Coalville but also a significant focus on Ashby. Provided transport infrastructure would support level of development at Ashby, there is no objection to Option 2.</p> <p>Option 3 is the least compliant with the Regional Plan and question whether it would provide the focus necessary to ensure comprehensive regeneration of Coalville.</p> <p>Option 4 gives Ashby a limited role in comparison to other smaller settlements. Current demographics show there are significantly more inbound trips to Ashby than there are outbound ones. Providing a choice of housing in town will enable people to live close to their place of work and reduce travelling. Ashby should have a significant role in housing provision in the district-wide strategy.</p> <p><u>Question 8</u></p> <p>The favoured approach is supported.</p> <p><u>Question 9</u></p> <p>Wording of the development strategy is appropriate but would suggest that wording in first paragraph could be more robust in terms of the circumstances that the Council would accept additional growth above the Regional Plan requirements. Must make clear that additional growth does not prejudice the objectives of the Core Strategy.</p> <p><u>Question 12</u></p> <p>Identification of specific sites is an important element of the Core Strategy. Helps give the strategic picture a spatial realism. Also 'front loads' dealing with strategic infrastructure issues and gives clarity to the later Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p><u>Question 13</u></p> <p>100 dwellings or a 1ha of employment is a suitable threshold to identify a strategic site. Right to consider</p>
--	--	---------	--

			<p>together areas of contiguous land promoted by different parties.</p> <p><u>Question 17</u></p> <p>Favoured option for Ashby would be Option 1. However it is recognised that under any of the development scenarios Hollywell Spring Farm features as a deliverable site.</p> <p><u>Question 18</u></p> <p>Support the development of Hollywell Spring Farm. Its development would provide increased housing choice at Ashby addressing requirements for those who work but don't live in the town. It would be an urban extension of sensitive scale and location, delivered without need for major infrastructure improvements but could provide a new neighbourhood centre and primary school plus new areas of woodland and public open space.</p> <p>Matters such as landscape transport, drainage and agricultural impact have been assessed. Site is accessible to town centre and its development would consolidate previous growth on edge of settlement without development of new services and highly connective at the Ivanhoe Business Park.</p>
4139	Thomas Slater	Object	<p>Question 40</p> <p>Object to proposal for a distribution centre in Lockington. The local people oppose the idea and it will cause additional pollution. Wildlife habitats will be destroyed and the additional air, noise and light pollution will add to global warming.</p>
4140	Peter Hobbs	Object	<p>Question 40</p> <p>Object to proposal for a distribution centre in Lockington as it will cause additional pollution to that caused by the Airport. Green fields should not be destroyed as they will be ruined for future generations.</p>
4141	Thomas Clowsley	Object	<p>Question 40</p> <p>Object to proposal for a distribution centre in Lockington As it will destroy wildlife habitats and nature walks. The development would contribute to local air, noise and light pollution.</p>
4142	Connor Hooper	Object	<p>Question 40</p> <p>Object to proposal for a distribution centre in Lockington as wildlife habitats will be destroyed and light pollution will increase.</p>

4143	Ellee	Object	Question 40 Object to proposal for a distribution centre in Lockington As it will destroy the land, trees and wildlife habitats.
4144	Heather Jones	Object	Question 40 Object to proposal for a distribution centre in Lockington. Green fields should not be destroyed for development.
4145	Charles Smith	Object	Question 40 Object to proposal for a distribution centre in Lockington. The air, noise and light pollution will affect all the local people. Wildlife habitats and green fields will be destroyed.
4146	Harry O'Brien	Object	Question 40 Object to proposal for a distribution centre in Lockington It will create light and noise pollution. A valuable recreational resource will be lost as well as precious trees.
4147	Lito Cahilig	Object	Question 40 Object to proposal for a distribution centre in Lockington as development would increase air pollution.
4148	Tristan Wood	Object	Question 40 Object to proposal for a distribution centre in Lockington as flora and fauna will be lost. The development would cause lots of noise, air and light pollution. There are already enough industrial buildings in the area.
4149	Alex Neal	Object	Question 40 Object to proposal for a distribution centre in Lockington as wildlife habitats will be destroyed and global warming will increase.
4150	Jackson Hiller	Object	Question 40 Object to proposal for a distribution centre in Lockington as it would cause increased pollution, local residents will lose nature walks and wildlife habitats will also be lost.
4151	Annice Khaw	Object	Question 40 Object to proposal for a distribution centre in Lockington as it will cause additional air, noise and light pollution 24/7. The development would increase the Districts carbon footprint and people's health will suffer.
4152	Jordy Smedley	Object	Question 40 Object to proposal for a distribution centre in Lockington as Wildlife habitats will be destroyed, pollution and

			global warming will increase. The scale of the proposed development is also too big.
4153	Lauren Callaway	Object	Question 40 Object to proposal for a distribution centre in Lockington as noise, light and air pollution will increase and the area carbon footprint will increase. Animals will lose their habitat and precious trees will be lost.
4154	Keytann Dobson	Object	Question 40 Object to proposal for a distribution centre in Lockington as animals will lose their habitats and future generations will suffer if the development goes ahead.
4155	Ella Toon	Object	Question 40 Object to proposal for a distribution centre in Lockington as it will increase global warming.
4156	Freyia Toon	Object	Question 40 Object to proposal for a distribution centre in Lockington as the trees in the area should be protected.
4157	Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments		Refer to Representation 2000
4158	Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group		<p>Support the view that provision should be made on a number of relatively small sites despite the extra management responsibilities this would create.</p> <p>Whilst the idea of creating mixed communities is welcome in principle, it can be difficult to deliver and has to be undertaken with the resident community and the gypsy and traveller community. Identifying sites as part of the strategic housing locations is also problematic because such sites may command high values placing them beyond the reach of the Gypsy and Traveller community.</p> <p>Option 2 has merit in identifying actual potential sites. These can be scrutinised as part of the consultation process, removing the uncertainty and controversy that will inevitably otherwise occur at the later stage of site</p>

			<p>provision.</p> <p>Further option would be to carefully consider granting permanent consents for established sites, particularly where these have not historically given rise to problems and where they have become well established within the community.</p>
4159	Central Networks		<p>Do not wish to influence the development in any way. Electricity supply is fairly flexible and considers our role to provide sufficient resources wherever our customer requires it.</p>
4160	Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Alexander Hastings Developments Limited		<p>Question 1 Strong and cohesive communities appear to be at the heart of the vision. However there appears to be a danger that an excessive focus on Coalville could be to the detriment of the sustainability of other settlements. The preferred spatial strategy needs to be consistent with PPS3 and Draft PSS4 and ensure the future sustainability of all communities within the district.</p> <p>Question 2 Strategic Objective SO8 refers to the provision of an adequate amount and range of housing. This wording is considered to be inappropriate and does not reflect the national and regional strategic imperative to deliver increase levels of housing provision. There is a possibility that the strategy would not be consistent with national policy or be in conformity with the Regional Plan.</p> <p>Question 3 The identification of Breedon-on-the-Hill as a Sustainable Village is supported. However it is not accepted that opportunities should be limited to infill sites of 0.1ha. This approach is unsound and is not based on robust evidence base. The SHLAA identifies one location in Breedon-on-the-Hill as a potential for housing development, with a site area of 0.92 ha.</p> <p>The Core Strategy should establish the overall settlement hierarchy to guide the location of development in the district. The appropriate scale and location of development in Sustainable Villages should be a matter for the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Question 5 The proposed number of 9,600 dwellings should be considered as a minimum level of provision. The Regional Plan confirms that higher numbers can be tested through development plan documents. The Core Strategy presents the opportunity to take a long term view. The key will be to establish a robust housing trajectory and a</p>

		<p>portfolio of sites will be required, including Brownfield and Greenfield sites, SUEs and development in Sustainable Villages. The Council will need to ensure a continuous supply of land and recent assessments show a shortfall in the five year housing supply.</p> <p>Question 6 The Core Strategy should address potential development beyond the end of the plan period and reflects guidance in PPS12. A flexible approach is needed to deal with possible uncertainties and to enable core strategies to respond to changes in housing requirements. A portfolio of sites will ensure a continuous supply of housing.</p> <p>Question 7 It is important that the Core Strategy is clear about the role Sustainable Villages will play in the development strategy. Evidence from the SHLAA could be used to indicate the overall scale of development in these villages. If there is too much focus on Coalville, as identified in Option 1 and 2, there is a danger that the housing needs of other communities in the District will not be met. The strategy relies on the release of a number of large extensions in close proximity and it is questionable whether this approach will ensure the delivery of the required level of housing.</p> <p>Question 8 Do not support the favoured approach to the development strategy. The strategy is overly focused on Coalville and fails to make appropriate provision to meet the development needs of other communities. The Core Strategy must provide sufficient clarity about the settlement hierarchy and the scale of development to be directed to different levels in the hierarchy.</p> <p>Question 9 Do not support the wording of the favoured Development Strategy. Concerns relate to the restrictive approach to development in Sustainable Villages.</p> <p>Question 12 Identification of strategic sites in the Core Strategy is consistent with PPS12. This approach would provide the necessary certainty for all parties. A clear strategy which identifies the overall scale of development to be provided in the Sustainable Villages is needed.</p> <p>Question 34 Do not agree with the favoured approach to the provision of affordable housing. It is not clear whether a sufficiently robust assessment of economic viability has been undertaken to support the suggested targets. The</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Leicester and Leicestershire SHMA 2008 identifies high levels of affordable need but acknowledges that contributions in excess of 40% are likely to be impractical.</p> <p>Question 35 Do not support the favoured approach for making provision for Gypsies and Travellers. The level of need identified in the GTAA indicates a need for the early release of sites to address shortfalls and a backlog in provision. Proposed urban extensions may not be best placed to meet these immediate needs. A more appropriate strategy would be to identify suitable previously developed sites within the Coalville urban area, which meet the particular locational requirements of the travelling community.</p> <p>Question 38 Do not support the favoured housing strategy, particularly with reference to affordable housing and gypsies and travellers.</p> <p>Question 49 Support the favoured town centre strategy. It focuses on Coalville as the main retail centre, but recognises the need to maintain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres in Rural Towns. Strengthening the network of local centre will ensure facilities and services are accessible for smaller Sustainable Villages.</p> <p>Question 51 The detailed definition of town centre boundaries is a matter for the Development Management and Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Question 55 Support the commitment to using the 'Building for Life' standard. Should also recognise that smaller sites in smaller communities can also deliver well designed, high quality sustainable developments.</p> <p>Question 57 Developments need to be supported by appropriate new infrastructure related to the development. It is also important that best use is made of existing infrastructure provision. Smaller scale developments in Sustainable Villages can help support and sustain community infrastructure. A portfolio of housing sites, including smaller development in Sustainable Villages which are not reliant on the provision of significant new infrastructure, will ensure a continuous supply of housing over the plan period.</p> <p>Question 62 Given that the Regional Plan renewable energy targets are to be reviewed, it would seem inappropriate for the</p>
--	--	--

			Core Strategy to seek to incorporate district wide targets at this stage.
4161	Cerda Planning		<p>Submission of site at Beveridge Lane, Bardon for inclusion in SHLAA and the Local Development Framework. The site extends to an area of 6 hectares and is proposed for residential development of between 180 and 240 dwellings. (Site plan submitted).</p> <p>The inclusion of this site will assist the Council in meeting its regional housing requirements. It is located adjacent to a large employment area. Its location close to Coalville and the proposed SUE would further enhance the sustainability advantages of this sites location. The site has clear and defensible boundaries and forms a cluster of development with existing residential units. There are no constraints relating to flood risk, drainage, agricultural land, trees or topography. Development would not be disproportionate to the existing built-up area of Bardon. Suitable site access can be provided and services and utilities are available to the site.</p> <p>The site is available and housing units could be delivered over a two year period. It is also advised that the site is achievable in accordance with the requirements of PPS3.</p>
4162	Diane Bull on behalf of Margaret Street Church, Coalville		<p>Question 52</p> <p>Would like the Council to consider including Margaret Street Church Centre premises within the 'envelope' of the Town Centre. Aside from the Emporium the Church Centre houses the largest hall in the Town Centre with stage and dance floor with further rooms to hire. The community building is of great benefit to the District and is within easy walking distance of bus routes and public car parking. The Church is currently used for a variety of activities and the premises are widely used for different events. In the future an increased focus on Leisure use is intended to be pursued. (A map of the Church Centre is provided).</p>
4163	Steve Poultney		<p>Submission of a land at Main Street, Blackfordby, for identification as a site for residential development. It is considered that previous highway concerns can be overcome; the development of this site would not set an adverse precedent as there is no potential for wholesale development in the village. Existing village property prices are currently out of reach of younger people and a starter home could breathe life into the village. The village has all the requirements for sustainability apart from a local shop. However the nearest shop is 1500metres away from the village.</p>
4164	Alliance Planning on behalf of TNT UK		<p>TNT UK Ltd is the owner of land east of A42, Lount. The site is accessed off and to the north of Melbourne Road and a site plan attached with the representation.</p> <p>Question 44</p>

	Ltd	<p>Seek the continued retention of the site and facility as a safeguarded key employment site through the LDF. This should be different from the blanket safeguarding of employment land as this is considered to fail to distinguish between modern, key employment facilities and outworn, poor quality sites, which confuses the real supply of land that meets market requirements.</p> <p>Details of site description and surrounding area are put forward. It is well suited to employment uses and makes an important contribution to the district's employment land supply. The TNT facility, warehousing and part of a major logistics operation, employs 209 staff.</p> <p>Request that the site be safeguarded as a key employment site and for the Core Strategy to include a suitable policy, particularly pertinent as Local Plan Policy J1 is not being saved as part of the emerging LDF. Concerned that the Core Strategy does not recognise or make provision for expansion of existing firms, outside of the strategic hubs specifically proposed. Whilst support the need for future employment development, the protection of key existing employment sites is not adequately addressed.</p> <p>'Local need' development is defined as 'A local business already within the parish and seeking modest expansion'. Question the relevance of the word 'modest'. If a local employers is doing well and can expand, this should be provided for in the plan, as long as any proposals are reasonable and make due provision for recognised constraints and other considerations.</p> <p>Consider there to be a strong case to safeguard the site to retain sufficient land to meet demand for such modern and strategic facilities of the type that operate that on this site, as part of the district's overall provision for distribution uses. Important to maintain existing employment generating uses in key locations such as this.</p> <p>There are instances when such modern employment uses have development at key sites in rural areas, outside of the settlement boundaries. However these reflect the pattern of communities and employment that have resulted from traditional industries. Consolidation of these uses, where former traditional uses have been replaced, represents a sustainable approach. This development approach is fundamental to ensuring sustainable development in rural areas and can play a major role in stimulating the District's economy.</p> <p>Continued retention of the land as a key employment site will bring economic benefits to the locality and wider rural area. This is consistent with the objectives of the Council's Economic Strategy. It will assist the Council with:-</p> <p>Make provision for range of sites of different sizes and characteristics.</p>
--	-----	---

			<p>Safeguard sites that are of sufficient quality and importance to the local economy. Facilitate relocation and growth of businesses wherever possible.</p> <p>TNT UK Ltd also needs to plan for future expansion and consolidation of the warehouses facility. Consider that the site has the potential of providing further employment floorspace and development with minimal impact on rural character, amenity and local traffic. Future development will secure approximately 209 additional jobs and help reduce need of allocation of alternative sites in more sensitive locations.</p> <p>Suggest the inclusion of a development control policy in the Core Strategy that supports the appropriate expansion of existing employers in rural locations.</p>
4165	Mrs Linda Hobbs	<p>Object</p> <p>Question 5 The housing requirement numbers imposed/suggested should be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. An aging population in the area leading to a natural supply of houses to meet local needs b. Worsening employment opportunities in the area c. Extremely poor transport links, no railway and the route to the M1 (Bardon Road) already very congested d. Run down town centre with few entertainment facilities e. Despite efforts to promote town and links with the national forest, it is not considered a desirable area of Leicestershire in estate agents terms. <p>Question 7 If housing in the area is really needed, suggests the following should be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Land near the new East Midlands Parkway Station, at least they would have a rail link b. Any spare land around Castle Donington, personal experience has shown that suitable affordable homes in Donington, Long Whatton and Diseworth can be difficult to find <p>Object</p> <p>Question 10 The answers given to questions 5, 7 and 16 suggest that building on the Green Wedge in Whitwick is both unnecessary and undesirable; especially as such building is liable to result in flooding.</p> <p>Question 16 The housing needs within the Coalville area could be met by building on Brownfield Sites such as</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Derelict pub sites e.g. Minnesota's, the Pick & Shovel, the Cocked Hat, the Fox at Thringstone, Whitwick Working Men's club, other pubs in Whitwick & Thringstone appear to be unoccupied, there are probably more. b. Industrial Sites, Grieve Factory if Asda proposal is rejected, Aucotts Garage site in Whitwick already has 	

			<p>OPP, Old Cascelloid factory area appears partly unused Woolworths? c. Old Forest Way School site if not able to be put to community use.</p> <p>Suggests there are lots more possibilities.</p>
4166	Natural England (Anna Collins)		<p>Advice given is only made for the purpose of the Additional Further Consultation.</p> <p>Question 1 Pleased to see a clear environmental theme in to the proposed vision. It is important that the vision sets an intention for a sustainable future for NWL. The vision could be strengthened by the provision of a clear view on what is meant by environment, in line with the environmental core objectives of the Regional Spatial Strategy which are explicit about protection of environment, a step change increase in the level of the Region's Biodiversity, reducing the cause of climate change and the impacts of climate change. The objectives in the RSS are challenging and NWL will be showing a clear positive intention by making specific mention of biodiversity and climate change in the vision. The following text is suggested and could be added to the second sentence of the vision.....<i>becoming a leader in green and sustainable communities, enhancing biodiversity and responding to the challenges of climate change.</i> To add further local distinctiveness to the vision it would be worth mentioning the National Forest and a strong driver for improving the Natural Environment in the District.</p> <p>Question 2 Are pleased to see and strongly support objectives in relation to sustainable growth, climate change, key environmental assets namely the Mease, Charnwood Forest and the National Forest, public transport, green infrastructure and access to open spaces. In general the strategy is commended for the obvious flow from the vision to the objectives and the policies that follow. Consider that clarification would aid SO2. Would support a positive statement in regard to responding to the effects of climate change which including sustainable drainage and managing floodwaters as part of new development. Would also support explicit mention of some of the methods to reduce the Districts climate footprint such as maximising resource efficiency, making best use of existing resources, promoting sustainable design and locating new development in locations that reduce the need to travel. Advise an overarching statement about what is meant by sustainable and sustainable development in NWL. There are some particular challenges in achieving a balance of social, economic and environmental in the District given the importance of road based distribution and East Midlands Airport on the economy, so a local expression of sustainability which includes a desire for net benefit for social, environmental and economic interests with no significant loss to any of them. This could be supported by a map showing the strategic assets of the District.</p> <p>Question 3</p>

		<p>Would like to see an essential service of all sustainable villages be the provision of green space. This would be consistent with policies in the RSS and the Council's own SCS for green infrastructure and access to open space. It would also acknowledge the major contribution that access to open space plays in quality of life and health.</p> <p>Question 7 Strongly support the Council making its decision for growth on the basis of a good evidence base which; considers the ability of the District to accommodate growth and understands the impacts of various options on future carbon use. We advise that given the position of both Ashby de la Zouch and Measham in the catchment of the River Mease SAC (a site which has the highest legal protection in Europe), these settlements are within a sensitive Natural Environment and the presumption should be for only low level of development here, with growth encouraged in other less sensitive areas of the District.</p> <p>Question 8 Strongly support the authority taking time to make sure it makes a decision about a development strategy which is consistent with the RSS and presumably its own objectives as set out in the sustainable community strategy. Note that current thinking is considering the impacts on the Districts CO2 emissions. Hoped that the thinking will also take into account the existence of certain areas of the District which are sensitive to development, and that development will be steered away from these areas.</p> <p>Question 9 With this in mind it is suggested that the Council could strengthen the favoured development strategy by adding to the second sentence as follows.....the Council will only support such growth where it can be demonstrated that the level of infrastructure required to support such development, especially in respect of transport and community facilities, will be forthcoming and at no extra expense the Council <i>and that it can be delivered without adversely affecting the sensitive natural environments and landscapes of the District.</i></p> <p>Question 10 No objection to the suggestion of identifying the western part of the Green Wedge as Countryside.</p> <p>Question 11 Concern about development of the Green Wedge as it's considered that these open areas may well be key to the emerging Green Infrastructure plans for the District and the 6C's. Any decision about these Green Wedges should be made in the context of the activities listed in policy 28 of the RSS. Certainly any loss of Green Wedge must be compensated for such that there is no net loss of green space within the District.</p> <p>Question 17, 18 & 19</p>
--	--	--

		<p>As previously stated because of the sensitive nature of the River Mease catchment Natural England advise that development should be steered away from this part of the District towards other less sensitive areas. Natural England has not seen any early work on the Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Core Strategy but we strongly advise that the Council begins the process now so that it can understand the implications of any draft policies on the Mease SAC and make any necessary amendments to ensure no adverse effect on the SAC. A quick look at the sites for growth suggests that South of Ashby, East of Leicester Road and Money Hill could all have an indirect adverse effect on the River Mease SAC. Only mentioned are the emerging requirements of the Water Framework Directive and the need for local authorities to work in partnership with the Environment Agency to enhance the quality of water bodies. It is likely that the authority will have to take steps to ensure that developments have only beneficial impacts on the River Mease and its tributaries.</p> <p>Question 29, 30 & 31 Comments are largely the same as those for Ashby – and the same answer as above is repeated for avoidance of doubt.</p> <p>As previously stated because of the sensitive nature of the River Mease catchment Natural England advise that development should be steered away from this part of the District towards other less sensitive areas. Natural England has not seen any early work on the Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Core Strategy but we strongly advise that the Council begins the process now so that it can understand the implications of any draft policies on the Mease SAC and make any necessary amendments to ensure no adverse effect on the SAC. A quick look at the sites for growth suggests that South of Ashby, East of Leicester Road and Money Hill could all have an indirect adverse effect on the River Mease SAC. Only mentioned are the emerging requirements of the Water Framework Directive and the need for local authorities to work in partnership with the Environment Agency to enhance the quality of water bodies. It is likely that the authority will have to take steps to ensure that developments have only beneficial impacts on the River Mease and its tributaries.</p> <p>Question 38 Care must be taken to ensure that any minimum housing density does not work against the Council's objectives to provide green infrastructure as part of new developments.</p> <p>Question 53 Natural England is supportive of the broad principles set out in the favoured approach. Advised that the final policy/policies should make explicit mention of ensuring that there is accessibility to the Countryside by modes of transport other than the car. Would also like to see strong emphasis not just on ensuring provision for access by walking, cycling and public transport as stated in the favoured approach, but a policy that pushes for maximising opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport. This would be in line with the new ethos of planning as established by PPS1 and the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act for planning that is good enough to permit</p>
--	--	---

		<p>rather than bad enough to refuse. It would also be a strong interpretation of Policy 46 of the RSS. Strongly support the safeguarding of any currently redundant transport infrastructure to provide new access routes and the re-opening of the National Forest railway line.</p> <p>Question 54 Would also support the inclusion in any transport policy of an intervention to safeguard existing recreation routes (access paths) from obstructive development, identify the recreational and economic benefits of recreation routes and identify the potential for new and improved multi-access recreational routes in the countryside.</p> <p>Question 55 Support the broad approach taken however, advise that the addition of further elements which should be required as part of new developments (see answer to Q56).</p> <p>Question 56 There are many good hooks within the Core Strategy in the form of policies for climate change for seeking sustainable development. However, they advise that to ensure developers have a clear understanding of what the Council expects when it requests sustainable developments. In particular we advise the explicit mention of sustainable design and construction measures, use of locally sourced materials and sustainable urban drainage.</p> <p>Question 59 Support the commitment of the Council to contribute to targets to reduce CO2 production. Advise that any policies which encourage renewable energy production do so whilst seeking to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work within the capacity of the landscape of the site and its zone of influence guided by a Landscape Character Assessment • Take account of cumulative impacts on the environment including ancillary development and power lines <p>Support an overarching climate change policy which refers to causes and implications of climate change to relevant policy areas. The policy should address any local climate change issues, which might include the impacts on Forest Creation and River Basin Management. The policy should also establish, in line with some of the provisions of Policy 26 of the RSS, that to aid the natural environment's adaptation to climate change habitat fragmentation will be reduced and connections between habitats across the landscape will be created.</p> <p>Question 63 It will be crucial that any Green Infrastructure Strategy for the District is informed by a good evidence base of the existing green space resource. It is our understanding that this has been done in part. Would expect this information to form the basis of the green infrastructure the Council considers. The Council may wish to include</p>
--	--	--

			the River Mease SAC and the Ashby Canal extension as these are both linear features which could contribute to a Green Infrastructure Network.
4167	Ms Penny Wakefield	Object	<p>Question 14 and 15</p> <p>Object to the earmarked development of Beveridge Lane, Ellistown and Grange Road, Hugglescote with 4500 houses. They are Greenfield and are a green wedge of land that separates two villages.</p> <p>The environment agency flood risk site shows that the low lying centre of Hugglescote is already a flood risk area and extends along part of the River Sence. Additional housing would increase the flood risk as development would result in less water run off area and less absorption. Climate change is also increasing flood risk.</p> <p>Reports identify the number of empty properties across Leicester and Leicestershire stands at around 11,000 and a further 19,000 remain incomplete. Why can these houses not be used to meet housing allocation targets? Why should all housing be put in North West Leicestershire and Ellistown.</p> <p>Evidence from the Ellistown and Battleflat Parish Plan supports the objection to mass housing. Any new building in the village should be small scale and geared to local need.</p> <p>Development of this scale would significantly increase existing traffic problems, the primary school is at full capacity, there would be a burden on local doctor's surgeries and employment would be a major issues.</p> <p>Ellistown and Hugglescote are Sustainable villages with their own identify and should not be swamped by new houses to become part of a Greater Coalville.</p>
4168	Mr Alan Sutton and Mrs Val McKiernan	Object	<p>Question 14 and 15</p> <p>Object to the proposed new housing development in Hugglescote and surrounding areas. Object to the village of Ellistown becoming an extended area of Coalville. School is full to capacity and cannot accommodate more pupils. Roads struggle to cope with existing traffic levels and new development would worsen this problem. Unemployment is a concern and the development would not create more jobs and therefore add to unemployment. Flooding risk would also be increased.</p> <p>The villages should be able to keep their separate identities. Whitwick have already rejected their proposed expansions and the housing should not be moved to the Hugglescote area instead.</p> <p>Understand that there is enough housing with properties standing empty. These should be used along with</p>

		<p>properties that need refurbishment. This approach would also improve the area.</p> <p>Please also take into account the number of old people in this are who do not have access to any means of objection. This representation is a true reflection of the thoughts of the people of the area.</p>
4169	Heart of the National Forest	<p>The new Vision and Action Plan (V & AP) for the Heart of the National Forest (HNF) is intended to unlock the potential of this unique part of The National Forest.</p> <p>HNF sits centrally within the National Forest between Ashby, Measham and Swadlincote at a size of 10,000 acres. Preparing to be an exemplar of The National forest and an asset of regional significance. The aim is to realise its full economic potential. Physical transformation has occurred from an area of derelict land to one of substantial woodland coverage. Now seeking through place shaping to create a strategic green infrastructure asset and established visitor destination.</p> <p>Essential to gain recognition of the HNF through emerging spatial, economic and green infrastructure policy at a regional, sub regional and local level. Request that the HNF is given explicit geographic and policy recognition in the emerging Core Strategy. Recognise that it has a fuzzy boundary and therefore suggest that is referred to as “....the area between Ashby, Measham and Swadlincote.”</p> <p>Propose that the LDF recognises and articulates the spatial strategy for the HNF which will create a diverse Forest economy based around tourism, leisure, woodland and environmental economy. Development in the HNF could contribute some 300 jobs, provide strategic green infrastructure, help address inequalities and build stronger and healthier communities. Hoped that the LDF will recognise the strategic importance of the HNF to the area. This will act as a mechanism for proactively encouraging appropriate development that is sensitive to the creation of an exemplar of The National Forest to take place.</p> <p>LDF should ensure future growth in nearby centre adds to the identify, character, green infrastructure linkages and vision of the HNF, providing policy, guidance and support to ensure new sustainable urban extension positively contribute to the HNF Vision. It is the aspiration that developments in the HNF are exemplars of sustainable design and construction in a Forest setting. Design and development can also be used to encourage a sense of place, orientation and interest through built form and design.</p> <p>The Vision and Action Plan provides a sound evidence base for the above principles to be incorporated into Core Strategy and Allocation and Development Management policies.</p>

4170	Mr Simpson	Object	<p>Question 14 and 15 Object to the scale of housing proposed in the Coalville area and the gypsy and traveller sites. Trees and green land need to be retained for the next generation. Development of this scale would adversely affect the character and tranquillity of the area. Villages will no longer be individual and will become part of one vast town. More housing means more traffic and impacts on flooding with less space for water run off. Schools are full, there are no jobs or anywhere for youngsters to play. Crime levels will increase, there will be extra police, and higher Council rates. Increase in pollution levels which in turn will have an adverse impact on health.</p> <p>Leaflet has been attached to the letter which 'Says No to development in Ellistown and Hugglescote'. Objections are made on the grounds of flood risk, traffic levels, inability of infrastructure to cope, existing empty properties, villages have their own identities, and any future development should be of a small scale, affordable and geared to local people.</p>
4171	Mr P J and Mrs G Sperry	Object	<p>Question 14 and 15 Object to the plan for 4,500 houses between Ellistown and Hugglescote. A series of questions are raised.</p> <p>Why is a flood risk site marked for extensive development? How will roads cope with traffic when there is already serious congestion in the area? Why the need for so many new houses when there are already empty and uncompleted houses? Why the loss of green amenity and recreation space? Where will all the additional children go to school as the existing school is at capacity? Why are sustainable villages being considered to lose their identity to become part of Greater Coalville?</p>
4172	Mr J C and Mrs E Wild	Object	<p>Question 17 and 18 Object to the development of 500 houses at Holywell Spring Farm, Ashby on the following grounds:- destroy good agricultural land, reduce access to green infrastructure and open spaces, strain on overstretched resources/facilities, provide little community benefit, destroy an area of outstanding natural beauty, increase risk of flooding, drainage problems, does not provide a 'green space' buffer between existing houses, loss of rural walk, increase traffic in the town centre, traffic congestion, highway safety, sewage would need to be piped several miles to the west, development would double the size of the existing Holywell Park Housing Estate.</p> <p>Ashby de la Zouch is a historic market town, an excellent centre for leisure and tourism. Any major new housing development would adversely impact on its unique character and damage its ability to attract tourists.</p> <p>Proposal appears to be another exercise on meeting arbitrary government targets which leads to the question</p>

			<p>whether or not such vast numbers are needed in this part of the country.</p> <p>Suggest that development of this scale is located in an area well away from existing housing estate, which are already overpopulated.</p>
4173	Helen and Richard Houghton	Object	<p>Question 20 and 21</p> <p>Following the public presentation organised by Pegasus with reference to potential future development of land at South Lane in Castle Donington. General information was provided but no detailed information was provided to form the basis of public consultation.</p> <p>A number of fields are highlighted for potential housing development but no accurate details were provided of the possible housing layout.</p> <p>No clarity was provided as to whether the proposed relief road would have weight restrictions on it. If HGVs are allowed to use this road this would lead to increased environmental pollution. It would also be a significant change from the 7.5 tonne weight limit currently in force through Castle Donington.</p> <p>No indication of additional infrastructure investment that would be needed in term of doctors, dentist and schooling.</p> <p>The proposal is to be submitted to the Council in November with a decision in January/February 2010.</p> <p>A number of signed letters of objection from residents were submitted with the letter of representation.</p>
4174	S & J Martindale	Object	<p>Question 21</p> <p>Support the issues summarised under 4173</p>
4175	Ms Joanne Woodward	Object	<p>Question 21</p> <p>Support the issues summarised under 4173</p>
4176	I Hodgkinson and B Lovatt	Object	<p>Question 21</p> <p>Support the issues summarised under 4173</p>
4177	J Furniss	Object	<p>Question 21</p> <p>Support the issues summarised under 4173</p>

4178	Ms Attwood and Mr Gubb	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4179	Mr Purkis	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4180	Mr Pilkington	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4181	Mr and Mrs Wright	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4182	Ms Higham	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4183	Mr and Mrs Burton	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4184	M C Thompson	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4185	Ms Allen	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4186	Joy Stevenson	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4187	Mr and Mrs Mead	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4188	Mr Upton	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173

			Presume that there will be opportunity to formally object when a planning application is submitted. The public presentation attended was not a consultation – information was limited, confusing and misleading.
4189	Mrs Beardsall	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4190	Mr Chantrill	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4191	Mrs Stevenson	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4192	Mr Forster	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4193	W M Franklin	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4194	Ms Chapman and Mr Boggett	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4195	Mr and Mrs Dawson	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4196	Mr and Mrs Ward	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4197	Mr and Mrs Smoth	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4198	Ms Sykes	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4199	Mr Sykes		Question 21

		Object	Support the issues summarised under 4173
4200	Mr and Mrs Lloyd	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4201	Mr Cutts	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4202	Mr Lowther	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4203	J Janes and G Janes	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4204	H R Webb	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4205	Ms McCafferty	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4206	S M Whitehead and P K Whitehead	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4207	R E Green and B F Green	Object	Question 21 Support the issues summarised under 4173
4208	Leicestershire County Council		<p>The proposed settlement hierarchy seems appropriate. However in view of the River Mease issues and the pending clarification of these issues, would suggest that it is premature to allocate housing numbers to each of the settlements.</p> <p>Pending resolution of the River Mease issues the areas of the District that are at capacity in terms of pupil places are: Castle Donington: The provision of an additional 1000 houses would result in a significant shortfall of places in all phases of school provision.</p>

			<p>Coalville: Option 4 with the provision of 8500 houses could generate a need in excess of 1000 secondary school places and around 1400 primary school places. The other options would place greater demands. Implications would need to be considered in the context of the overall provision of education infrastructure that would be under extreme pressure even without additional capacity.</p> <p>Ashby, Kegworth, Measham and Ibstock: additional school places would be inversely proportional to the number of houses scheduled for Coalville. Even 500 houses would place considerable pressure on school places in Ashby. Impact on school places in the other three smaller communities would not only be on their primary schools but also the secondary schooling which will often be located in larger urban settlements.</p>
4209	The National Trust		<p>Options 3 and 4, propose, proportionally a very sizeable increase in the size of Castle Donington whereas much more modest levels of development have been accommodated in this settlement in recent years. There is concern about the impacts of this scale of development upon historic assets and upon the wider landscape character of this part of the District.</p>
4210	Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group		<p>The approach being adopted in regard to the provision for gypsies and travellers is considered to be unsatisfactory. The reluctance to identify sites conflicts with national guidance. The implication that only one site is to be brought forward of part of the identification of Strategic Sites is unsatisfactory.</p>
4211	Ian Baseley Associates		<p>Representations made on behalf of their clients, a group of local Travelling Showpeople.</p> <p>Concern is still raised over the Council's reference to the need for only 8 pitches for Showpeople for the period 2007-2012, in light of misgivings over the methodology and findings of the GTAA. Policy 16 of the Regional Plan confirms that LDFs should make provision for minimum additional pitch requirements, taking account of the need arising from future growth beyond 2012. Therefore any reference to pitch requirement should acknowledge that this is a minimum.</p> <p>A review of the Regional Plan has already commenced which will revisit future housing requirements and it is expected that the requirements of Travelling Showpeople will also be reviewed at the same time. Sufficient flexibility should be included in the Core Strategy to allow future provision for increased (and more accurate) numbers of Showmen's pitches within the District.</p> <p>Suggest that the provision of one site to fill the total identified need may not meet the potentially diverse requirement of the different groups. Therefore the issue of ensuring adequate provision of sites to meet the minimum identified is perhaps dealt with in the subsequent Site Allocation DPD rather than at the Core Strategy stage. Core Strategy can include a criteria based policy and acknowledge the need to provide sites, and the</p>

			Allocations DPD should identify sites.
4212	McDyre and Co on behalf of St Modwen Developments Ltd		<p>Green Wedge Favour the retention of all of the Green Wedges as a strategic gap preventing the merger of Coalville with the surrounding built up area. The Cabinet report indicates that there is not a clear justification for retaining the Green Wedge although there is no explanation for this approach. The Regional Plan simply asks for them to be reviewed.</p> <p>The report hints at perhaps partial development in the Green Wedge in order to accommodate the thousands of new homes required in the Coalville area. The north of Stephenson Way is considered to be problematic. However there is scope to accommodate this housing in an area to the south of the town, particularly the South West Coalville SUE.</p> <p>Strategic Sites The threshold for strategic sites should be 500 or more dwellings rather than 2000 dwellings as suggested by GOEM. If the threshold is 2000 dwellings, only two sites would achieve the threshold and if the Green Wedge area was not developed or reduced in size, there would only be one strategic site. If 'Broad Locations' are selected then they should include the South West Coalville SUE.</p> <p>Scale of Development Regional Plan housing requirements are currently being reviewed and the period extended to 2031 with an emphasis on housing numbers likely to increase. If flexibility is not built into the Core Strategy, this omission could lead to pressure for new ad hoc housing proposals. Stratford Borough Council took this line of approach and their Core Strategy was found to be unsound, one reason being that it did not provide flexibility for change in circumstances in the housing trajectory.</p> <p>Growth Options The suggestion that the scale of development should be somewhere between Option 3 and Option 4, with approximately 6500 houses for Coalville, is considered to be a conservative figure. It would not be consistent with the requirements of the Regional Plan, particularly Policies SRS3 and 12, which require development to be located mainly at Coalville and within and adjoining settlements. The SHLAA identifies 7912 potential new dwellings in Coalville and therefore more than 6500 houses should be ascribed to Coalville. This is particularly important due to the Environment Agency objection to development in the River Mease catchments.</p> <p>South West Coalville SUE The South West Coalville SUE is essential and is well placed to deliver its 700 dwellings. It has good access to</p>

		<p>the town centre, the Coalville by pass gives easy access to the wider trunk and motorway network and there is easy access to a variety of employment opportunities in Coalville. The building programme for this site can also be phased between different developers and our client's site at Ravenstone Road, adjoining the Industrial Estate, can be delivered quickly. Clients are also happy to work with adjoining landowners and developers in bringing the development and delivery of this SUE forward.</p>
4213	Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society	<p>Evidence Base There are still considerable gaps in the evidence base, such as the Water Cycle Study and the Princes Trust Report. These reports may have a profound impact on the proposals and without this evidence the core strategy will be found unsound.</p> <p>Employment Allocations For sustainable development, employment and housing should be co-located. The core strategy does not consider the location of employment land. Unless the quantity and location of potential employment is known how can housing land allocations be proved to be sustainable?</p> <p>Strategic Warehousing The need and location of strategic warehousing should be determined and included in the Core Strategy. It would be unacceptable to leave this issue unresolved.</p> <p>Gypsies and Travellers The existing criteria bases policy has failed to provide the sites required. A firm commitment to specific sites is required in the Core Strategy if government targets are to be met.</p> <p>Outside Coalville and Rural Towns Policy H4 has been detriment to the vitality of villages. Their lack of expansion has led to the closure of village shops, churches, post offices, schools and pubs. Only 35 houses per year have been built in the villages and the Core Strategy now only proposes 25 houses per year to be built in the villages. This decline in villages needs to be reversed, and would suggest that 1000 houses be allocated to villages as opposed to the 500 recommended.</p> <p>Regeneration of Coalville Town Centre Its regeneration relies on the expansion of greater Coalville generating investment through section 106 money, growth point grants, investment in retail and employment. Concerned that 6500 houses are insufficient to create a critical mass to achieve the regeneration objectives. Proposals to allocate significant housing away from Coalville to the other towns will reduce the resources and commercial interests focused on Coalville. Therefore as much housing as possible should be developed close to Coalville town centre in order to maximise</p>

		<p>regeneration. For example, the Pegson Terex site could provide land for housing, assist in the town centre regeneration and reduce pressure on the Green Wedge.</p> <p>Development of Ashby de la Zouch Ashby has consistently been overdeveloped which has led to the deterioration of the River Mease SAC and slowed the regeneration of Coalville.</p> <p>There are unacceptable levels of phosphate loading in the River Mease and there will be a significant shortfall in meeting targets. The Environment Agency will not allow any future connections to the foul sewer at Packington. Best estimates by the water authorities are that work to improve the situation will not commence until 2015 at the earliest but this work will not be sufficient to allow the restart of development at Ashby. Therefore sites on Leicester Road and Smisby Road may be undeliverable. Additional equipment will be required at the developers expense and section 106 charges on modest sites would not cover these costs. EMRA have clearly stated in the Regional Plan and in their response to the core strategy consultation that development of Ashby should be avoided.</p> <p>There are significant constraints to the delivery of dwellings in Ashby and the ability to deliver over 700 houses between now and 2026. This equates to a build rate of 70 houses per annum and it is unlikely that this number could even be met in Coalville and its multiple developers.</p> <p>The proposed housing allocation for Ashby is unrealistic and the level should be reduced. Any proposal should be backed up by evidence that the River Mease SAC issue can be resolved. If this approach is not taken the Core Strategy will be found unsound.</p>
4214	Housing Futures (NWLDC)	<p>Q1 – Support Q2 – Support but more could be done to meet SO8, SO10 and SO12. Need to link this to rural areas. See response to Q3. Q3 – No. Question the evidence base for this favoured approach and the findings of the SHMA do not appear to have been taken fully into consideration. Q4 – Local authorities should have a role in making less sustainable areas more sustainable. Housing plays an important role in enhancing the network of local centres and a restrictive use of sustainability criteria prevents less sustainable areas becoming more sustainable. Q5 – Yes Q6 – Yes provided fully justified. Q7 – Too concentrated in larger urban areas and rural towns. The rural need will not be met through exception site policies alone.</p>

		<p>Too early to consult regarding infrastructure in terms of Highways PCT and Leisure until a decision has been taken about the favoured development strategy.</p> <p>Q8 – No</p> <p>Q9 – No – Local Needs Settlements should be clearly defined.</p> <p>Q10 – No – feel that local identity is an important issue. Option 3 would require minimum use of the Green Wedge.</p> <p>Q11- Keep settlements separate yet accessible by tree planting, creating forest walk ways that provide a buffer between the settlements.</p> <p>Q12 – Yes – if sufficient sites are brought forward through the SHLAA.</p> <p>Q13 – Yes</p> <p>Q14 – Option 3 – Wouldn't support Option 1 as not a need for housing in Greenhill , but options are unclear as housing numbers for each site are not clear at this stage.</p> <p>Q15 – More provision could be made in the West along the A411 corridor towards Ashby.</p> <p>Q16 – Support Option 3 consider the site highlighted along the A511 should be utilised to spread the development more evenly around Coalville to reduce the necessity to develop the whole of the Green Wedge area.</p> <p>Q17, 20, 23, 26, 29 – all Option 3</p> <p>Q18, 19, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31 – all difficult to comment as housing numbers for each site are not clear at this stage.</p> <p>Q22 – Make additional comments in relation to Castle Donington re employment.</p> <p>Q32 – Support the possibility of expanding Coalville but do not support the favoured scenario option 1 and more housing is needed in other areas.</p> <p>Q33 – Yes but not with option 1.</p> <p>Q34 – No – a mixture of the two would be a better option because more affordable housing will be built will be desperately needed as evidenced in the SHMA.</p> <p>Q35 – Would support the favoured approach provided this is the favoured approach with the Gypsy and traveller community.</p> <p>Q37 – Would support the favoured approach provided this is the favoured approach with the Gypsy and traveller community.</p> <p>Q38 – Yes with amendments</p> <p>Q46 – Support the favoured approach</p> <p>Q48 – Yes</p> <p>Q51 – No, shouldn't be defined until the preferred option is decided.</p> <p>Q53 – In general yes, but feel more needs to be done the encourage the production and use of hybrid vehicles.</p> <p>Q55 – Yes</p> <p>Q56 – Developers need a stronger steer on what the national Forest style is.</p>
--	--	---

			Q57 – What ever option is considered we need to ensure the provision of affordable housing is not affected.
4215	Response on behalf of John Holmes		<p>The single most important contribution to global warming is transport for both people and transport. Both need to be either reduced or made more sustainable.</p> <p>Freight transport should be transferred from road to rail. Disappointed that a specific site for Strategic Distribution will not be identified as part of the Core Strategy. The Council have overlooked the RSS ambitions of East Midlands Airport Growth and improved surface access.</p> <p>The solution for personal transport is more involved. Opportunities should be provided for shorter journeys and for people to live close to where they work. Land use policy should enable this provision and the Core Strategy should select sites for new housing growth that allow new employment opportunities to be delivered alongside. The principle of 'self-containment' of settlements should be followed.</p>
4216	Hallam Land Management		<p>Keen to see the Core Strategy delivered quickly although the report seems to be light on the consideration of housing delivery.</p> <p>Green Wedge Support the need for a review but do not support its identification as a strategic site for development. The Green Wedge does not fulfil a significant role and this is the same for a number of other Greenfield sites in Coalville and across the district. Therefore a more thorough exercise is required before a decision can be made as to whether the Green Wedge should be developed. More work should be undertaken to identify the role of the Green Wedge, alternative development locations and the potential for some sustainable development in the Green Wedge.</p> <p>Strategic Sites/Areas of Growth A strategic site of 2000 dwellings is more robust than previous suggestions. However there are still concerns and it is imperative that these sites are demonstrated to be deliverable if they are to be included in a Core Strategy.</p> <p>The only site that may meet this criteria is land to the South East of Coalville. However a key criteria is delivery and there are delivery issues associated with the delivery of such a large number of houses in Coalville. This site was as an allocated site in the Local Plan. Although work has already been undertaken on this site, and this may allow it too be identified as an allocation, this can only be done if the issues of landownership and highways which have previously constrained the development, have been resolved. The land south of Grange Road is not so advanced and a comprehensive masterplan, greenspace strategy and transport solutions are needed for this</p>

		<p>and the above site, in order to enabled allocation in the Core Strategy. The merging of the two sites may also delay delivery.</p> <p>Identification of broad areas of growth would effectively be the identification of an allocation without the background information to demonstrate deliverability. Without comprehensive information the Core Strategy may not be sound. The only site that has a comprehensive suite of information is the Packington Nook site. The identification of broad locations will slow down the Core Strategy process by making it more contentious.</p> <p>Scale of Development The Core Strategy must be flexible. The Regional Plan is always subject to review and is under review at the moment. An inflexible Core Strategy would result in it being made redundant within a few months. Therefore suggest that the Core Strategy adopts the scale of development outlined in the adopted Regional Plan but how it is distributed should be flexible.</p> <p>Distribution of Development The Three Dragons report identifies six housing sub markets in the District with Coalville, Castle Donington and Ashby forming the key settlements. The needs of settlements should be assessed and provided for in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed distribution does not set out how the needs have been assessed nor how the specific numbers are justified, and therefore are open to challenge. There is also a lack of information on the affordable housing needs of the settlement.</p> <p>Suggest that it would be sensible not to suggest specific numbers to these settlements, unless there is sufficient information to justify it. There are two alternatives, one would be to base growth on the sustainability of the settlement, and the second would be to base growth on housing sub markets. A range of numbers for each of the settlements is suggested under each scenario. Such an approach would allow for flexibility, with the numbers set out in the Regional Plan met and with no immediate need to review the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The current figures put forward do not reflect the sustainability criteria of Ashby and Castle Donington, which are the next sustainable settlements after Coalville. Ashby has surplus employment, good retail facilities, good schools and access to the strategy rod network. Castle Donington is part of an employment hub and has access to the strategic road network.</p> <p>River Mease</p>
--	--	---

			<p>The precautionary principle adopted by Natural England and the Environment Agency should not prevent development in Measham and Ashby. Severn Trent (statutory undertakers) are confident that improvements can be made to the Packington Sewage Works to accommodate future growth of the town, without detriment to the SAC. These works would also bring overall improvement. The River Mease issue can be mitigated. In addition, Environment Agency evidence shows that the Packington Nook development would increase the phosphate levels in the River Mease from 0.3mg/l to 0.32mg/l. However there was no evidence that this would have a significant effect on the SAC.</p>
4217	English Heritage		<p>It would appear not to be possible to make a decision about the appropriate level of growth for Ashby until such time that the issues associated with the River Mease SAC have been resolved. Also important to give consideration to how much growth the town can accommodate before it begins to have an adverse impact on the town's historic character, both its built form and town centre character. Once there is a clearer view of the potential constraints arising from the River Mease SAC, would be willing to discuss, especially if higher levels of growth are being considered.</p>
4218	Castle Donington Parish Council		<p>Green Wedge No comments to make on the Green Wedge.</p> <p>Strategic Sites Broadly in agreement with the emerging view.</p> <p>Development Strategy In agreement with the Development Strategy.</p> <p>Settlement Hierarchy Agree that the suggested approach is appropriate. However if significant housing numbers are proposed in Ashby and/or Castle Donington, there would be some merit for these to be higher order settlements and to include a plan for the improvement of facilities and settlements in these settlements.</p> <p>Growth Option Whatever option is preferred, it is appreciated that until the issue with the River Mease is resolved, this option is somewhat fluid. However, notwithstanding this issue, do not consider that more than 350 houses can be developed in Castle Donington without significant improvement to services and facilities. Would not like to see a large housing settlement used as vindication to extend the already substantial commercial development in the area.</p>

		<p>Suggest that the Council considers using brownfield sites to meet the housing requirement instead of a Greenfield site. Would recommend a site off Victroia Street (off Station Road) – an old factory which is standing empty.</p> <p>Strategic Distribution Broadly in agreement. However do have concerns that the naming of specific sites in the Core Strategy would be 'fait a compli'. Concerned that all major planning applications mentioned in the Core Strategy would get approval regardless of the Environmental Impact Assessment, Sustainability Assessment and the opinions of councillor and residents. There is also no opportunity to comment and have input into the criteria used to assess the sites for distribution.</p> <p>The Castle Donington and Hemington and Lockington area is wholly unsuitable area to have a distribution site, in particular since the scaling back of the M1 widening scheme.</p> <p>Gypsy and Travellers Concerned that there is nowhere in the current consultation that allows comment and to have input into the criteria used to assess the sites for Gypsies and Travellers. This is not acceptable as a criteria policy is only as good as the criteria used.</p>
4219	The Coal Authority	<p>Whilst, the Coal Authority has no preference to make with reference to the selection of a preferred spatial distribution, a number of the larger settlements in the district lie within the defined coalfield. These include Coalville, Ashby, Ibstock and Measham. The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that the implication of coal mining is taken into account in the preparation of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>There are coal resources present in the District that are capable of extraction by surface mining techniques and the Coal Authority is keen to ensure that these resources are not unnecessarily sterilised by non-mineral development. In instances where non-mineral development takes place in these areas the Coal Authority would seek prior extraction of the coal in line with MPS1 requirements. Prior extraction also has benefit of removing potential land instability problems.</p> <p>Also a significant legacy of past coal mining activity in the district and it is important that coal mining information is considered by the Council to help inform any future allocation process and identification of strategic site or broad locations for growth. This should be done to ensure land is stable and therefore meet the requirements of PPG14.</p>

4220	East Midlands Regional Assembly		<p>Green Wedge Previous comments still apply (AB to check and summarise)</p> <p>Strategic Sites Reference made to PPS12 advice and potential problems drawbacks of including specific sites in the Core Strategy, for example, could lead to the Core Strategy becoming dated. Suggest an alternative approach of showing outlines on key diagram rather than identifying specific boundaries with site specific criteria included in the written statement of the Core Strategy to establish principle of development in that location.</p> <p>Further detail could then be included within a Site Specific Land Allocations Documents (SSLAD) and masterplanning. What would a SSLAD if a significant level of detail is included in a Core Strategy.</p> <p>Development Strategy Regional Plan policies 3,13a, 20, Three Cities SRS3 and Three Cities SRS4 will need to be reflected in the Core Strategy when addressing the scale and distribution of new development. Whilst a partial review of the Regional Plan is being undertaken, the options being reviewed do not appear to be a strong material consideration with respect to conformity o emerging DPDs.</p> <p>Policy 13a of the Regional Plan enables Local Authorities to test higher numbers than those expressed in the Regional Plan provided they are consistent with sustainability principles and they have been tested through a sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Strategic Distribution Policy 21 of the Regional Plan applies.</p> <p>Gypsy and Travellers It is not clear whether the emerging view would deliver the number of pitches required by the Regional Plan.</p>
4221	Leicestershire Police (Architectural Liaison Officer)		<p>Recent work may assist with the preparation of the Local Development Framework and Core Strategy.</p> <p>Strategic Review of Estates – Aim is to agree options in the new year and consultation will be undertaken with partners. An opportunity to look at diverse and localised estates. Appreciate that the Coalville focus will place pressure on existing outlets and are keen to understand this and whether investment and combined services offer accessibility advantages to the communities served. Coalville will remain the important delivery focus for policing in the district.</p>

			<p>Paying for Infrastructure – It will be crucial to capture funds that can be earmarked towards necessary investment and look to the Council to do this through effective s106 and CIL .</p> <p>There are a number of concerns on the HMA assessment of infrastructure requirements. For example, the impact of large public transport projects, limited involvement of partners and use of metrics that bear no relation to what is currently used. Therefore the Police are keen to work with individual Local Authorities to match growth proposed with our best estimates on infrastructure needs. Suggest that policies and protocols are revised to be able to address the level of growth proposed and to keep infrastructure growth in line with this. Will be looking for robust policies to earmark funds specifically for additional policy and the floorspace to accommodate this. Would also be happy to partner on work that seeks potential contribution of Growth Point Funding or Regional Funds to kick start necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>Growth work with other Local Planning Authorities – Police are now able to give advice on the likely infrastructure requirements for what the Core Strategy proposes. We agree with the principle of concentration to achieve the critical mass to effectively fund and deliver services.</p> <p>Review of our Metrics – Policy is used on s106 contributions. Figures are currently being reviewed and it is likely in the New Year that Polices will be able to advise on the site identified in the Core Strategy.</p>
--	--	--	---